

Temple University Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, May 7, 2014 - 1:45 PM
Kiva Auditorium
Minutes

Attendance:

Representative senators and officers: 45

Ex-officios: 1

Faculty, administrators, and guests: 19

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by President Rahdert at 1:51 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

The December 6, 2013 minutes were approved.

President's Report – Mark Rahdert:

Rahdert distributed a summary of the actions of the Senate and the FSSC during the past year. He encouraged us to share this information with our colleagues.

The work of the Senate is a group effort, but Rahdert offered special recognition of the following:

1. Vice President Tricia Jones who has done a magnificent job of staffing and working with the various standing committees of the Senate.
2. Paul LaFollette, secretary, who has prepared the minutes for the various Senate meetings and also the weekly meetings of the FSSC.
3. Senate coordinator Cheryl Mack who really helps us run smoothly. Without her it would not be possible to operate.
4. The members of the FSSC who devote two hours every week.

He also expressed his thanks to President Theobald, Provost Dai, the various members of the Provost's staff, and the Chairman of the Board Patrick O'Conner, all of whom have shown, over the last year, a tremendous level of support for all that we do as the Faculty Senate.

Shared governance at Temple faces many challenges. Some of these challenges can be overcome by direct action. Others may be channeled into productive discussions. A few may have accumulated such force that they cannot be conquered but only managed. In this kind of environment, preserving shared governance takes dedication, hard work, wisdom, and perseverance. Rahdert has tried this year to do his part, with the hopes some small success, to strengthen shared governance. He is extremely confident that next year we will have the kind of leadership under President-elect Jones that will lead to further strengthening of shared governance.

Vice President's Report – Tricia Jones:

It is a pleasure and honor to be able to watch the kind of work that President Rahdert has done. You may also know that Mark is a musician. We would like to present to him a token of gratitude for everything that he has done over the past year for the Senate. We hope that he enjoys this opportunity for music and relaxation and that he remembers us fondly as he experiences it.

We have had an enormous response from the faculty in willingness to support the Senate. Eighteen percent of full-time faculty serve on Senate committees. That is a lot of time and effort that all of us are giving as faculty. Our committees have representation from all campuses, all schools and colleges, and all faculty rank levels. We have had a wonderful response from the Medical School from faculty serving on committees. We have

increased the size and scope of the International Studies Committee. We have been consulted at every turn by the administration with respect to matters not covered by our standing committees. Counting the faculty who serve on non-senate committees, we have nearly 25% of our faculty doing committee work at the University level.

Recognition of Retiring Faculty:

This year we honor the following faculty members who are retiring:

1. Richard Bernstein, Dept. of Economics, CLA
2. Judith Goode, Dept. of Anthropology, CLA
3. Earl Henderson, Dept. Of Microbiology & Immunology, MED
4. Boris Iglewicz, Dept. of Statistics, FSBM
5. Patricio Silvo, Dept. of Medicine, MED
6. Richard Stewart, Dept. of Anthropology, CLA
7. Kenneth Mangan, Dept. of Medicine, MED

We are grateful for all of your years of service to this institution. We hope that your years ahead are full of enjoyment, and that you look back at your time at Temple with fondness.

Recognition of New Officers:

Tricia Jones, President

Chip Jungreis, Vice-President

Deborah Howe, Secretary

Dialog with Dai:

Provost Dai began his remarks by expressing his appreciation of the two Senate President's he has worked with, Shapiro and Rahdert. Also thanks Steve Newman for his work on the Faculty Herald.

Enrollment – 2014 fall. Last year we had nearly 4400 freshmen with the highest SAT scores on record. This year we went to a new application process. We managed to recruit a class as good as last year with more than 4500 freshmen.

NTT multi-year contracts: Last year the deans and the Provost agreed that we would strive for multi-year contracts for 50% of the teaching NTT's in each college. This year, we raised this to 60%. Every college has now made the 50% mark and by next year each college will exceed the 60% mark.

Total research spending is \$225,000,000.00. For the first time in decades, Temple University will be ranked in the top 100 universities in NSF ranking.

The Senate recently passed several resolutions relative to P&T proceedings. The President and Provost will provide a formal reply, but the Provost wants now to assure us that there have been no procedural changes from the previous procedures except for the change in the number of recommendation letters from five to eight.

