

**University Faculty Senate Meeting
Meeting Minutes
May 8, 2013**

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate President Joan Shapiro at 1:46pm.

2. Minutes from the December 7, 2012 University Faculty Senate meeting:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the minutes from the December 7th meeting.

3. Vice President's Report:

Mark Rahdert, Vice-President of the Faculty Senate gave a brief report. He started by asking for a big round of applause for the wonderful leadership that was provided this year by Faculty Senate President Joan Shapiro. Mark indicated that Joan deserves our respect and thanks. She is a great scholar and teacher and has given so much to Temple University through her service as Faculty Senate President. The senators gave Joan a big round of applause.

Mark also reminded senators that he is encouraging applications for committee membership. Applications coming in after today's meeting will be processed for September by newly elected Vice-President Tricia Jones. Mark noted that we have an urgent need for applicants to fill vacancies on several important committees including EPPC, budget review committee, CATA, international programs, Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color, Committee on the Status of Women, Lecture and Forums, Student Awards, and Inventions and Patents. Please send your applications to senate2@temple.edu.

4. President's Report:

Faculty Senate President Joan Shapiro thanked Mark Rahdert for his excellent service as Vice-President. She gave an update on some exciting work at the university and then provided a brief summary of the accomplishments of the Faculty Senate during this academic year.

In terms of exciting projects, she reminded faculty of the Visualize Temple campaign that has just been launched and will be going throughout the summer in terms of planning meetings with faculty. The Smith group is asking for faculty volunteers to serve on committees. There will be a need for approximately 13-15 faculty members from all sectors of the university who are able to work over the summer session 1 period. If you are interested in being a volunteer she asked faculty to send their bio and reason for interest via e-mail to senate2@temple.edu.

Then Joan provided a brief report of the work of the faculty senate and the faculty senate steering committee (FSSC) under her leadership. She indicated that the FSSC meets 2 hours every week and members also contribute additional time and effort on various subcommittees. There are representatives from every school and college on the FSSC. FSSC has met with 20 guests since January on topics including decentralized budgeting, undergraduate education, collegial assembly bylaws, athletics; electronic versions of SFFs, graduate student supports, etc. FSSC has also created two ad hoc committees to focus on (a) disruptive students and faculty and (b) review of faculty governance practices. She ended her presentation by giving her sincere thanks to the members of FSSC, the collegial assembly chairs, the faculty senators and the Faculty Senate executive committee for their work and support throughout this year. And, she ended with a very special thanks to Cheryl Mack, the Faculty Senate staff person for all of her hard work.

She turned the floor to Paul LaFollette, past-President of the Faculty Senate, who brought to the floor the attached motion for a shared task force on undergraduate education (see attached). Paul reminded the Senate that this motion was moved and seconded at the last meeting and that it was being presented now

for a second voting. Paul read motion from the minutes of the last meeting. There was no discussion, and the motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions.

5. Decentralized Budgeting Forum:

Joan Shapiro introduced the main focus of the meeting – the Forum on Decentralized Budgeting. Forum presenters included:

- Doug Priest (specialist in decentralized budgeting at Indiana University)
- Anthony Wagner (CFO of Temple University)
- Terry Halbert (Faculty member in the Fox School of Business and member of the University Budget Review Committee)
- Doug Wager (Chair of Theater, faculty member in TFMA, FSSC member, and member of the University Budget Review committee)

Each member of the panel made a brief presentation followed by a question and answer session from faculty and finally some summary comments from President Theobald.

Tony Wagner: He summarized that he has been making presentations about the DBM (decentralized budgeting model) to groups around the university including collegial assemblies, FSSC, and others. The PPTs of this presentation are available on his website. He overviewed some of the major points about DBM:

- DBM can be an important tool to help us bring new revenues into the university
- Temple formed a steering committee; faculty and administrators
- The core philosophy of DBM is to give revenue ownership to schools and colleges
- DBM better aligns authority with responsibility
- Temple is not leading the way on DBM; we have 2 decades of work already on this and a great deal of research on its effectiveness (which is summarized on temple.edu/cfo.)
- There is appropriate concern about creating a model too market driven and profit oriented; we need to be careful about how we do this
- If there is concern about anybody getting the rug pulled out from underneath them – not the case – we are building into the model a hold harmless year

Terry Halbert: In Terry's presentation she made several excellent points:

- Is this process mission driven? The budgetary steering committee developed key principles (transparency, fairness; shared governance)
- Who is defining and defending mission? Faculty participation must be real and significant in order for DBM to work.
 - IU visit confirmed her view of faculty involvement in that process
 - Faculty governance is problematic at Temple and that concerns her; faculty are and have been frustrated with getting budget information and access to that information
 - We must have a healthy functioning faculty governance
 - We need leadership that happens in schools and colleges; we MUST have Deans that support faculty input
 - IU has faculty committees active within units and a campus-wide committee (these are largely faculty; trained and supported by budgetary staff)
 - How are these committees being developed in our colleges as we speak? There are colleges where Deans are handpicking faculty to say what they want to hear; to hand over decision-making authority to Deans
 - Maybe DBM has promise to overcome the strong Dean model, but this will require leadership that must insist on very strong and real faculty involvement in this process.
- There is a strong concern about Undergraduate Education under DBM.
 - DBM gives pressure to losing quality control; IU doesn't have GenEd.

-1/3rd UG education (GenEd) needs guarding

-Temple must look seriously at how to protect GenEd during the DBM implementation

- There is not enough faculty representation on this DBM task force. She indicated that she enjoyed serving on this committee; but we are not at sufficient faculty input, it is too administration-heavy. He explained that at Indiana University they had a three faculty-led and faculty-composed committees and then gave recommendations to leadership.

Doug Wager: Doug Wager discussed a change-based orientation to considering DBM.

- DBM is not the be-all and end-all of RCM. It is one component.
- The committee began with a series of phases and we're in model development (phase 3). Phase 1 was assessment and alignment. Phase 2 was defining guiding principles and identifying cost drivers
- There are several guiding principles
 - Mission driven (what is our mission?) (details in the making)
 - Aligning of authority with responsibility– the closer the point of operation to point of impact the better. Decisions have to be made closest to point of consequence.
 - Strategic planning is key. To make budget process truly responsive to mission requires strategic planning overall and within each unit. Max Dupree- Leadership as an Art – said that if you lead from the bottom up you have to look at how your decision-making structure is built . Temple is at point of learned helplessness; we need to be in a state of learned optimism; consciously challenging negative self-talk; move from scared governance to shared governance
 - Encourage the use of roving leadership
 - Provide and maintain momentum; team's job is to provide environment that allows momentum to gather

Doug Priest: Doug Priest shared some of his insights from the many years of experience he has had with DBM.

- As you go through it is important that faculty concerns be heard; this is not a process that undoes history; we want to look forward
- He that there is a better synthesis of academic and financial planning through this DBM

Questions and Answers (the speaker posing the questions is identified by name and college affiliation and the respondent is identified by initials in parentheses):

Steve Gross (COE) – how does this model account for external economic contexts (like economic hits to K-12)?

(DP) – Education not one of the highest priority schools on the campus; schools may be able to still have certain things within your control that they can use to move forward

(DW) those externals are coming at us anyway; those challenges are best met if response is from the local level

Michael Sachs (CHPSW) –curricular oversight follow-up; how does this work in practice? How has it worked at IU?

(TH) in place now is EPPC; the decisions can/should come back to GEEC for GenEd; (one strength is that GEEC has representation across campus – but we don't have an equivalent structure for all undergraduate education)

(DP)– Provost Dai is moving forward with two committees that will oversee undergraduate education

Tricia Jones (COE) – we need full faculty training and awareness so faculty are informed and can engage effectively in DBM; we need to think about developing faculty cohorts that can lead in DBM and provide incentives for that work

(TW)- a critical question is how to build that kind of training regime to meet our needs; should be available to all faculty; will have access to that. We are learning a lot from IU because they have a very robust collaborative training process.

(TH) – Leadership Academy; fuse that the DBM understanding into that?

Howard Spodek (CLA) – should we be concerned with role of Board of Trustees in our plans?

(President Theobald) – I think not; role of the Board is to set policy; this is a management issue; they set constraints within which budget will operate but management of that budget is our responsibility.

Steve Newman (Faculty Herald and CLA) – where is discussion on funding for graduate students; may pose a challenge here because of dispersal through graduate school. There are concerns that departments that don't bring in grants may be at a disadvantage.

(DP) – IU started with centralized system and never really got away from it. They have a mixed model and not a perfect one. Colleges where graduate students are valued for program development may have to find the money for themselves rather than depend on it coming from university general support.

Jim Korsh (CST) – what was force or driver for Temple deciding to go to DBM?

(TW) – I had heard that there were earlier discussions. As the great recession continued decreasing appropriations we needed investments for student advising, etc. These things really increased the need to consider the different models that could be more entrepreneurial. When Dick Englert became Interim president he thought about bringing this to the attention of the Board. When we have 10% of funding coming from the state we need to have a different approach – it's more about culture than finance.

(DW) – when budgets got tight you need to think more about a cultural change of how you handle revenue generation.

President Theobald gave a short response in the last several minutes of the meeting. He said the most important thing is to ask faculty to get involved. He got involved as chair of campus budget committee. Why are we doing this? We are choosing to do DBM; we are not being mandated to do DBM. Think of this as more of an academic initiative – push out authority to make decisions. This empowers faculty and deans. DBM makes it very transparent what schools are paying for services.

President Theobald then commented on the Visualize Temple process – what do we want this university to look like in 20-30 years? He again encouraged faculty involvement and Joan Shapiro reminded interested faculty to self-nominate by sending bios and statements of interest to senate2@temple.edu.

6. Call to Adjourn:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:22pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary