

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY  
**REPRESENTATIVE FACULTY SENATE**  
**Kiva Auditorium**  
**Videoconference: HSC, 342 MERB – AMBLER, ALC201**  
 Minutes – Tuesday, January 28, 2020

**Attendance:**

Representative senators and officers: 29

Ex-officio: 0

Faculty, administrators and guests: 9

**Guests: Vice President for Research, Dr. Michelle Masucci; Associate Dean Joe DuCette & Gina Calzaferri, Assessment of Instruction (formerly SFF) Committee**

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>1. Call to order</p>	<p>Meeting called to order by Faculty Senate President Rafael Porrata-Doria. He reported that the first order of business would be to approve the minutes of 12-11-19.</p>	<p>Meeting called to order at 1:50 p.m. in Kiva Auditorium.</p> <p>Minutes approved as read.</p>
<p>Guests: Dr. Michele Masucci, Vice President for Research at Temple University</p>	<p>Dr. Masucci' s Presentation Pptx slides are attached to these minutes.</p> <p>Greetings... there have been lots of changes. Here's what we do &amp; what we're able to manage on behalf of the institution.</p> <p>We are responsible for the organization &amp; operational apparatus of research &amp; how it flows through the University. Our motto is: <b>Learn discover, research &amp; innovate.</b></p> <p>Our office is responsible for: Grants of all sizes &amp; their management; those from external sponsors. I will share tracking docs from current strategic initiatives. TU's Organizational identifiers are:</p> <p>1. We were just renewed as a Carnegie 1. This review is now</p>	

every 3 years instead of every 5 years. The designation is not only based on research expenditures. It's based on numbers & the number of graduate degrees in STEM fields. Carnegie looks at publicly available data. We have been able to remain in this R1 status, which is related to our participation in federal demonstration partnership.

2. FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP: See my pptx. This is a National Academies of Science (NAS) activity. How do universities sit in their economic development ecosystems? A compendium of 155 R1 universities, along with representatives from federal funding agencies, looks at these markers. Typically, these individuals come from NSF, NIH, NASA, DOD, HOMELAND SECURITY & others. They consider what are the best ways to solve problems to relieve the administrative burden of faculty on the ground? Time spent nationally on administration of grants was 42-44% of the investigators' time the last few times this was looked at.

We work with a primary mission to hold the line as new rules & regs come out from the feds. Investigators must make efficient & quality use of federal dollars. Our number at Temple University is about 43%. We are tracking right along with the national norm. Internal concerns include time & detail regarding the implementation of projects. Temple U's might look & feel a bit different than other organizations. Are we an outlier? Are we an innovator? What are the best practices across all 155 institutions?

3. As an aside, we now have the IRB Wizard under trial for adoption: for anyone submitting protocols now, it would allow faculty to self-exempt if Temple were to adopt the Wizard. Currently it's a demonstration project. It could happen within the year. If you're doing exempt research, you could go through the checklist rather rapidly.

4. Another thing is what goes on behind the scenes. When you receive a grant & subcontract parts of it to another university, like Drexel for example, we're required to make sure that they will be able to pay their fair share & can manage the money effectively.

What the FDP did was to create a clearing house for financial audits that flag when there may be a high risk institution. We do this behind the scenes. This was pilot tested, and they saved 19,000 hours grant review the first time they used it (for things like managing financial audits and the clearinghouse.) Hence, we don't have to send the audits & verification each time since we adopted the system. This is value added. Temple University, along with Cal Tech, is a leader of the FDP. This is a big step for researchers across country & it's great for TU to be in a leadership role.

5. The Association of Public & Land Grant U's (APLU) - We are also a member of this. Presidents, Provosts, Vice Provost Faculty Affairs Kevin Delaney and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (VPUS) Dan Berman go. Temple is making a more concerted effort to attend in recent years. This organization works in parallel with the privates, like AAU. They

monitor things like how the environmental landscape in DC is shaping up. In November of 2021, Philadelphia will be hosting the APLU national conference. Spread the word around the faculty so that Temple can be present, active & hosting some events. For faculty who are wearing leadership roles in their own work, this is a good opportunity to represent Temple & yourselves. There is a new category of activity here related to Public Institution Research. Penn State University & Lincoln are Pennsylvania's big land grant universities, going back centuries. We aren't a land grant university, but we have similar interests.

6. The Office of Research at TU:

1. Maintains Temple's Research & Development mission. We have oversight of our grants portfolio. We are making efforts visible to public audiences & making sure that they are consistently represented.
2. We have management of regulatory issues connected to your research, whether it is funded or not.
3. Research administration: There are pre & post award teams. Many of these function at the level of the schools & colleges. The ERA system is part of all of this. The second tier of review after ERA is my office before it gets submitted to an external granting system. I'm the person who signs off on your requests to sign off on your last minutes stuff. Seven people handle 1500

proposals per year. I happily sign off on most of the late proposals, but we need you to follow the timeline to take meaningful looks. The Office of Research Administration staff is responsible for financial guidelines.

4. The ERA team functions under a system called INFO ED, as well as a number of independent committees that are faculty led.
5. Pre & post award management: This is done in concert with the Office of the President. This allows an independent compliance officer to oversee as well. This creates checks & balances. There is a separate budget area that provides oversight in addition to the schools & colleges. Please see the table in my pptx: Total expenditures of research. In 2008, it was less than \$100,000,000/ year. Now: \$284,380,000 in expenditures, for fiscal year 2018. This includes all of Temple U., including Fox Chase Cancer Center (FCCC). The expenditures were much less before 2012, when we purchased FCCC. TU s FCCC expenditure has gone up \$100 million. Federal funding is up to \$161 million in that time period. We came up 81<sup>st</sup> in our Federal ranking last year. (We were 78<sup>th</sup> earlier). Compared to other public universities only, we rank 56<sup>th</sup>. We are solidly a top 50<sup>th</sup> – 60<sup>th</sup> in number, which is something to be proud of. Our faculty are doing something special in the knowledge enterprise. I spend all of my time trying

to support this. Last year, we were up \$10 million from the previous for just TU, excluding the numbers for FCCC. Ken Kaiser (Temple University Chief Financial Officer) likes our indirects, which increased from \$20 million in 2008 to about \$48 million last year (2019). This is just one indicator of how much of that activity is going on.

6. Another endeavor that we cover is:  
TECHNOLOGY  
COMMERCIALIZATION  
DATA (our IP) This is related to either a start-up or somebody's licensing of technology so that they can commercialize it. Temple's goal: more independence from Federal dollars. We are building up a staff to handle this. For FY 2020, we anticipate 93 active licenses. We're expecting 60-100 inventions. (In 2008, there were < 30/year). We file 50-100 patents/year. We look at marketability. If we think there's a market value, we pay for the patent expenses. This is all covered under our budget. In 2008, we received four patents. These numbers are small, but the direction is quite large. Please see the last column in my slides for TU start-ups. Today, there are 5 startups. We anticipate \$53,000,000 to be spent. This is a vehicle for faculty to get grants & drive them back into their activities.

Are there any questions?

Dr. Williams-Witherspoon (Senate V.P.): Have you teased out how much of this money is related to the Health Science Center's versus others'

revenue? Do faculty share in some of the money from that IP?

Answer: Thanks for asking excellent Q's: Faculty get 40% of the return. This is way above share compared to the industry. We've also moved away from the licensing. Here, 40% stays & 20% goes to the schools for development. To take away the faculty share would be antithetical. Ours is pretty generous compared to the rest of the country.

We're primarily biomed. Two thirds come to us from biomed. The Lewis Katz School of Medicine (LKSM) holds 45%. It's not just one part of campus. Our DC representative would track to that activity. Our discipline (I'm a geographer) is not recognized. Engineering has surged lately. Social sciences have become more productive, but I don't have numbers. It's 'impactful.' With the Associate Deans, we send this information to them. In the RCM environment, all the money goes back to the schools & colleges.

Other questions? No.

One more thing: That is the implementation of INFO READY. There are challenges around limited submission opportunities. How should we do it better? If I come to you with the opportunity, pick me because there is a small window of time during which these proposals can be submitted. Limited opportunity grants allow only one grant per a specific department or one to a specific university. We want to fairly communicate the opportunity so that we don't exclude internal opportunities. Sometimes high quality & internal opportunities align, but there is no worse feeling with time & energy that so many people invest in, and then there are too many proposals. Then, someone else got selected. This is always a tense process. After working with faculty & research AD's, we got INFO READY software. Go to it using accessnet usernames & passwords.

	<p>Submit a white paper there. This gives an opportunity for a peer review of your/their activity. Look for it on the top of the Research websites.</p> <p>There are 2 other strategic initiatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Research regulatory affairs science hub is situated on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Health Sciences Center, Student Faculty Center. All IRBs will be able to meet there in the space. It's been recently reconfigured and has space dedicated for training, outreach &amp; review of protocols for the responsible conduct of research. Formerly, there was no place to go physically. The compliance office is now open.</li> <li>2. On the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Old Dental School (in the Kornberg School of Dentistry on the Health Sciences campus). This new science hub is opening there to support faculty &amp; research activities. It's opening in the fall, 2020.</li> </ol>	
<p>3. Joe DuCette &amp; Gina Calzaferri</p>	<p>Dr. DuCette was introduced by Senate President Porrata-Doria.</p> <p>Dr. DuCette: Good afternoon. Some of you know me. I'm the chair of the Assessment of Instruction Committee (AIC), previously the Student Feedback Forms (SFF) Committee. This is an update on where we are, what decisions have been done. Gina &amp; I made this presentation last week at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) &amp; they asked us to come here. The current SFF system that you know &amp; love with the 11 core questions, has been in place for around a decade. We knew that there were some problems with that &amp; that TU was out of sync with the mainstream. Therefore, the following decisions made:</p>	



1. Make the system far more flexible that it currently is. There will be more opportunities at 4 different levels to add questions (examples, about Writing Intensive, Gen Ed courses, College level & Department level questions). We've been working > 2 years to get that in place.
2. