BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Temple University – Of The Commonwealth System of Higher Education

PUBLIC SESSION

Tuesday, May 10, 2005, at 3:00 p.m.

Trustees only met in Executive Session for an informational briefing.

Feinstone Lounge, Sullivan Hall
Liacouras Walk and Berks Mall

MINUTES

Presiding Officer:
Daniel H. Polett, Vice Chair of the Board

PARTICIPANTS


Ex-Officios: Oscar A. Chow, Jane D. Evans, Lori A. Shorr

University Counsel: George E. Moore


INVOCATION: The invocation was given by Trustee Joan H. Ballots.
Introduction of Guests:

Faculty: Anthony S. Kidawa, Karen M. Turner

Students: Seth T. Embry, Ryan M. Phelan, Mohit Manglani

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of March 8, 2005, were approved.

* * * * * * *

PRESIDENT’S REPORT – David Adamany

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Tomorrow is the last day of final exams, so the 2004-2005 school year is drawing to a close.

A week from Thursday, May 19, we will celebrate Commencement, and degrees will be awarded to 4,500 students.

I want to express my thanks to the faculty of the University and to the academic staff and administration for bringing us successfully to the completion of another academic year.

At the next meeting of this Board, I will give a report on some of the highlights of the academic year. Today, however, I wish to bring a matter of substantial University policy to your attention. I am not yet ready to make a recommendation on this matter, but I believe it is important for the Board to be aware that this issue has arisen.

Last Wednesday, May 4, the Graduate Faculty of the University met to consider a proposal to establish uniform minimum standards for membership in the Graduate Faculty. Although the proposed standards also set forth the qualifications to be met by those who teach graduate courses, the core issue was the qualifications of faculty who supervise doctoral students writing dissertations.

The proposal would have required a faculty member to have a pattern of productive scholarly activity to be appointed or reappointed for the purpose of supervising a doctoral student’s dissertation. Membership in the Graduate Faculty would be a term of four years, after which a faculty member would again be reviewed to see if he met the standards for continued membership. Such a requirement for Graduate Faculty membership and for periodic renewal of that membership is commonplace in American universities. And it is important to students because the dissertation is a major piece of research; and students ought to be assured by the University that those who supervise research activity are themselves active in and knowledgeable about research and research methods in the field.

Under the proposal, schools and colleges would have been allowed to have higher standards for Graduate Faculty membership or dissertation supervision. These additional requirements would have been subject to review and approval by the Graduate Dean.

These proposals were recommended by the Graduate Board, a body of 33 members—30 elected by the Graduate Faculty and three graduate students.
With 114 members of the Graduate Faculty present, or 15 percent of the total membership of the Graduate Faculty, which numbers 746, the proposal was defeated. More than 25 percent of those present came from a single college with a relatively weak record of scholarly performance and research.

One can readily understand the dynamics at work. Faculty members, like the rest of us, do not want to be subject to review. Some are no longer active in scholarship, and they are concerned about loss of status, as well as the loss of opportunity, to supervise doctoral students. But the University’s standards of quality should not be affected by these personal considerations.

The results of the Graduate Faculty vote are deeply disappointing. They continue to set standards for graduate faculty membership lower at Temple than at leading universities in the nation. As I pointed out in my Self Study in 2001, the National Research Council’s 1995 study of graduate programs throughout the nation ranked only three of the twenty-one Temple doctoral programs that were evaluated as being in the top half of all doctoral programs in the country. The National Research Council has a new study underway, but I am not aware of any changes in our graduate programs that would place a significant number of them among the top half nationally. In short, the graduate programs at Temple are an area for continuing attention to quality and performance. And Temple’s graduate students are entitled to an assurance from the University that their doctoral dissertations will only be supervised by faculty who are themselves engaged in productive, recognizable research endeavors.

Under ordinary circumstances, the administration of the University would return to the faculty to undertake further discussions that would resolve this issue. That’s what we did with the General Education program last year. When the faculty declined to act, the Provost and I formulated a proposal, submitted it to the Faculty Senate for comment, and advised the faculty that after a defined period for further faculty deliberation we would take our proposal to this Board for action. The Faculty Senate leadership further revised its own proposal, and the administration and faculty were able largely to agree on a General Education program that was then adopted by the Board of Trustees.

Unfortunately, the administration does not have any authority to enter into policy making in the area of graduate policy. The 1975 policy on the Structure of the Graduate School, adopted by the Board of Trustees, appears to delegate both the administration’s responsibilities and the Board of Trustees’ own policy-making authority to the Graduate Faculty. Specifically, the 1975 policy says: “The Graduate Board is the policy-making body of the Graduate School.” Further, the 1975 policy says: “The Graduate Faculty elects the Graduate Board as its policy-making body, and has the final authority with respect to all such policy.”

We are unable to find in the minutes of the Board of Trustees or any other documents still available to us the reasons why the Graduate Faculty was delegated full and final policy-making authority over graduate policy in the University.

This delegation stands in sharp contrast to the Board’s mandate to the Faculty Senate which has jurisdiction over all academic matters other than graduate programs. The Constitution of the Faculty Senate, approved by the Board of Trustees in 1969 and not modified since that time, provides that the Senate may consult, recommend and review; but it does not provide for the Senate to make final decisions. The Senate also has the authority to ratify or reject proposals by the administration, but even that provision makes clear that these matters are submitted to the Senate only for advice. There is no provision whatever that delegates final decision making authority to the Faculty Senate.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the administration of the University is now stymied from taking steps it deems necessary to significantly improve the quality of Temple’s graduate programs, many of which are solid
but lack national distinction. Nor can we take steps to provide reasonable assurance to doctoral students that those who supervise their dissertations are fully qualified to do so.

