

FSSC October 29, 2013
Minutes

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

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 PM.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

President's Report:

President Theobald responded to President Rahdert following last weeks meeting with the following points:

- He will continue to work with school and college administrators to help them develop budget planning models.
- He believes that the number of external review letters for Tenure and Promotion is an administrative decision appropriately made by the Provost.
- The procedure for review of deans is nearly final.
- A study of diversity at Temple is underway.

Rahdert was asked if we would be able to review the procedures for decanal review before it is released:

Answer: Rahdert has asked for this several times. He has not been refused, but neither has he seen any results.

There was some dissatisfaction expressed with respect to points one and two.

President's Report Continues:

Rahdert thanked all who participated in the retreat. He reports that he has heard from two schools, the law and dental schools, that they are setting up budget advisory committees with serious faculty involvement.

Rafael Porrata-Doria, chair of the University Budget Advisory Committee has expressed concern that there is no overlap between this committee (a Senate committee) and the University Budget Steering Committee. It was suggested that we need to further define the roles of the various committees bearing "Budget" in their titles.

Nearly every school & college has identified their winner of the service award and has provided a dean's letter of support. The brunch will also include a special award from the Provost this and on subsequent years. The FSSC will meet directly following the brunch in room 744 Altar Hall.

Vice President's Report:

Hector Postigo from TUMS was approved to serve on the Inventions & Patents Committee.

We still need members for the Research & Creative Awards Committee. We have been waiting to see which of our nominees for the Provost's new committee for course and program approval are not selected, but we are not getting this information. We discussed how best to give those not selected an invitation to apply to serve on the R&CA Committee.

Diane Maleson still wants us to provide names to her for her appointments to the UTAPC.

A current member of the Senate budget committee has expressed interest in serving on the University Review Committee. We agreed to propose her.

A further discussion developed around the relationship between these two committees, and their relationship to school/college budget planning committees.

Old Business:

Newman brought forth the two resolutions his committee has prepared for presentation to the Senate in the November meeting. The motion was made to present these as motions from the FSSC at the Senate meeting. This motion carried. (motion attached)

Guest: Tilghman Moyer - Interim Sr Vice President, Institutional Advancement

Moyer made a detailed presentation about the role of his department at Temple University. The powerpoint slides from this presentation are attached as an appendix to these minutes.

Among the points brought forth:

- 78% of Temple's budget comes from tuition and fees.
- 83% of Temple's giving comes from individuals, either as gifts or bequests. Nationally the average is 80%.
- Failing to get substantial giving from alumni/ae makes it harder to attract corporate giving.
- Last year of 30 million dollars received, 25 million was spent, 5 million was added to the endowment.
- Much of the money in bequests goes into the endowment.
- 8% of our alumni made gifts last year. This is a typical figure for urban commuter universities. Penn State had 14%, Pitt had 19%. Our goal is 10%.

There was some discussion of the frustrations that some schools and departments had experienced in the past in getting Institutional Advancement to share contact information about their graduates. Moyer seemed more willing to work with schools and colleges to help them keep in touch with their graduates.

The problem came up of where to assign students when the departments they graduated from have been rehoused or renamed. Alums often do not know with whom they should identify.

New Business:

none

The meeting adjourned at 3:04

Paul S, LaFollette, Jr.
Secretary

- 1) Recently, the Provost asked the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) to furnish names for the Academic Program Advisory Committee (APAC). According to the administration this committee will be charged with “encouraging innovation and promoting transparency while avoiding redundancy and inefficiency in the new budgetary model.” The current proposal calls for five faculty members out of a committee of nine with perhaps a sixth faculty member if a member of the School of Medicine is not among the initial five. Two of those faculty are to be selected by the Provost from a list furnished by the FSSC. The other three are to be selected directly by the Provost.

When this committee structure was presented to the FSSC, its members requested that more faculty be included and a greater proportion of those faculty be directly supplied by the Faculty Senate, possibly by appointment but preferably by election. Additional faculty at the October Faculty Senate meeting expressed similar views. However, it is our understanding that the current proposal for the composition of the committee remains unchanged.

The Faculty Senate believes that a stronger and more representative faculty voice is needed on this committee. The Senate therefore urges the Provost to reconsider the make-up of APAC to allow for more faculty representation and a greater role in the process of selection by the Faculty Senate and the FSSC.

- 2) While the Faculty Senate supports the formation of a committee charged with “encouraging innovation and promoting transparency while avoiding redundancy and inefficiency in the new budgetary model,” we also have some concerns about how this committee will operate and the scope of its charge. They include the following:

- While we understand the desire for efficiency, we believe the proposed ten-day comment period on course and program proposals will not give academic units impacted by proposals enough time to respond in an effective way.
- As the University implements decentralized budgeting, it is likely to create incentives for schools and colleges to generate more credit hours at the potential expense of academic quality, even if this is short-sighted and ultimately self-defeating. Ensuring academic quality does not seem to be part of the charge of this Committee. While some proposals will be subject to review by the EPPC and the Graduate Board, it is our understanding that a proposal for an undergraduate course or program that will operate within a single school or college is not likely to be reviewed by either body. While we believe curricular committees in the colleges and schools will faithfully discharge their duties, we think it is crucial to have a faculty-based body at the university level that will review the academic integrity as well as the efficiency and lack of redundancy of proposed programs.
- We are also concerned about the possibility, in cases where a new program and an existing program overlap with one another, that those authorized to make the decision will favor the new program over the old and take steps to phase the existing program out. While this may or may not be in the best interests of the University, we seek clarification as to whether APAC will possess such authority, and, if so, what procedures are contemplated for involving the school or college responsible for the existing program in making this sort of decision.

For these reasons, the Faculty Senate therefore urges the Provost to:

- lengthen the commenting period to at least three weeks and to task either the proposer of the program or the committee itself to actively engage in discussions with other schools or colleges whose existing programs may be affected
- make maintaining academic quality a specific part of the committee's charge.
- clarify the committee's policies and procedures with respect to phasing out of existing programs deemed to be either inferior or less efficient than new proposals.

Drafted by Paul LaFollette, Steve Newman, and Catherine Schifter