In Temple We Trust?

Perhaps we can learn something about Temple’s situation now by beginning with a brief look at an episode in the history of mistrusting universities. In 1762, a Glasgow clergyman and controversialist named William Thom published The Defects of an University Education, and Its Unsuitableness to a Commercial People. As the title promises, it is a full-bore assault on the University of Glasgow, Thom’s alma mater, for its useless curriculums of metaphysics and logic, its professors’ aversion to spending time in the classroom, and their indifference to helping their students figure out “what Business in Life [they] were designed for.” To remedy this, Thom wants to found an academy like one already proposed for the town of Perth. Its faculty will teach more, pay closer attention to their pupils’ individual minds and vocational needs, and instruct them in subjects suitable for “a commercial people,” including bookkeeping, math, writing, and geography. The academy does not aim to educate the university’s bread butter, future clergymen; but if it should dent the university’s enrollment, well, then, that would be all to the good, since those hidebound faculty and administrators “need such a Motive to rouse them to Activity.” Besides, if Glasgow doesn’t open an academy, the market will be filled by competitors like Perth.

Temple’s Institutional Integrity: The Task Force’s Report and Recommendations

By Frank Friedman, Professor of Computer Science (emeritus) and Eleanor Myers, Associate Professor of Law

On July 17, 2012, Acting President Richard Englert appointed a special Temple University task force to review the findings and recommendations contained in the report of the special investigative counsel to Pennsylvania State University, often referred to as the Frech Report, and to consider opportunities for improvement within our own institution. Named the Task Force on Institutional Integrity, the group was chaired JoAnne A. Epps, Dean of the Beasley School of Law, and consisted of 8 administrative members, 4 senior staff, and the two of us as faculty representatives.¹

The complete Task Force report was issued in September, 2012 and may be found at www.temple.edu/president (see the “Reports” link on the right hand side of the page). In recognition of the short time given, the initial Task Force charge was changed to a focus on (1) a review of University activities involving minors; and (2) an assessment of compliance with The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (the “Clery Act”). As time permitted, the Task Force was tasked with grappling with other issues.

The Price of Performing a Mitzvah at Temple University

The Cost of Caring for One’s Fellow Human Beings in the 21st Century

By Michael Sirover, Professor of Pharmacology

“No good deed goes unpunished” Oscar Wilde

In the Jewish faith, the Rabbis teach that one must study Torah (the Hebrew Bible) and perform mitzvahs (good deeds). The former is insufficient by itself. It must be accompanied by the latter. The necessity of both is further emphasized on Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, when the phrase, “Teshuvah, Tefilla vi Tzedakah” (repentance, prayer and charity) is a constant refrain chanted throughout the holiday as one seeks forgiveness for the sins committed during the course of the year.

In Christianity, the parable of the Good Samaritan is well recognized as a means of underlining the role of good deeds and charitable acts as fundamental tenets of the Christian faith. Similarly, in Islam, its Third Pillar, zakat, emphasizes the role of charity as a major tenet of a virtuous life.

For almost a century now, Temple University has practiced admirably what each of these faiths and many others preach. Through its hospital, Temple

An Interview with President Theobald - Part Two

On January 16th, I sat down with President Theobald for an hour to talk about his view of the issues facing the university, with an emphasis on the faculty’s role. The following is the second part of a transcript that I’ve redacted for clarity, with President Theobald’s approval. The first part, which takes up Pres. Theobald’s sense of the key issues facing Temple, the philosophy behind de-centralized budgeting, faculty review of deans, and other topics, can be found here.

My thanks again to Pres. Theobald for taking the time to speak with me.

How to measure good teaching and how to approach general education and writing-intensive courses

SN: I want to change tacks to talk about our students, who are the heart of the enterprise.

NT: Absolutely.

SN: Let’s start with this: How do we know that good teaching is going on? There are some things that feel easier to quantify and even give good qualitative answers to and others that are more elusive? I wonder if you have

¹ The views in the article are the authors' only and do not represent the views of the Task Force
thoughts about how we properly reward good teaching and how we know that it’s good.

SN: Yes. Our valuable colleagues not on the tenure track, whether full- or part-time, tend not to have the same degree of institutional memory and some of those who are part-time are teaching at 3 and 4 different schools. If we have a commitment to gen ed, how do we put our resources where our commitment is? Especially in a model where the money starts outside of any university-wide educational initiative? We’re already concerned about how gen ed is being staffed and administered. Recently, for instance, the deans have been given authority to set caps on both gen ed and writing intensive courses, which had historically not been the case.

NT: --and everywhere else.

SN: Yes. It’s already had effects and worries us. We understand efficiencies, but some things are not pedagogically doable with certain numbers with for, example, writing-intensive courses.

NT: You mean minimum caps?

SN: No, for instance, the W/I courses used to be capped at 20 maximum but they have now floated up.

NT: They’ve gotten rid of the caps. I thought you meant they put in caps.

SN: No, no. I would have no trouble there. [Laughs.] One of the questions about how we are serving our undergraduates has to do with gen ed and what we can do to strengthen a sense of predictability and security in staffing them so that they’re getting teachers who have been here a while and are properly compensated. You see what I’m asking.

NT: I would say, not to keep going back to decentralized budgeting, but so many of these things flow through it in that we are in a resource-constrained environment and so money almost always matters in these things. I’d say if that there was one change I saw at IU over the 20 years is the number of high-profile faculty teaching entry-level courses went up dramatically with decentralized budgeting. Why? Because under the IU structure, the tuition revenue that had the faculty member teach the course. And so you had obvious incentive to want people to like your courses. So 100-level courses, the gate-keeper courses, if you wanted to end up with majors, if you have those schools that previously with lower quality entry-level courses didn’t end up with people in their 200- and 300-level courses.

SN: People would vote with their feet.

NT: Right. So you saw The College of Arts and Sciences was particularly effective at this, and so was the business school at making those 100-level courses some of the best we had ever seen. You provide disincentive for providing poor-quality courses. But it isn’t all finances. This has to be something that we have decided is important and we’re going to put resources behind it. It isn’t all driven by budget...That’s why I talked about earlier about a conversation about our higher and lower and priorities.

On MOOCs

SN: And I’m wondering what you think about the rise of MOOCs, the Massive Open Online Courses. Reading the PA post-secondary ed report, which I don’t know if you have had a chance to read it.

NT: Yes, I did.

SN: The appendix observes that the PASSHE system has now farmed out the decision on whether the MOOCs will get credit to the CAEL, the Center for Adult and Experiential Learning. I am dubious about that. I don’t want to throw anything out the window, but...

"that’s an issue we’re tracking weekly. What is the diversity of our applicant pool, our admit pool, our in-state/out-of-state, all of those things matter. We are a public university of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that’s where we start the discussion."
- President Neil Theobald

NT: Well, the decision on credit is made by the university.

SN: And the faculty have to have a role in the decision.

NT: Faculty are in charge of the curriculum. Clearly. We’re not part of PASSHE, though.

SN: But insofar as PASSHE is also held up in that report as a model for performance-based funding, I wonder what sort of pressure there will be on the state-relateds to follow suit there.

NT: I come from a state that performance-based funding as long as, again, we’re clear about what it is we’ve prioritized and what we’re supposed to
What Faculty and Students Need to Know About Each Other

By Zack Scott, Temple News

1. Different students bring different levels of preparation to class

To assume that every single classroom will be filled with students of exactly equal experience in the subject and mental acuity would be foolish. Regardless of the prerequisite system in place, a range amongst the students present is naturally occurring. But that does not prevent it from becoming an annoyance, especially for those located at the poles of the bell curve.

For a student who finds him or herself overwhelmed by the difficulty, this might just mean having to throw in a little extra proverbial elbow grease to catch up and stay on pace with the rest of the class. When “extra hard work” escalates into self-teaching an entire course, then the situation becomes dire enough as to be unacceptable.

Students who find themselves stranded in a classroom where they have already achieved some level of mastery over the material are in an equally frustrating experience. It is no secret that college is becoming an increasingly expensive investment. Enrollment in a class of this sort can feel like tuition is being taken in exchange for questionable returns.

This dilemma is further muddled by a fair desire by all parties involved – students, faculty and administration – to preserve the academic independence of professors in their classrooms. Surely students recognize that the people who stand before them in class have earned that place by demonstrating somewhere along the line a mastery of the topic they are being paid to teach.

While that academic independence undoubtedly must be preserved, it need not also intervene with a student’s ability to receive the type of education they have paid for. That is not to say that a collegiate education should be treated solely as a service industry in a manner similar to a local restaurant or retail store. But it is unavoidable that an element of “we want what we pay for” seeps into the student perspective, especially in instances like those described above.

If the question is how to fix the problem, then the answer is a complex one that will likely require efforts from students, faculty, and the administration. But if the query is generalized to what should professors do to help control for this frustration, then the answer essentially can be distilled down to flexibility. If it is clear that the bell curve of the class is skewing closer towards either side, then perhaps try to correct for it as best as possible within the allowable confines of the syllabus. If a particular student makes their concerns known to you, don’t merely brush them aside and tell them that they should have been more judicious in their course selection.

Despite what I perceive to be an expanding reputation, students do care about more than just the final grade. The process of learning is important, too, and a classroom environment should work to foster that, regardless of who is sitting in it.

2. Students have diverse motivations for being in classes

In a utopian education landscape, grades would be considered merely a means to the greater end of learning. I don’t doubt that there are numerous students and faculty members who believe that is still the case. But it would be foolish to say that grades don’t matter at all when it’s such common knowledge that they carry incredible weight. Any remnants of doubt about that went out the window in June 2010, when The New York Times published the names of 10 law schools found to be inflating student grades because they “seem to view higher grades as one way to rescue their students from the tough economic climate.”

Because of the importance infused into the grading system, it naturally becomes the topic of conversation when discussing the professor-student dynamic. Enrollment questions sprout from left and right. The entire matter seems to exist in terms of sliding scales and degrees, perspective dominating the entire exercise.

From the student position, the issue can be summed up as a matter of...
The Affordable Care Adjunct, Coming Soon?

By Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor

Over many decades, adjunct faculty at Temple University have been denied full-time employment status and as a result have not had access to many of the benefits earned by full-time faculty, such as affordable health care and collective bargaining rights. Could the passage of the Affordable Care Act significantly change the benefits status of contingent faculty at Temple? On March 23, 2010 President Barack Obama signed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (commonly called "Obamacare" or ACA) into law. Most of its provisions, including the individual mandate, were ruled to be constitutional by the Supreme Court decision National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius on June 28, 2012. An upcoming provision of the bill, effective January 1, 2014, is that an annual penalty of $95 or 1% of income over the filing minimum will be assessed to families without adequate health insurance coverage unless the least expensive policy exceeds 8% of their income. This penalty, also known as the "shared responsibility payment," will increase more than seven-fold to $695 or will take 2.5% of income above the annual minimum from uncovered families starting January 1, 2016.¹

Institutions that employ more than fifty people, such as Temple University, are required by the new law to offer the opportunity for at least 95% of its full-time work force to enroll in a health plan with essential coverage or face an institutional fine of $2000 per uninsured worker as well, effective July 1, 2014. While the ACA will not change the general benefits structure of full-time faculty without a renegotiation of contracts, administration or employees who already work more than 30 hours a week at Temple University and earn basic health insurance coverage, less is known about how the new policy's implementation might change the benefits of contingent faculty.

The Chronicle of Higher Education has reported that on January 2, 2013 the Internal Revenue Service published proposed rules in the Federal Register for employers implementing the Affordable Care Act. In a document called "Shared Responsibility for Employers Regarding Health Coverage," the IRS made recommendations to employers about a number of careers that could possibly fall through the loopholes of the ACA. Most airline pilots, for instance, cannot meet the 30 hour work week requirement legally because they are limited by federal regulation to flying only 100 hours a month. With regard to the often irregular hours worked by adjunct faculty, the IRS has specifically advised that colleges and universities must "use a reasonable method for crediting hours of service" that accounts for the time adjuncts spend working and preparing outside of scheduled course meeting times. The IRS has also been taking recommendations on the matter from higher education institutions and teachers unions. The most popular proposal seems to be assigning three hours of work to each credit hour a taught course is worth. Another idea has been to compare the number of course hours taught by an adjunct with those of faculty

¹ Under the current insurance benefits package a "regular" Temple adjunct, defined as one who has taught one or two courses for four consecutive semesters, may apply for a 25% or 50% subsidy to Temple's current Personal Choice PPO plan and is eligible for a number of voluntary benefits. As of July 2011, the monthly premium for an adjunct's unsubsidized Personal Choice PPO insurance plan costs $443.08 with a $1500 out-of-network deductible for an individual and $1188.38 with a $4500 out-of-network deductible for a family. A "regular" Temple adjunct with a 50% subsidy might still expect to pay $221.54 a month for themselves, or $966.84 for a family, while only taking home roughly $1200 a month.
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has cared for the less privileged and the less fortunate among us. It has opened its arms dispensing care, consideration and courtesy seeking to make hard lives easier, ameliorating the pain and suffering of the less favored generations of Philadelphia residents and those of the surrounding community. From generation to generation of Temple administrations and faculty, through each of their tenures, through successive Presidents, Hospital Chiefs, Deans, Provosts and the faculty at large, Temple University’s commitment to the health care of those who seek its aid has remained constant.

Temple University’s acts of compassion have not been without cost. In the 35 some years that the author has been on the faculty, it seems that there has been a year in which the financial difficulties of the Hospital (and the Medical School) have not been a major concern not only on the Health Sciences Campus but for the University in general. There was the “hole in the ground” when funds were insufficient to build the new Hospital and one walked around that fenced-in area with an air of sadness; the time when the Main Campus needed to loan the Hospital some $30 million or so to make ends meet; the mergers and acquisitions phase where the Hospital purchased physician practices and other hospitals which regrettably did not yield the anticipated financial revenues; when funds intended for basic science faculty raises were diverted to meet hospital needs; and lastly, the protracted and ultimately unsuccessful bid to move St. Christopher’s Hospital for Children to Broad Street. This resulted in the dissolution of our ties with St. Chris, the formation of the Temple University Children’s Hospital followed by the considerable financial losses incurred when that hospital failed.

Now, as we traverse the 21st century, we have witnessed not only the arrival of Dr. Larry Kaiser as the Head of the Health Sciences Center but also that of Dr. Neil Theobald as our 10th President. (Full disclosure-the author has now served under 5 of Temple’s 10 Presidents. Yipes!) Accordingly, as a means to inform the faculty, the author was requested by the Herald Editor and the Herald Advisory Board to provide a global overview of the Hospital, presenting his views of the old concerns we continue to face, new concerns which have arisen, and, intriguingly, potentially novel ways in which the new Administration seeks to change the paradigm which has guided us these many years. As such, the author hopes this discussion will provide faculty on the Main Campus relevant information which may prove useful as questions arise with respect to Hospital and Medical School financial support in relation to University economic planning.¹

There is an old saying which states, “The more things change, the more they remain the same.” As such, from generation to generation, the core patient population served by the Main Hospital at Broad and Ontario has remained relatively constant. It comprises a lower socioeconomic and, at times, under-privileged, group of individuals. Their insurance coverage is restricted and, at times, completely lacking. Further, they present not only with the problems characteristic of each age group (children with their illnesses, adults with their maladies, and seniors with the afflictions of old age) but also with those which characterize individuals at that economic level living in a less than optimal environment.

¹ This article was not intended to provide a financial analysis of the Hospital and the Medical School which is beyond the author’s expertise. That being said, historically, in discussions of said finances, one tended to overlook the teaching contributions of the clinical faculty who participates in medical school instruction in each of the students four years. If one presumes a class of 200 students each paying $40,000 in tuition, the basic science and clinical faculty contribute to the provision of some $8,000,000/class/year or $32,000,000 annually. The fate of the latter is unclear.

Sirover continued on page 8
There is much to remark upon in this early call for what now goes by the self-congratulatory and faux-radical name “educational disruption.” On one hand, Thom’s complaints about the curricula and the faculty should sound very familiar to us. On the other, we can measure the distance between 1762 and 2013 in Thom’s inclusion in his more useful curriculum “a compendious view of Poetry, Rhetoric, and Moral Philosophy” as well as the history of philosophy, politics, and the fine arts—something he gets right, as I’m sure my colleagues in the humanities will agree. And yet before we give him too much credit, it’s also worth noting that at the University of Glasgow in 1762 was one of Thom’s favorite targets, Adam Smith, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Dean of the Faculty, whose foundational work in what comes to be known as economics would strike many as eminently useful. It is not his fault that his work has so often been misused to dismiss as unsuitable for a “commercial people” anything outside of what the market calls valuable, including much of the teaching and research that happens at places like Temple.

But I am most interested in what Thom cites as the occasion for his various criticisms: A friend of his recently remarked on how few Glaswegianis were sending their sons to the university (of course, in 1762 it was sons only). In other words, the university had lost the trust of the community it was designed partly to serve and with which it could not operate. This should sound very familiar to us. We might want to dismiss the Reverend Thom’s of our day—certain elected officials, edu-pundits hawking “disruption,” and the like—but rejecting them outright will not gain Temple the trust it needs not only from state legislators and our governor but also from the parents, students, and citizen-taxpayers who aren’t out to score ideological points in a “disaster capitalism” approach to education. We could argue that the betrayal our students and their parents feel (if they are footing the bill) at soaring tuition costs is due in significant part to the precipitous decline in state support. But counter-arguments won’t be enough.

First of all, I do not see that we yet have good responses to some of the forces that have eroded trust or threaten to erode trust in Temple. Whether we will be able to keep the trust of the community our hospital has served for decades is a question Mike Stoverposes in this issue. As is clear from my dialogue in this issue with the editors of our [student newspaper], many of our students find our curricula incoherent, and this decreases their trust in us. So we either need to increase their coherence or explain better how they already are. We often fail in the same way with our research. Many of our students are skeptical of our craft that research leads to better undergraduate teaching rather than distracting from it. While I hope that our initial dialogue helps build trust by allowing for a candid exchange of views and an opportunity to educate each other, it is clear we have much to do to improve the trust between students and faculty at Temple.

Even if we enjoyed a fuller sense of trust from our various stakeholders, and that’s a big if, it seems that that trust has been diminished if not severely compromised. In Temple’s case but not only Temple’s, the difficulty in restoring a culture of trust is compounded by a lack of trust among faculty of all ranks and between faculty and the graduate students. Theobald has stressed the importance of faculty involvement and transparency among collegial and university committees—many of them are the creation of a University Integrity Officer or ombudsperson (or some alternative structure), an evaluation of institutional accountability, and an “independent evaluation of the University Board of Trustees and administration to determine if their procedures are adequately transparent and whether constituents feel adequately heard and their positions appropriately respected.” The Task Force also recommends requiring the President to report to the Board of Trustees this coming Fall on the progress Temple has made on these recommendations. If and when he does, I hope he has much to report. The administration could also help promote a culture of trust by giving faculty a substantial role in evaluating deans, an idea broadly supported by President Theobald and fleshed out by Mark Rahdert in the last issue.

But we must not just wait for the administration to take these steps. We must advocate for them strongly. We must also show our own trustworthiness by engaging responsibly in the opportunities for governance already available to us—including collegial and university committees—and opportunities that should be available. By the latter, I have most in mind the budget advisory committees in each college and the university-wide committee that are at the heart of the de-centralized budgeting process to be phased in over the next two years. These committees should and must be elected by the faculty. As appointed by the President, the top of the university committee, central administrators. Although some colleges and schools already have functioning, faculty-elected budget committees, many do not, and this must change. In his many comments on this new system, President Theobald has stressed the importance of faculty involvement and transparency. This is one of the best and most important opportunities at Temple in many years to create a culture of trust, to signal that a new chapter in faculty-administration relations at Temple, which have often been needlessly antagonistic, has commenced. There are also many opportunities for informal trust-building: At a faculty lunch I attended with President Theobald, one of my colleagues recommended that a set of faculty and administrators make time to meet and discuss a common text. This seems to me an excellent way we could get to know each other as people committed to the core of our academic mission. Without restoring trust in the faculty-administrator relationship, it will be hard to address effectively the trust our students, our neighborhood, and the citizens of Pennsylvania have or lack in Temple. The Reverend Thom’s of our era are not going to go away; nor, as long as we have so much to get right, should they.
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produce. In general, the MOOCs... I think there is definitely a role for online education. I’m not quite clear that an extremely large group of students taking a course online has much of a future... simply not in the business we’re in. There may be, and I don’t know the PASSHE schools, but I can imagine that someone picking up a course here and a course there that isn’t part of a degree program. I could see something like, I don’t know, strategic marketing. A student could say to himself, “I can sit at home and do that.” But that’s not going to be part of a Fox School of Business Degree.

SN: There was an article in The Chronicle today about San Jose State. They’re looking at Gen Ed and Intro level courses. One of the questions many have is how is the MOOCs would be monetized. These courses are free and costs enormous amounts of money to mount. How is this going to be even a break-even proposition let alone a profit-making one? The suggestion made by the recent move to grant credit to them is that you pay a fee for an intro level course at a cut rate compared even to what you’d pay a community college and that would then take out some of the credits. This would encourage students to then enroll at your school. This is where a group like CAEL comes in. But from where I sit, my concern is that then Gen Ed is getting even more and more removed from the core of the university.

NT: If we say Gen Ed are the courses everyone needs to have and then to follow that up by saying that those aren’t the courses that our faculty need to teach, well, then...

SN: That seems like a disconnect.

NT: Yeah.

The president’s course in leadership

SN: One other topic has to do with funding graduate students. And I also want to spend at least a little time on Temple’s mission as an urban university in the community around it. I also have some final questions such as what would you do if you had more time to research or teach a class.

NT: I am going to teach next year.

SN: I thought I read you were going to teach.

NT: I’m going to do a course on leadership for incoming freshmen. There are two sides to this transaction. I’ve done something similar in my previous employment, and the students find the class useful, worthwhile, they learn something. But from my end, it keeps me in contact with students. I’ve worked for five presidents, and what has happened in five cases is they are all committed to being involved with students, but the pace of this schedule is such that something has to go. And I hate to say, it’s just... Well, if you’re teaching a class, as you know...

SN: They’re right there in front of you.

NT: You can’t not be there, right? You can’t check out and sit there and be looking at your email when it’s going on. It’s just a discipline that’s built in. I’m going to do that with incoming freshmen. In the past, I’ve done something similar to identify something just like what you’re asking: What should we be at Temple? What are the problems here? I’ve found that isn’t simply that’s a good exercise for students, but the quality of the information you get in return. Now, I’ve always done this with seniors at IU, so this is going to the other end of the spectrum, but I think the same thing will be true. Better work than I could get a form a consultant, because they’re people who really care about Temple. They really know a lot about undergraduates. They’re one of them. They’ll put a ton of work into it. They’ll talk with people. The answers I’ve gotten and the projects I’ve gotten in return’s been great.

SN: That sounds fantastic.

Funding Graduate and Undergraduate Students

SN: Thinking about funding graduate students, the easy answer is we just raise more money for it. But that’s not easy to do. It’s just the answer. I know it’s not easy to do.

NT: No, it’s not easy to do.

SN: I wonder how we go about it. You’ve run a successful capital campaign of which this is a part. What are the keys to that, specifically having to do first with funding undergraduate education? I think this speaks to mission because for example one initiative that Interim Provost Dai discussed at a recent Senate meeting is tying aid to SAT scores. That’s great, but one also worries about if we’re also working to help educate under-represented groups, which is at the core of Temple and what it’s supposed to be doing, that can’t be our only strategy that way, and I imagine that Interim Provost Dai might agree...

NT: That’s exactly right. We spent about half of the last cabinet meeting talking about that very issue.

SN: That’s really interesting. So what’s your sense how we build in the well-being of our graduate and undergraduate students into a strategy for fundraising?

NT: I think they really are separable and different. Starting with graduate students. Part of that is fundraising, you’re right, having fellowships that are competitive. But that has to be something internally we value and say, we’re going to have Teaching Assistants, we’re going to have RAAs, this is how these people afford to be here, to afford school. And we’re not going to bring in a large number of unsupported graduate students.

SN: Which is what we’re doing now.

NT: That is a model, to go back to the very first thing we talked about, that cannot work in the long term. We really have to look at how we use our graduate students and put them in situations where they can succeed. I’ve had TAs for 25 years, I’ve had Research Assistants—I ran a research center. If graduate education is really important to us, this is going to be one of those things where we have to generate more money somewhere else, whether it’s fundraising, but even if it’s not, from other sources that we’re going to use on this.

Raising money for undergraduates is a lot different. First of all, in my experience, it’s a whole lot easier to raise funds for undergraduates than it is for graduate students. That’s just reality. People our age, you and I, look at an 18 year-old differently than a 28 year-old. It’s just different, especially for those who didn’t go to graduate school themselves. They’re going to see them as a wide apple for the wind.

SN: That’s an interesting issue.

For undergraduates, the internships are crucial... graduate students are so specialized, getting them off campus much is more difficult. With undergraduates, providing them with internships, especially paid internships—that was one of the issues I was speaking with a donor this morning about. Even if they are not leaving campus for internships, capstone experiences that make them more ready to get a job when they’re done. That’s what you’re doing. Fundraising, getting them internships, making them world ready when they leave here, by having some kind of ending experience, whether it’s a thesis or some kind of leaving exam, so that they have some kind of portfolio to show future employers.

Temple, Philadelphia, and the Community: Admissions and the Example of Early College High Schools

NT: As far as Temple’s role in the neighborhood, that speaks to a topic we’ve already talked about, the role of the medical school and hospital. It’s part of our mission, but the costs have gotten to a point where we have to discuss what’s really viable here.

Two days ago, I had a wonderful conversation two days ago with the new superintendent of the Philadelphia School District, William Hite. I like him a lot. He and I talked about this very thing. What can the school district work with Temple on and vice versa? His view is that our teacher preparation program is fabulous. The people they are hiring out of the School of Education as teachers, they say: “You’re doing everything we would want you to do.”

The leadership role, though, has really changed in school districts. It has gotten to be a very political role. You have to be someone who can communicate with business interests, the city council.
Temple’s Institutional Integrity
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also encouraged to make additional recommendations on topics covered by the Freeth Report and beyond the scope of activities involving minors and the Clery Act.

The Task Force’s inquiry was as comprehensive as time permitted. Accordingly, many of the recommendations are expected to require additional investigation and procedural and policy development, both immediately and in the future. In making its recommendations, the Task Force focused primarily on activities involving minors and Clery Act compliance. We also discussed and made recommendations on several other topics covered by the Freeth Report. Most notably, the Task Force made pointed suggestions related to

1) improving the operational transparency of the University,
2) improving the periodic training of all members of the university community concerning appropriate conduct shown by one member towards other members or associates of the University, and
3) ensuring a confidential and easily accessible university mechanism (such as a university ombudsperson or an Integrity Officer) for the reporting and handling of issues related to community member misconduct.

All discussions and recommendations related to all University campuses and the University Health System.

Details pertaining to Activities Involving Minors and the Clery Act are provided in pages 4-10 of the Task Force report. Many of these actions have already been fully or partially addressed by the University administration, as outlined by Acting President Engler and listed in our report to the Faculty Senate at the Full Senate meeting in May, 2012. We believe that the second set of recommendations issued by the Task Force (see pp 10-12), are also of significance to the integrity of the University. These recommendations include 1) the creation of a University Integrity Officer (or some alternative structure), 2) an evaluation of institutional accountability, and 3) an "independent evaluation of the University Board of Trustees and administration to determine if their procedures are appropriately transparent and whether constituents feel adequately heard and their positions appropriately respected."

Also included in the second set of recommendations are a set of suggestions pertaining to 4) the Temple department of Athletics and the University's oversight and operation of intercollegiate athletics, 5) consideration of the applicability of Task Force recommendations to all University campuses, and 6) a requirement that the University President report to the Board of Trustees in Fall 2013 the actions of the University in response to this Report.

We believe that progress in these 6 areas are of vital interest to all members of the Temple University community and that it is incumbent upon the University faculty to work with the new University administration to ensure that appropriate steps are taken to ensure the integrity of the University both with regard to internal operations and the image it projects.

We were honored to have been appointed to the Task Force, although the appointment of a faculty Senate representative was made belatedly, and only after the Senate leadership requested this appointment. The Task Force's deliberations were collegial and enlightening, and we were highly impressed with the caliber and dedication of the participating administrators. The Task Force was a fine example of productive administration/faculty work on important challenges to the university.

We urge all interested faculty to read the Task Force report. We are concerned that attention to issues extending beyond the treatment and protection of minors, such those related to operational transparency (throughout all levels of University administration), the training of university personnel, and the concept of a high ranking and highly visible Integrity Officer (to name a few), may have lost some momentum as the new administration has taken over and responded to immediate and pressing concerns. If we are guilty of repetition in this regard, it is only because we believe that the decision to appoint the Task Force in the wake of the Sandusky matter provided Temple with a forceful rationale and impetus for effecting cultural and operational changes of significant magnitude. We hope Temple does not let this opportunity pass.

The Affordable Care Adjunct?

**Lawson continued from page 4**

peers who are considered full-time employees. Higher education employers must also determine a "standard measurement period" that will define whether or not an adjunct is an ongoing hire, along with a six-month "stability period" to be observed if the adjunct is considered an ongoing hire after the standard measurement period. The standard measurement period could be set anywhere between three and twelve months and may also include an interim "administrative period."

When asked how the ACA might change health care options for Temple adjuncts, Assistant Vice President of Human Resource - Benefits Jennifer Silvestri stated that "The University is currently in the process of examining and reviewing how this complex legislation will affect the University population, including adjuncts. We are following the emerging guidance and are in discussion with the Office of the Provost, University Counsel and representatives from the schools and colleges on how we might best implement the provisions. We will be communicating more on this topic with the schools and colleges in the months to come." Most of the decisions about the future status of contingent faculty, it seems, have yet to be made and could be deliberated for up to a year. The recommendation of counting each credit hour taught as three hours of employment would not help current Temple adjuncts who are already limited to teaching two courses per semester. At three hours per credit hour plus instruction time, a typical adjunct at Temple would still only be classified as working for a total of 24 hours a week... six hours short of the IRS recommendation. Comparing an adjunct’s work load with full-time faculty is not exactly helpful either since publishing, committee work and service are also integral to the definition of full-time faculty work and are not typically the responsibility of adjunct faculty.

Temple administration's other option, which lines up closely with recent labor policy for adjuncts at the university, would be to continue to limit the definition of adjunct work load hours below the 30 hour-a-week requirement for full-time employment. Currently, Temple adjuncts are limited to teaching only two courses per semester and are classified as part-time 20 hour-a-week workers... fostering a marginal employment status that does not provide an affordable health care plan, the ability to collectively bargain, or the right to participate in faculty governance. Companies that have restricted work hours in other industries, such as food service, have been publicly criticized by consumer groups and by the media and lost profits. Would incoming freshmen want to attend a university if they were aware that nearly a third of their teachers were treated no better than part-time minimum wage earners? Granted, paying the "shared responsibility payment" will be more affordable for adjuncts than the current Personal Choice PPO plan options, but all faculty should express concern to the administration about the particulars of ACA's implementation since it will fundamentally touch the health, wellbeing and the structure of work for everyone in the university community.
Similarly, the level of reimbursement received by the Hospital from third party sources has remained insufficient. Indeed, one can reasonably argue that the reimbursement level has decreased in the last few years as economic conditions worsened and as governments at all levels sought to reduce discretionary expenditures. Temple's state appropriation has been diminished, and, with the Sandusky scandal, may prove more difficult to obtain as time progresses. Further, an unrecognized factor today with respect to Temple's financial status is the apparent lack of a budget line in the Philadelphia City Budget. With the closing of Philadelphia General Hospital (PGH), our only municipal hospital, many of those patients sought assistance at Temple.² As is its custom, the Hospital accepted this new responsibility without reservation and has continued to care for those patients formerly served by PGH. (The standing joke at the time was that, when individuals who used to be treated at PGH presented for treatment at certain center city hospitals, they were given cab fare to get to Temple.)

There is another old saying (diametrically opposed to that stated above) which states, “The only thing constant about life is that it changes.” In particular, the cost of medical care has dramatically increased based on the new technologies which have revolutionized the manner in which we treat patients. In the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, the death rate from childhood cancer was 3 out of 4. Today the cure rate from childhood cancer is 4 out of 5. New technologies in coronary care ranging from “clot busters” to open heart surgery to heart transplants have enabled hundreds of thousands of patients to recover from their illnesses. In vitro fertilization has enabled many barren individuals to know the joy of holding their offspring in their arms.

For those reasons (and so many more), the costs inherent in the care that Temple Hospital needs to offer its patient population have exponentially increased as have the financial constraints described briefly above. Thus, these new technologies represent a two-edged sword for the Hospital and for the University. To offer the care that any responsible physician would deem appropriate, funds need to be found to provide the resources for that care. This is a fundamental conundrum Temple faces in the 21st century.

Another factor that has impacted patient care and its financial foundation at Temple is the development of an extensive network of suburban regional hospitals that offer state-of-the-art care in a user friendly location. When the author arrived here in 1973 as a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute for Cancer Research (which became the Fox Chase Cancer Center), Abington Hospital was perhaps 1/5 its current size. It comprised a single red brick building and offered services commensurate with that size. St. Mary’s Hospital in Bucks County was a hospital, which, in all candor, you only took your child to when he/she was injured in a soccer game and needed an ankle or shin treated. Similarly, Doylestown Hospital in Bucks County, Paoli Hospital in Chester County, Cooper Hospital in Camden and even Lankenau on the Main Line were far smaller than they are today. For serious illnesses one went “downtown.”

Now, each of these hospitals qualifies as an impressive regional hospital center offering the most modern treatments in a neighborhood setting. Further, Einstein has just expanded, opening an extensive facility in Montgomery County. Even Aria Health Systems (a.k.a. Frankford Hospital) is expanding its services. Most notably, this has included the recruitment of the orthopedic specialists known as the “Three B’s” (Booth, Balderston and Bartolozzi), from Pennsylvania Hospital, ensconcing them in their Bucks County campus right across from Sesame Place. For Temple Hospital, these changes have proven to be a problem of sorts as the presence of these excellent health centers obviates the need to travel here.

Yet the old Temple Hospital paradigm of surviving from fiscal stress to financial calamity may be now yielding to a new approach whose dividends may not be evident at present. In the early 1960’s, Bob Dylan (né Robert Zimmerman-sorry-Jewish pride) wrote, “The Times They Are A Changing,” the anthem for the Baby Boomer generation as it came of age. That phrase may be applicable to the here and now at the Health Sciences Center. Apart from the new Hospital and the technologies contained therein, we have seen the building of Shriner’s Hospital with its notable contributions to the Health Sciences Center, the new Medical Education and Research building, and, most recently, the purchase of the Fox Chase Cancer Center which now joins Jefferson Hospital as part of the Temple Health System in Burholme Park in Northeast Philadelphia. In addition, there has been the recruitment of new basic science and clinical faculty who represent a generational change in both the Medical School and in the Hospital.

Each represents the next phase of Temple history with the expectation and hope that the patterns of the past may be discontinued. Indeed, the purchase of Fox Chase may be especially intriguing for a number of reasons. As noted above, the emergence of regional centers of excellence in the Philadelphia metropolitan area reduces the patient base from which Temple may draw. Considering this “friendly” encirclement of Temple by our Hospital colleagues, the purchase of Fox Chase may have the intended or unintended consequence of providing a mechanism to pierce that circle providing a means for expansion of our patient base.

In the movie, Dr. Doolittle, there was an animal called the pushmi-pullyu. It had two heads which faced in opposite directions. At Temple, in 2013, we may face two contradictory goals, i.e., the need to establish a firm economic foundation as we go forward in the 21st century and our commitment to our fellow human beings as evidenced by the care our hospital has provided over these many years. How we deal with this challenge may reveal the nature of our character and the strength of our convictions.

² It appears that of the 5 largest cities in the United States, Philadelphia is the only one without a municipal hospital.
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SN: And in Philadelphia, to the state.

NT: Right. It’s less administration than it is being a change agent who can communicate, who can strategize. We need to be sure that we’re preparing people for those roles going up. We have a huge educational role.

As far as admissions, I mentioned we probably spent half of the last cabinet meeting talking about this. There are future physicians, business leaders, and authors in every neighborhood. Our mission is to find them and make sure they succeed at Temple. Now, the SAT may or may not be the right predictor, I’m not an expert in this area. We simply have to look at the results. They’ll tell you whether you are doing this or not. If you have very few from this zip code and a whole bunch of people from that zip code, that may suggest you’re not using the right criteria. But it isn’t clear what that criteria is. That’s something that Superintendent Hite and I discussed.

SN: One of the issues I’ve been tangentially involved with when I was Director of Undergraduate Studies in English was the idea of an Early College High Schools.

NT: Yes, I’m familiar with them.

SN: I’m not surprised given your deep knowledge of the K-12 system. I read an article of yours about what role universities should play in charter schools. The Early College High Schools are a somewhat different animal, but it’s in the same family.

There are two initiatives I’ve been involved with. One is the Community-Based Learning Network, and I’ve done a service-based learning course, as it’s sometimes called. Another is a more concentrated commitment that comes with both high-risk and high-reward. I’m not sure if you know the history of this at Temple. We’ve actually been approached now twice on this by foundations. Since I’ve worked on it, I suppose I’d like to see it happen, though I know it is not my decision to make. I wonder if you have any thoughts on that.

NT: I have lots of thoughts and no conclusions. The reality of running a K-12 school is the dailiness of it. Research faculty have commitments that make it very difficult to mesh their work life with the dailiness of those requirements. However, there are roles we can play in those schools. So as far as actually operating a school, I would have to be convinced, just because faculty have so many commitments elsewhere. The teaching is going to require for me to be there. Same thing for a K-12 school, you’ve got to be there for parent conferences. But does that really fit with the context we’re in.

I had a meeting with Rev Johnson from Bright Hope Baptist Church; he and his family came to my house for dinner. We spent a lot of the time talking about how kids learn. This university is one of the world leaders in how the brain works, about new ways of knowing how kids learn. Gee, why don’t we try bringing that knowledge more into our neighborhood? High school may be a little late, actually, if you’re looking at changing a kid’s pathway. Might be in elementary. But it could be either one. We’re really the expertise providers, rather than the day-to-day operators. That’s a model that makes more sense to me.

SN: We got as far with the previous School Reform Commission leadership, and of course, when you have a change in leadership that makes a difference. I think they were going to give us an academy inside a pre-existing school, so the day-to-day operations that would be beyond the time and capacities of the average faculty member we wouldn’t be doing... We would be there to teach the courses and we would have designed the curriculum. Of course, the question is what how the person who runs it day-to-day is going to be compensated.

NT: All of that can be worked out, though. The real question is who is going to be there day to day, 6 hours a day for 180 days. I’m open to those ideas, it’s just...
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and to submit work for publication. Adjuncts are likely spending a fair bit of time traveling from one campus to another.

Whatever our track or rank, pretty much all of us have lives outside the classroom. We have families to take care of. Many of us are busy helping our kids with their homework; others are tending to our elderly parents; some are doing both. We are members of civic, religious and political organizations.

We even have hobbies!

None of this is to suggest that you do not deserve our attention or that you shouldn’t demand it. While Temple is a research university, it also has a primary mission to educate undergraduates. And, while education should never be reduced to fee-for-service, it is not a trivial fact that our salaries are largely paid by undergraduate tuition. I mean only to suggest that when you email us at midnight on a Sunday, we may not be able to get back to you as quickly as we’d both like. Or that if you as a question that we’ve answered explicitly and repeatedly in class, we may get a bit irritated because we want to make the time we devote to undergraduate teaching count as much as possible. Finally, I mention all this to give you a fuller sense of who we are as professionals and people. I think it’s a good idea for us to get to know each other better while respecting our right to privacy and the boundaries of a healthy student-teacher relationship. It makes for a richer educational experience for all of us.

3. Most of us do remember what it’s like to be students, though our memories may be a bit out of date; but while many of us sympathize with your situations, there have to be limits to that sympathy.

It’s true that many of us have not been students for decades. But that doesn’t mean that we have forgotten entirely what it’s like: laboring to master difficult concepts, to balance academic work and the jobs that pay your tuition and – for those of traditional college age – to make sense of what it means to be a young adult. But though many of us try to let this knowledge inform our teaching, there are limits to what it can do. We are obliged to maintain the academic standards of our classes, so however sympathetic we may be to your extracurricular demands, we must not let this soften the necessity for you to do the work that a class requires. Those of us who are doing our jobs well demand a lot from you not because we’re sadists or because we can’t imagine what it was like to be a student but because learning requires effort if it is to be what it should be: serious fun. Most Temple students I have the pleasure to teach know this; but some don’t, and I hope a reminder doesn’t hurt.

What Faculty Need to Know About Students, cont.

prioritization. There are absolutely students attending Temple who chose classes with a mindful eye to ratemyprofessor.com or a keen ear listening to friends and classmates, searching for professors with reputations as A factories. But there are plenty of others who legitimately are seeking intellectual betterment. To say that all students want to be graded generously or sternly is to commit a sweeping generalization, ignoring the classroom composition at Temple which consists of vastly different people with different expectations.

Likewise, professors have different expectations, and what makes a particular professor “good” or “bad” cannot be summed up by their grade distribution. What can and should be considered is the transparency with which a professor makes his or her grading intentions clear. Students want their intellectual guides to tell them right from the beginning what the expectations are so they can plan accordingly.

3. Some student do legitimately have full plates

At this point I seriously doubt there is anyone at any university in the country that hasn’t heard a student yell, “Don’t they know that this isn’t my only class?” It’s become quiet hackneyed, and it is so overly simplistic that it doesn’t deserve a serious place in this discussion.

No, students don’t deserve or should expect sympathy concerning the quantity of work they must do. Asking for a reduction in the workload is not a fair request to make. But asking for flexibility on a case-by-case basis shouldn’t be.

Just as professors need to balance their responsibilities of teaching, mentoring on an individual level, researching and producing works relevant to their respective fields and volunteering their expertise elsewhere, students need to balance myriad obligations. The issue of workloads isn’t as simple as number of classes. Students are often preparing to enter a highly competitive workforce, and therefore need to occupy themselves with pursuits like internships and student activities that can further their post-collegiate goals. There has been much talk about student expansion into surrounding neighborhoods, for good reason. But one consequence of this expansion is that students now see monthly rental and utility bills that need to be paid.

These time commitments add up, and they can do so quickly. For those students who have four papers all due the same day and are trying to conduct research during lunch breaks at work, an extension or a chance at a revision can make all the difference.

Some students, inevitably, would come forward with some story about their dog eating their flash drive or some variation of a classic. Abuses are to be expected and accounted for as best as possible.

Everyone knows homework assignments and papers don’t exist in a vacuum. But sometimes it seems as though professors don’t really respect the quantity of clutter invading students’ lives. Applying discretionary leniency would alleviate this dilemma.

Zack Scott can be reached at zack.scott@temple.edu or on Twitter @ZackScott11.

What Students and Faculty Need to Know

Redacted and condensed transcript of conversation on 2/28

SN: So, on point #1, different students bring different levels of preparation to class. Has it been your experience that you’ve walked into classes and you’ve felt blindsided? That is: “I have this 2000-level class over here that assumes this much knowledge and then I have this other 2000-level class that assumes this much knowledge. Is that an experience that you all have had?

Zack: Yeah. I’m still weighing the merits of this point, but I just think that overall throughout various disciplines, there isn’t a lot of conformity as to the progression. Two of us are tied to both journalism and political science, and those two majors have recently gone through curricular restructuring. The journalism program has become even more de-centralized; the idea of tracks has gone out the window while at the same time the political science department has gone in the opposite direction. You have to take an evidence and knowledge course that teaches you the basics. You need to take practice capstones before you take your capstone. Is there a set direction that various programs should be going in? I think personally that we should be transitioning toward this added-knowledge model. I’ve been in classes and the people next to me either don’t know anywhere near what I do on the subject or know lots more than I do. It happens too frequently and it disrupts the learning process.
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Sean: In journalism especially . . . I’m in the new journalism major. You take 5 or 6 core classes and then you’re basically free to pick 6 more specialty courses in anything. One of the things you run into is you either get a class like publication design that I’m in right now. You go from your basic design for journalists, which teaches you the basics of Photoshop and end design and layout programs. And then you go to publication design, which assumes that you’ve mastered those skills when you were in that class, but there are a lot of people in it who haven’t had as much practice and so they have to get another course on Photoshop and end design. The other thing is true in some reporting classes where you are regurgitating all the information that you learned in your basic reporting class over again in different subjects.

SN: So you don’t feel as if you’re actually making progress.

Sean: No. You’re just on the same level but perhaps in a specialty subject.

SN: There’s no increasing sophistication.

Sean: No.

Angelo: I do think there’s something to be said about these classes where there are varying levels of expertise, but I think that it’s also fair to say that giving you that freedom allows you to expand . . . At least in journalism I’ve always been an advocate of being able to dabble in a little bit of everything, especially in journalism because it’s such a changing industry where you kind of have to know a little bit of everything, whereas maybe it should be a little more restrictive in fields that aren’t changing as rapidly.

SN: In Chemistry there’s a clearer progression. But in other fields—some in the social sciences, many in the humanities, the sense of additive knowledge often is not as clear. It’s more of a rhizome or a network. Nonetheless, one should expect that a course in any department at the 4000-level would be different in character from one at the 2000-level, and more advanced courses in all disciplines should build on each other. I think you have pointed to a fair criticism that can be leveled at many of our curricula, which is that the faculty as a whole have not thought them through sufficiently. Many majors have a gateway and a capstone course, but then the middle of the major lacks definition. This is true of the English major. While a department may have reformed its curriculum 15 or 20 years ago, it may not have done so recently enough to have thought through how the classes we’re teaching mesh up with the state of the discipline, whether those classes speak to each other and build on each other. That requires a conversation among the faculty and then a commitment by that faculty to adhere to those guidelines.

These conversations are complicated by a bunch of factors. One of them is the faculty’s understandable resistance to being told what to teach; professional autonomy and academic freedom are key values. Another is something I mentioned in my list of what students often don’t know, which is that courses are being taught by faculty members of different types. Leaving aside whether all the tenured-stream faculty are speaking to each other and we don’t do that enough, then there’s the question of whether we’re talking with our non-tenure-track full-time colleagues or with the adjuncts who are often hard to find because they’re teaching at lots of different schools. How do we bring them into the conversation? And then there’s the question before that question, which is: “What is that knowledge worth?” “Why is it valuable to be able to do x?” “What is it that you want your majors and other students to get out of your classes?”

But to answer those questions properly, we also need to know who are students are and to talk to them about what they want. Faculty, of course, are the experts in the field, and we should not cede that authority. Still, we need to know what our students want from the curricula and figure out if we can provide it, assuming that they’re willing to do the work. How do we balance a need to have students master particular bodies of knowledge and ways of knowing—from knowing how to build a bridge to how to analyze a poem—with students’ healthy desire to sample various courses? One reason I like this point most is that it assumes that students care about their course of study, and that’s something I want to believe. They want their studies to matter to them and to have some sense of coherence.

Angelo: I really liked your second point about what teachers do outside of the classroom—specifically about research. It seems like Temple in the past few years, there is a growing move to do more research. There are different raises . . .

SN: You mean through merit pay?

Angelo: Yes, through merit pay. Does that at all, in your experience at Temple, detract from professors’ focus on the classroom?

SN: It can. The answer you tend to get from professors is that research is supposed to make our teaching better. We’re in dialogue with what’s happening out in the field and we can bring that back to our students and it keeps our graduate and undergraduate courses fresh. Ideally, yes. But the fact is that there are only a certain number of hours in the day. It is possible, then, to imagine that as expectations for research go up and as the incentives increase, some faculty make decisions about where to invest their time. Look, if you’re a scientist and you don’t nail a grant, you’re dead in the water. You can’t do your work.

What I’ve found at Temple, though, is that in many cases our most accomplished researchers are also our most accomplished teachers. If you look at the Great Teachers inscribed on the wall of the Alumni Garden, they do not only excel at teaching. They are typically serious researchers, some with international reputations.

In the modern sciences, peer-reviewed research has always been crucial. Provost Dai who is himself an eminent chemist who has received a great deal of funding for his research is looking to help build on recent gains at Temple in attracting sponsored research. This also applies to social sciences where grants are more common, though that doesn’t make them easy to get, like criminal justice and geography and some fields in education.

Things have also changed in the humanities. 30 years ago, to get tenure at even some good schools, you simply didn’t need to publish as much. But as we in the humanities started to take our cues from the sciences on research productivity, since that’s where the prestige is, the expectations there have shot way up. There’s a push to publish more.

Sometimes research does invigorate your teaching. Sometimes it forces you to make a painful choice where to invest your time. Does that make sense?

Sean: It goes hand in hand with students not only going to class, doing lots of things outside of taking classes.

SN: Yes, and it shows why when we do manage to get together, to be in the same room together, that’s really precious time and we have to make sure it’s productive.

Zack: What are the administration’s priorities on these issues? Research obviously increases the university’s visibility and adds prominence and helps with recruitment. But teaching is what keeps students here. Which would you say they stress?

SN: That’s really tough… It’s going to be hard to find anyone, be it an administrator or faculty member, who doesn’t say that teaching and research go hand in hand. We say this in part because we believe it, but it’s also a useful way to deflect the question. I would just judge in part by how merit gets broken down. Our union puts out how the different colleges award merit. Across the board, 64% of merit last year was awarded for research, 20% for teaching, 16% for service, and that’s similar to the levels over the past few years.

This is a research university; and the value of research is not exhausted by what it contributes to teaching. Temple is committed to producing knowledge. But in addition to being a public university, which means it needs to be responsive to the public’s need for educated citizens, Temple is also rela-
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tively unusual in its commitment to the Conwellian mission and in having a very small endowment relative to other research universities, which makes it dependent on undergraduate tuition. So we have to commit to undergraduate education in a serious way. Have to. Otherwise, we’re false to our mission, and we will not be able to sustain ourselves financially.

Angelo: In my experience as an undergrad one of the things that’s been missed is the idea of teachers bringing their research back to the classroom.

SN: You just haven’t seen it that much.

A: I haven’t seen it at all. It might just be because of my major and because the classes I explored outside of my major are pretty basic. That may play a role.

Sean: The only thing you see in Poli Sci a little bit more is the fact that the professors might make you buy the textbook that they wrote. [laughter] Adjuncts in journalism, if you count their actual work, they a lot of the times use their stuff in their papers as examples. If you count that as research…

SN: I would.

Zack: It is in theory, but not in the sense that these are tenured teachers who are getting paid and bringing in revenue by doing their research and the university then gets paid for selling it.