Quite apart from the administration’s role in graduate school appointments, I would like to express concern about a University policy that puts such matters beyond the normal process of review by the Board of Trustees, whose fiduciary responsibilities reach to the quality of the University’s academic programs just as surely as to the University’s financial health. In the past year, this Board, upon recommendation of its Academic Affairs Committee, has reviewed and acted upon a new General Education Program, a wholly revised curriculum for the first two years of education in the Medical School, and an overhaul of the curriculum in the Fox School of Business and Management. And as members of this Board well know, the Board, again acting upon the recommendation of its Academic Affairs Committee, reviews all decisions to award tenure and consults with the president about the appointment of faculty to endowed chairs or named chairs. I am not aware of any reason why in the Board’s exercise of its fiduciary responsibilities for the educational program of the University, the standards for appointment and reappointment to the Graduate Faculty should be excluded. The Provost and I have not concluded the steps we ought to recommend to this Board. We are considering whether to ask that you amend the 1975 Graduate School policy to provide that the Graduate Faculty have the same scope of authority as the Faculty Senate—namely, to consult, recommend, review or ratify. Obviously, in cases of disagreement, Graduate School policies would be finally adopted by the Board of Trustees.

We will be discussing this matter with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for the purpose of having a recommendation before you as early as your June meeting.

Thank you again for your attention to these remarks.

I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at Commencement.

* * * * * * *

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION
STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Trustee Affairs – Daniel H. Polett

1. Report

The report of the Committee on Trustee Affairs was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 1.

Executive Committee – Daniel H. Polett, Vice Chair

2. Report

The report of the Executive Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 2.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACTION:

3. Borrowing Authority – July 1, 2005, through October 31, 2005

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees authorized the officers to borrow, for operating purposes of the University, $30 million on terms which the officers believe best for the University, such authority to cover the period from July 1, 2005, through October 31, 2005.
4. **Report**

The report of the Temple University Health System, Inc., was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 4.

**Facilities Committee – Mitchell L. Morgan, Chair**

5. **Report**

The report of the Facilities Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 5.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION:**

6. **New Medical School – Design and Pre-Construction Management Services**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Facilities Committee (4/14/05) that the officers be authorized to proceed with design and pre-construction management services for a new Medical School facility, also known as the Multi-Purpose Health Sciences Building, at a cost not-to-exceed $10,880,000, with the funding and financing sources being the Plant Development Fund and State Capital Funds, with the project to be referred to the Special Committee on Major Facilities Projects.

7. **Biology & Life Sciences Building – Switchgear Replacement**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Facilities Committee (4/14/05) that the officers be authorized to proceed with the replacement of switchgear and breakers located in the Biology & Life Sciences Building at a cost not-to-exceed $532,000, with the funding and financing sources being the Plant Development Fund.

**Academic Affairs Committee – Leonard Barrack, Chair**

8. **Report**

The report of the Academic Affairs Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 8.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION:**

9. **Consideration of Tenure**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) and the President regarding the granting of faculty tenure.

10. **Transfer the Department of Kinesiology from the College of Education to the College of Health Professions**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) that the officers be authorized to transfer the Department of Kinesiology from the College of Education to the College of Health Professions.
11. **Transfer the Tenure of the Faculty Members of the Department of Kinesiology from the College of Education to the College of Health Professions**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) that the officers be authorized to transfer the tenure of the attached list of faculty in the Department of Kinesiology from the College of Education to the College of Health Professions.

12. **Transfer the Center for Neurovirology and Cancer Biology from the College of Science and Technology to the School of Medicine**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) that the officers be authorized to transfer the Center for Neurovirology and Cancer Biology from the College of Science and Technology to the School of Medicine.

13. **Transfer the Tenure of the Faculty Members of the Center for Neurovirology and Cancer Biology from the College of Science and Technology to the School of Medicine**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) that the officers be authorized to transfer the tenure on the attached list of faculty in the Center for Neurovirology and Cancer Biology from the College of Science and Technology to the School of Medicine.

14. **Establish a Master of Science Degree in Epidemiology in the College of Health Professions**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee (4/25/05) that the officers be authorized to establish a Master of Science degree in Epidemiology in the College of Health Professions.

Audit Committee – Patrick V. Larkin, Member

15. **Report**

The report of the Audit Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 15.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR ACTION:**

16. **Selection of Auditing Firms for University “Small Audits”**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Audit Committee (4/11/05) and appointed Deloitte & Touche as auditor for the University pension funds, and Mitchell & Titus as auditor for The Liacouras Center and WRTI radio station.

Budget & Finance Committee – Lewis F. Gould, Jr., Chair

17. **Report**

The report of the Budget & Finance Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 17.
Development Committee – Richard J. Fox, Chair

18. Report

The report of the Development Committee was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 18.

The Athletics Committee and the Student Affairs Committee did not meet during the reporting period.

* * * * * * * * * * *
OFFICERS' REPORTS

19. Secretary's Report – George E. Moore

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board of Trustees approved the presentation of degrees-in-course dated August 26, 2005, to candidates approved by the appropriate academic committees of the faculty with the understanding that degrees for Law School evening students who regularly complete their studies in July shall be dated July 20, 2005, with a certificate from the Dean of the Law School verifying said receipt; and that degrees for School of Dentistry students who regularly complete their studies in June and early July shall be dated July 7, 2005, with a certificate from the Dean of the School of Dentistry verifying said receipt.

20. Treasurer's Report – Martin S. Dorph

The Report of the Treasurer, including grants and contracts awarded between January 1, 2005, and March 31, 2005, was accepted as presented in Agenda Reference 20.

OLD BUSINESS:
Reminder: The 118th annual Commencement ceremony will be held on Thursday, May 19, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., in The Liacouras Center.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT