

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**Tuesday, October 15, 2013**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Mark Rahdert (Pres.), Tricia Jones (Vice Pres.), Paul LaFollette (Secy.), Joan Shapiro (Past-Pres.), Li Bai (Engr), Kenneth Boberick (DENT), Cheri Carter (SSW), Deborah Howe (SED), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Karen M. Turner (SMC), Matthew Miller (TFMA), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

**Absent:** Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Matthew Miller (TFMA), Robert Reinstein (Law)

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 PM.

**Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes were approved as corrected.

**President's Report:**

Jim Creedon, Vice President for Facilities and Security, will be visiting us in February.

President Theobald will be our guest at next week's meeting. Rahdert suggested that we use the FSSC listserv to discuss possible questions for him.

Friday, October 18, will be president Theobald's inaugural celebration. Hundreds of faculty have announced their intention to attend.

Patrick O'Connor, the President of Temple's Board of Trustees, has been invited to meet with the FSSC. He has asked first to meet with President Rahdert alone.

Past President Joan Shapiro was honored by the Board of Trustees at their recent meeting for her service to Temple.

Plans for the upcoming retreat are well underway. Members of the FSSC and representatives from the deans have been asked to lead the discussions.

We need to think about topics to discuss with today's guest, Diane Maleson. We briefly discussed the matters of training of department chairs, and the T&P process.

Several members of the FSSC attended a session in which Peter Jones Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, showed the new web pages which will give students access to some of the ESFF data. Those who attended felt that the structure used to present the data was well designed.

The point was raised that ESFF's remain one of the primary vehicles used for evaluating teaching for T&P, merit, and contract renewals. We need to revisit how ESFF's should most properly be used.

It was further announced that the students have access to only four of the questions on the ESFF's, and that they can see the data from the past two years. They can look up scores by course or by instructor. Peter Jones is interested in expanding the number of items shown.

One FSSC member suggested that without any information about how many responded to the questions, the ESSF data are "almost silly." Also that TAUP has received several questions from faculty members as to whether release of these data to students constitutes the release of what should be private HR data.

Another member asked whether we can see our own scores.

Answer: Yes, they are available on the Tuportal page.

It was asked why only four questions are shown. The answer was given that everything else correlated strongly with these four questions. It was then asked, if that be so, why we bother asking all the other questions. Nobody had an answer to this query.

A person with experience as a department chair expressed a belief that nearly everyone gets reasonably good scores on the numbered questions – the really useful information lies in the written comments. It was also stressed that the numeric values need to be read in the context of the kind of grades the instructor in question assigns.

Rahdert pointed out that Peter Jones will be visiting us on November 7, and can respond to our comments then.

There was a brief discussion of the agenda for the upcoming Senate meeting. Peter Jones will make a presentation about ESFF's.

President Theobald will address the full University Senate at our December meeting.

One of our members suggested that at next Tuesday's meeting, we remind President Theobald that we made some requests of him regarding the functioning of collegial assemblies. He has not yet responded to those requests.

### **Vice President's Report**

We have a nominee for the GEEC, Gerard Brown. A colleague made strongly positive comments about him. The FSSC voted to approve him to serve on the GEEC.

Daniel Fesenmaier (STHM) is interested in serving on the Handbook Committee.

The Research and Creative Awards Committee needs members.

Diane Maleson has asked us to give her some suggestions for people we would like to see her appoint to the University T&P Committee

We need to give the Provost the names of two people to serve on the Budget Review Committee (the Provost's Task Force, not the Senate Budget Review Committee).

A member asked whether the money generated by Schools and Colleges under the new budgetary model would be distributed by school or by department. The answer was that the money will come into the dean's office of the school or college. An FSSC member observed that this could be used to treat some departments unfairly.

It was observed that we need to better define the relationship and linkages between the Senate's Budget Review Committee and the Provost's Budget Committee.

### **Discussion of the Campus Master Plan**

Those who were able to attend the most recent report of the planning consultants gave a brief report of what they had heard.

- The report was limited to Main Campus, the HSC Campus and a tiny bit of discussion of Ambler.
- This may be because the consultants felt that these campuses would be of greatest interest to the people invited to this particular report.
- The consultants are assuming that student composition will be stable except for an increase in foreign and master's degree students
- We need more non-traditional, non-lecture space.
- There is an expectation that the need for lab space to support research will increase by 40% in the next 5 years.
- This is partly to encourage the development of new research synergies.
- There was some discussion of developing a sense of order in the campus, with the arts located to the north, professional schools to the south, natural sciences to the east, and public functions to the west, along Broad Street.
- They are regarding possible uses for the Ambler campus on the basis of asset relevance, academic differentiation, and sustainability.

There was a short discussion about the fact that the consultants have not reached out to individual departments that might have the professional expertise to help them.

### **Other matters:**

A last draft of the letter to the Provost will be made this week, and we will vote on it next week.

A committee was appointed to draft two motions, one regarding the membership on the APAC Committee, the other encouraging the administration to take notice of the report of the committee chaired by Vicki McGarvey and Catherine Schifter by accepting that committee's recommendations about best practices for distance learning.

We discussed our concern that we have heard no more about the plans to review deans.

**Guest: Diane Maleson -- Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Faculty Affairs:**

Maleson began by asking us to formulate some suggestions for her appointments to the University T&P Committee. Members are possible from the following schools: Boyer, CHPSW, FSBM, SMC, and the unnamed division of the Center for the Arts.

At our request, she then gave a brief report on her very positive experiences with training new department chairpersons undertaken over the summer. More than 50 chairs attended. She plans to continue these sessions.

She announced that there are a total of 35 summer research stipends available, and only 24 applications. She will extend the application deadline to Oct. 31.

In response to a question about the duties of a chairperson, Maleson referred us to a document on her website answering that very question.

We then began a discussion about whether NTT faculty hired to do teaching were eligible to receive merit for research and scholarship. This was a lively discussion with most faculty disagreeing with the university's position that a person can only get merit for what they were hired to do. Several faculty made compelling arguments to the contrary including:

- Merit should be awarded for doing over and above what is expected
- Publications by any faculty, whether T/TT or NTT, bring honor to Temple
- Teaching and scholarship are intimately related, with each informing the other.
- T/TT faculty are not specifically hired to do service outside of Temple, yet they can and have received merit for such activities.

There was no meeting of the minds.

The topic changed to T&P matters. A member expressed concern that the increase in the number of outside letters required in a tenure package represented a change in the Presidential guidelines that was made with no faculty consultation. The hope was voiced that if further changes are to be made, they be done in the same way the last Presidential guidelines came into being – namely with recommendations from a joint faculty/administration committee co-chaired by the Provost and the President of the Faculty Senate.

A second member suggested that if such changes are contemplated, that this could mean the confluence of three important opportunities to collaboratively maintain consistency – the revival of the Handbook Committee, the possibility of T&P guideline changes, and the upcoming TAUP negotiations.

Maleson suggested that she was beginning to feel that perhaps the Handbook Committee should put off getting started until the contract negotiations are completed. Several members countered that there was enough in the Handbook that is outdated, and that will not be affected by the new contract, that it is worth getting started on those items.

Another member reported that their collegial guidelines mandate 3 to 5 letters and that the new President's guideline conflicts with that. Maleson responded that the college should change its guidelines.

It was asserted that one dean did not believe it when informed that the Provost had told us that this year only, fewer than eight letters would be accepted. This person said that it is important that this message be widely disseminated to the deans. Maleson said that she would bring it up at the Council of Deans meeting scheduled for the next day.

It was asked whether the change in the number of letters reflects a belief on the part of the Provost that Temple's tenure standards are too lax. Maleson replied that she has heard no discussion of lax standards.

Additional points made in this discussion:

- The increase in the number of outside letters suggest an increase in the relative importance of research over teaching and service. Scholarship and teaching at least, should be of equal importance.
- One member wondered what kind of support is available for those denied tenure who elect to stay the one remaining year. Are they protected from being exploited because they are in a weak position?
- Another member observed that they have observed an increase in the number of candidates who, during their fifth year, are being discouraged from even coming forward for tenure. Maleson answered that her office has been working hard to identify potential problems early in the process so that those who will fail will know before they have wasted time.
- Yet another member asked whether it is perhaps time to explore different approaches to T&P, perhaps basing the decision on the whole body of professional work. Might this be a good time to consider this? Maleson answered that this might indeed be a good time.
- It was proposed that it is time to re-affirm the notion that one size does not fit all. There was general agreement on this point.

A short discussion developed about the difficulty of finding people to write in support of promotion to full professor who do not know the candidate. Several people felt that especially in a small field, it was unrealistic to expect this.

### **Service Brunch**

Several colleges have not yet made their selections. There was a brief discussion about the mechanisms possible for making these selections. The only thing required is that the final selection be supported by a letter from the dean. The language seems vague as to the process, and perhaps this needs to be revisited.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:06 PM

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.  
Secretary