SN: I’d like to define research a bit more broadly since the stuff I do doesn’t tend to sell. Even if you define it that way, look: If we’re all telling you that, “No, you’re producing a false dichotomy b/t research and teaching and research actually invigorates our teaching.” Say, “Well, I don’t see it.” Even if you grant in theory if you say you aren’t seeing it practice, that’s something we need to hear. Obviously, it also depends upon the level of the class. But if we’re not making good on the claim that research makes for better teaching then we either have to do better or acknowledge that the claim is bullshit and give it up.

Angelo: I would venture to guess that you do see it more in some areas, but it’s not as prevalent as it might be.

SN: Is that true of your experience?

Cara: I’ve taken a lot of sociology classes, and I’ve found that the professors there and in Women’s Studies tend to use what they’ve written as textbooks.

SN: Let me ask you about that. You say they use it as a textbook, and there was a knowing wink about that. It’s one thing to say they are bringing their ideas into the classroom. It’s another to say that they’re charging you 50 bucks part of which goes into their pockets. Is it more the latter or the former?

C: This semester, it’s the former. I’m taking a Women in Poverty class, and the teacher isn’t necessarily using the textbook that she wrote, but she does discuss the research that went into it, and she’s supplementing the course with novels. While the course is structured around what her research background is about which is mostly about welfare reform, by saying that she’s done all this research, it gives her authority in the class, but she’s also using texts outside of her own.

SN: But it does feel as like her particular research interests are helping to producing the scaffolding on which the class is built.

C: Yes.

SN: But it doesn’t sound as if you’d had that experience all the time with tenure track faculty. Where one of the things they’re paid to do, their research, is not well integrated with their teaching. And the fear is that if the incentives are on the side of research that might actually distract them from teaching.

All: Yes.

SN: To speak to my own experience, the people who are really accomplished researchers are very devoted to their teaching. It’s like tenure. You get tenure, and it’s quite possible to get away with phoning it in. But very few professors in my experience do. The same thing with research. If you’re a well-known researcher in the sciences or not, you could act like a big shot, “Screw you. I’m on CNN on all the time. Who are you?” I don’t see it as much as one might expect. Do you all run into this Big Cheese Syndrome much?

All: No.

Angelo: I have had people who would qualify as Big Cheeses, yes, but they haven’t acted that way.
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, January 28, 2013

Attendance:
Representative Senators and Officers: 57
Ex-officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 24
Total Attendance: 82

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:48pm.

2. Approval of Minutes
It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the Representative Faculty Senate Meeting of November 8, 2013. The motion was unanimously approved.

3. Vice-President’s Report:
Faculty Senate Vice-President Mark Rahrert reported on progress with committees.
He indicated that we need more members on the Budget Review Committee.
We have members retiring and on leave and this is a very critical committee. He encouraged people to volunteer and recommend colleagues.
-There are still vacancies on the University Sabbatical Committee. The FSSC has decided that interim appointments may be necessary.
The Faculty Senate Nominating Committee is being formulated. The role of that committee is to identify a slate of candidates for President, Vice-President and Secretary of Faculty Senate. Paul LaFollette, past president of the faculty senate, will be chair.
-He reminded senators that chairs of committee should be developing reports on what they have accomplished during the year. These committee reports should be brief — 2-3 paragraphs at most. Shorter and sweeter is better because they need to meet the publication limits for the presentation in the Faculty Herald.

4. Terry Halbert:
Terry Halbert, faculty senate representative on the University Budgetary Steering Committee spoke to the senate to make a pitch for volunteers. She explained that right now the committee has 3 people from Fox School of Business and 1 member from the Law School. She emphasized that we need representatives from other colleges in the university. She indicated that people may be concerned whether they have enough expertise in budget matters but that service on this committee is “not about numbers, it’s about priorities.” She also mentioned that Deans are being encouraged to form committees in schools and colleges to be advisory to them on budget.

5. Guest: 10th Temple University President, Neil D. Theobald:
President Theobald was introduced to the Faculty Senate in his first address to this body. He graciously spent over an hour talking with faculty, listening to their questions and comments, and sharing his thoughts about his visions for work at Temple.
Faculty Senate President Joan Shapiro began by giving an introduction of President Theobald’s background and accomplishments as a teacher, researcher, and administrator. Among the qualifications and accomplishments mentioned were:
-Indiana University senior VP; top administrator at IU; leader of $1.1 billion capital campaign, and boosted IU’s credit rating to Moody’s highest level.
-Three-time winner of IU Teaching Excellence award well-published; received a Culbertson Award from UCEA, early career award researcher who focused on decentralized education budget and financial models; ran a research center on higher education finances.

President Theobald thanked Joan for her kind remarks. He added that his path to administration was through faculty governance so he sees a very important role for shared governance. He explained that his main goal today is to hear from the faculty.
In his augural in October 2013 he plans to present a 5-10 year plan for the university.
Based on what he has heard and studied he has identified some critical issues for Temple. A brief discussion of those issues included:
-Student debt and level of student debt is a critical issue. We need to do a much better job of making sure that students and their families are literate financially with these decisions.
The Fox School of Business has put together a course that someone can take to build financial literacy. He wants to see a broader application of these courses and has even talked with Dr. Hite, Superintendent of the School District of Philadelphia, about using these resources for their students.
We need a shorter length to graduation — strongest predictor of student debt; tuition is smallest part of debt, living expenses are huge; and there is a postponement of earning income.
He is a big fan of decentralized budgeting; it makes more sense to him.
He believes that faculty are our most important resource, and that recruiting and retaining best faculty possible should be a high priority.
We need balance between teaching and research; he values both sides.
It is crucial that we do a better job of telling our story about what a great place this is—but we’re adding a Vice President for Marketing to help with that.

President Theobald then invited faculty to make comments and ask questions. His responses to those are indicated as (P) below:

Gregory Urwin (CLA): We need a leader to re-establish bonds of trust between administration and faculty. Much can be accomplished with a few gestures of respect and decency; give faculty credit for taking no raises and helping with state funding last year.
(P): agrees, faculty are core of the university; question is how we put faculty in the lead.

Tracy Weiss (SMC): She is concerned that we don’t have an umbrella platform where schools are working together on online education.
(P): The first step here is hiring the Provost who should lead this effort.

Molefi Asante (CLA): We need to emphasize academic leadership; we have a problem of faculty harassment. There is also a need for marketing flagship programs like the Ph.D. in African-American Studies.
(P): He is not fully informed about harassment issues, but will examine this.

Doug Wager (TFMA): How do you see the process unfolding? How does it fit with the RCM approach? Long range planning could be about retribution and reallocation.
(P): Each university is unique and we’re starting from scratch. He’s used the wisdom of Doug Preist and budget colleagues like Amy Heiter, but acknowledges that there are many issues to think through. For example:
-If money follows student does that mean it follows their major or
Jennifer Cromley (COE): There is data from a 4-year transition study that suggests quality of feedback to students is key; that we need to think smarter about socializing these teenagers for college.

(PT):- Having robust quality orientation is key.

Tricia Jones (COE): In the planning process it may be helpful to have more of a safety net for schools and colleges attempting innovation and entrepreneurial activity – something the Faculty Senate has been emphasizing. Perhaps this can be included, especially for smaller colleges that have fewer resources to weather initially costly start-up efforts under an RCM model.

(PT): Good idea.

6. Motion to Adjourn:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:21pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary

For an archive of Faculty Senate Minutes, go to: http://www.temple.edu/senate/minutes.htm

Audio Recordings of these and other Senate Meetings may be found at: http://www.temple.edu/senate/Apreso/FacultySenateApresoRecordings.htm
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