

Representative Faculty Senate Meeting
March 21, 2014
Minutes

Attendance:

Representative senators and officers: 45

Ex-officios: 1

Faculty, administrators, and guests: 8

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:50 PM.

Approval of Minutes

The secretary announced that normally the practice is to identify those who speak at Senate meetings. This makes sense since anyone can go to the audio capture web site and hear who said what. For these minutes, however, he omitted the names of speakers because he did not want to discourage the kind of open and frank discussion that had taken place at our last meeting. He stated that if there is any objection to this, anyone is free to move that the names be included.

Dieter Forster (CST) made the motion that the speakers be identified in the minutes. This motion carried. The minutes were then approved as corrected.

President's Report – Mark Rahdert

The FSSC will be jointly sponsoring a symposium with the Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color and the Academic Center on Research in Diversity. This symposium will explore issues related to diversity at Temple University. If you are interested in helping plan this symposium, get in touch with Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon.

FSSC has made a request to the Provost's office for data about diversity at Temple. The Provost's office has agreed to provide this information, and it should be available to us by the end of March.

The Alumni Affairs office is interested in engaging faculty in alumni relations. They have created a short survey which the FSSC has distributed to the faculty via the listserv.

The FSSC has set up a sub-committee to seek information from the administration and faculty about the tenure and promotion guidelines that will be used in evaluating T&P cases. We are trying to assure that there is full transparency as to what those procedures are.

The FSSC met with Jim Creedon for an update about the master plan. The consultants' report is scheduled to go to the Board in April and will shortly thereafter be presented to the faculty. Creedon has been invited to present the report to the Senate. This is a proposed plan; there will be an opportunity for comment and feedback.

Rahdert has also been in touch with Ken Lawrence, our Vice President for Government Relations. Each year Temple has sessions with members of the Pennsylvania Legislature. Lawrence is interested in having faculty participate in this. April 29 will be Owls on the Hill

Day. Prior to that there will be several training sessions to prepare people to go. He would like some faculty volunteers who would be willing to go to Harrisburg on April 29. If you are interested, please let Rahdert know.

Vice President’s Report – Tricia Jones

Jones introduced Joan Shapiro, chairperson of the FSSC nominating committee who announced that the ballot for officers consists of:

President
Tricia Jones

Vice President
Marina Angel
Charles Jungreis

Secretary
Deborah Howe

Voting will begin Monday morning, March 31 and proceed through 5:00PM Monday April 7, 2014.

Jones then announced the nominees for elected committees.

EPPC
William Miller

Personnel Committee
Mark Rahdert

RPPC
Mahmut Safak
Timothy McDonald

Honors Oversight
Erik Cordes
Steven Gross
David Pryluck
Mahmut Safak
Paul Swann

UTPAC
Rebecca Alpert
Therese Dolan
Tricia Jones

Guest – Provost Dai

The Provost first asked that as the symposium on diversity develops, we keep Rhonda Brown’s office involved. The President has recently moved that office into the Provost’s office. She has now been empowered to be more active in helping to achieve diversity in terms of faculty and students.

He agrees that it would be a good plan, after the release of the master plan recommendations, to have a dedicated meeting with the faculty to discuss these recommendations.

He then summarized some of his activities this year:

- The creation of a new online and distance learning office.

- The research office has been enhanced. There are new hires. This office should become the point of contact for all research issues. Schools which have large enough grant income to be able to afford their own research offices will continue to use their internal offices. Schools with less grant income will be assigned to the central office which will handle their needs.
- Approved 90 faculty searches across the university.
- Gradually increasing the percentage of teaching NTT's on multi-year contracts. The target is to have 60% of NTT's in any college on multi-year contracts.
- We have considerably decreased the wait time for students wanting non-emergency mental counseling from two months to less than two weeks.
- We continue to invest in student advisors. We now have 102 advisors across the university.
- Creation of the Fly in Four program to encourage four year time to graduation.
- Hired a new director of Career Services.
- Increased the size and quality of the Honors Program.
- Both merit based and need based scholarships have been dramatically increased.

Paul LaFollette (CST) commented that over the past several contracts, we have put on hold discussions of intellectual property. With the increasing interest in online and distance learning, I would want to have this issue settled before I began developing any such courses. Will this happen?

Answer: This will be settled within one half year.

Art Hochner (FSBM) is pleased to hear about the initiative to increase the number of NTT's on multi-year contracts. He has just looked at the statistics for NTT's in the TAUP schools and colleges. At this time 37.5% are on multi-year contracts, 62.5% are on one year contracts. This varies greatly between colleges. FSBM has 51% on multi-year contracts. CLA has 18%. Tyler has 0%. There is a long way to go.

The Provost responded by first clarifying that his goal only includes teaching NTT's. This year he will do a college by college survey to make sure that each school or college is approaching the specified percentage.

Marina Angel (LAW) asked how the Provost decided which schools would maintain their own research offices within the school and which will be served by a central office? Also, were the deans of the schools put into the pool consulted, and did they agree to it? How much will this centralization slow down the process? Are there limits as to how much seed money each of the schools in the pool can get?

Provost Dai responded that when he first came to Temple he had to work both with the university's research office and with his college's business office. He found this very burdensome as a faculty member. So, at that time CST created a college based research administration office. In such an office, you need a grant specialist, a human resources specialist, and you need accounting expertise. But these three people require about \$300,000.00 per year. This must come from indirect cost recovery. This means at least \$5,000,000.00 in

funding in order to hire these three people. CST's current funding is around \$20,000,000.00 so this is not a problem for them. But COE, for instance, does not have enough overhead cost recovery to fund such an office. This is true of many colleges. We created this model and then asked each dean if they were willing to participate. If they were, then we calculated what each participating college would be taxed for these pooled services.

Angel: So if a college does not want to participate, it doesn't have to?

Provost: It does not have to. This is completely voluntary.

The Provost also noted that the new hires in the Research Office are mostly involved with compliance, an area where we had previously had some problems.

Joe Schwartz (CLA) asked whether the problems with the IRB are being addressed.

The Provost responded that these are being addressed. Response times are improving.

Schwartz also commented that the Honors Program is important, but it is not representative of the economic and racial distribution of our students. How should we address this? It could be that an under-advantaged high school student with a lower SAT may have more potential than a better advantaged student with a higher SAT.

Answer: This is an excellent point that we should look at. Maybe we should look at factors other than academic factors in admitting students to the Honors Program.

Dieter Forster (CST) agreed with Professor Schwartz's comments. He also wanted to point out that the best way for a student to get into the Honors Program is for a professor to identify and recommend the student to the Honors Program.

Peter Jones commented that students can be admitted to the Honors Program any time during the freshman or sophomore years. We also admit transfer students.

Steve Newman (CLA and Editor of the Faculty Herald) reminded us that some months ago the Faculty Senate endorsed the guidelines for distance learning that Vicki McGarvey and Catherine Schifter developed as part of a committee. Will those guidelines become a part our policy?

Answer: Yes

Newman also asked about the Fly in Four program. While it is desirable to clear away roadblocks to timely graduation, there is also logic about the way in which we sequence our majors' courses through pre-requisites. There is logic about requiring certain GPAs in some pre-requisite courses. There is some concern that the pressures to increase four year graduation may compete with pressures to maintain quality and likelihood of success in the major. APAC serves as a watchdog for cannibalization under RCM. Have we given any thought to creating a structure to help deal with the kind of competing goals that I just outlined between Fly in Four and maintaining the quality of programs.

The Provost responded that we want to make sure that there are not roadblocks. We do not want to change our standards. We do want to assure that when a student needs to take a course, he or she will be able to. This requires the cooperation of the faculty. We need, for instance, to make sure that there are not time conflicts by encouraging classes to meet the matrix. We do not intend to change our standards. As we have more students graduating on time, our classroom capacity will be freed up, and we are therefore looking at increasing our freshman admission numbers.

The Provost then announced that for the first time in many years, we have moved into the top 100 in the NSF research rankings. In 1976 our ranking was 67. Temple dropped to 140, but now we are climbing back.

The chairman of RPPC asked about seed money. It would help the university if we could increase the seed money available to RPPC.

The Provost responded that there are several sources for seed money. RPPC is only one of these. We also have \$240,000.00 to support faculty summer research. Also the Research Office will have, from time to time, specifically targeted funds to encourage, for instance, interdisciplinary research. RPPC has about \$60,000.00 but this is only a part of what the Provost's office funds. His suggestion is that the \$60,000.00 component be all targeted at non-sponsored research areas such as the arts and humanities.

Update on Some Budget Matters

Rahdert brought forth some information from Rafael Porrata-Doria, the chairperson of the Senate Budget Review Committee.

There have been between 12 and 15 budget review conferences. These conferences review requests from various budget units for next year's funding. Each unit must submit a proposed budget for review. The review committees all contain faculty members. The presentations are all scored using a scoring sheet developed by the budget office. The Senate Budget committee will meet with Ken Kaiser after this process is complete to review the scoring process and evaluate how effective the procedure was.

These budget presentations open up the budget by showing much more detail than the budget supplied to the state each year. Rahdert believes that this represents a big move toward increasing transparency at Temple.

Included in your materials is a resolution that the FSSC has presented to the President, the Provost, and the CFO. It regards collegial budget committees. Please communicate this to your own schools and colleges, especially to your budget committees. This resolution was sent to the FSSC by the University Budget Committee with the request that the FSSC endorse it.

Old Business

None.

Additional Comments

Marina Angel asked whether the budget review process had taken place yet for the Medical School. We have lost \$28,000,000.00 in the last six months, and 75 doctors have left. The relationship between the hospital and the medical school is quite entangled. If the Medical School review has not yet taken place, it would be important that the matter of the hospital be brought up during that review.

Art Hochner (FSBM) asks whether Rahdert has heard anything about the desire of some of the faculty at West Chester to become a state related university?

A: No, I have not heard about that specifically. What he has heard is that there are some units of the state system that are rapidly losing students and others, like West Chester, who are doing quite well. The latter are unhappy that they are subsidizing the former.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.
Secretary