Questions:

Hochner (FSBM) – Two questions. The first is about NTT's. I applaud the push for multi-year appointments. Are there criteria for determining which NTT's get multi-year contracts and for how many years?

A: That is a matter for discussion between the individual deans and department chairs. May depend on rank and experience.

Q: To what degree is the big jump in research dollars attributable to the acquisition of Fox-Chase?

A: Comparing the data from 2012-2013, we had an increase of about \$90,000,000.00. Half of that is attributable to Fox-Chase. 25% is increased research activity at main campus and the medical center. The last 25% resulted from a change in our accounting practices to bring them into accord with the practices of other universities. In

the past, we were not including such things as start-up funds and unrealized indirect cost recovery.

Marina Angel (LAW)

Q: The money allocated to RPPC is \$60,000. This has not increased over the past ten years. You seemed to believe, the last time we discussed this, that the money was distributed only on main campus. We continue to get many applications from health sciences and other campuses. The current amount is inadequate. Do you plan to increase it?

A: I would encourage you to limit grants from RPPC to the humanities and the arts, and social science. It is very hard in these areas for faculty to find external funding. The Provost's office will be directly investing in targeted interdisciplinary research areas such as materials science.

At this point the Provost took the opportunity to announce that a joint paper between him and Joel Sheffield has just been accepted as the cover paper for a very important journal in chemical physics.

Q: We were promised a while back, transparency in the amount of seed money for all units, and we have never received it.

A: We have not done any seed grants for the past several years. You will see a call for proposals across the university with at least two investigators from two departments.

Q: Will the Senate be choosing the faculty members to sit on the committee to review these proposals?

A: Yes.

Q: You have said several times that the only change in P&T procedures is the number of required letters of recommendation. Actually, the major change was the injection of the Provost into the process. I think most of us believed that the Provost would be guided by the same principles required of the President. Has that now been established?

A: I don't quite understand the question. My understanding of my role is that based on the materials presented to me, I make a recommendation to the President. So I read all the information, I take note of all the votes, and I make my recommendations.

Q: Do you apply the same standards that the President is required to apply?

A: I don't know. Are there a set of standards written down somewhere?

Q: For the President there is.

A: Guidelines. There are guidelines. The same as the guidelines we send to reviewers.

Q: I am not talking about the reviewers. I am talking about your decisions.

A: We all value impact and scholarship as demonstrated by the reviewers.

Karen Turner (SMC): A comment and a question.

The comment is, I want to thank you and your staff for providing the diversity data that we have been asking for. I do want now to request that we also get information by rank and by track.

Q: Evaluators for T&P. Are there guidelines that address at what point the letters are considered?

A: Right now this is a college by college process. We have a general expectation that for promotion, should be full professors. For tenure, should be leaders in their fields. In CST we ask that brief information about the

proposed reviewers be forwarded to the dean and then the dean will approve or disapprove them. They should also be independent of the candidate. Up to 3 can be recommended by the candidate.

Q: Sometimes the appropriate evaluators may be people who may not be affiliated with universities.

A: I have studied this, and discovered that in all fields there are sufficient academic experts in the field.

Q: Once you receive the evaluations and the portfolio, is it assumed that they be reviewed together, or is it that the letters are evaluated first, or the portfolios first?

A: Usually I look at the candidate as a whole, at the same time.

Stephanie Knopp (TYLER)

Q: I wanted to elaborate on the comments made by Karen. On the issue of professional schools, and this affects music, dance, theater, we need to recognize that there are amazing practitioners of the field who are regular teachers. They teach at the college level at premier schools, but they are not necessarily tenured. These may be schools that do not offer tenure. They may only teach one course per year. It may be the capstone course in a program. I would like to argue that a small subset of the people who write these letters be permitted to write these letters. These can be the best quality people.

A: I know the challenge. There is still a distinction between someone who excels in the art but does not hold a tenured position. I generally believe that letters should come from tenured practitioners who understand how to evaluate people for academic positions. But, if a dean or department chair were to recommend a particular person for a particular reason, we would be willing to listen.

Ken Kaiser – CFO:

Kaiser thanked Mark for his help in developing the RCM processes. His report is well summarized by the power point slides he handed out and which are included as Appendix I of these minutes.

Jim Creedon – Campus Master Plan:

Again, Creedon’s presentation is well summarized by the summary handouts provided and which form Appendix II of these minutes.

Old Business

None

New Business

None

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 PM

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.
Secretary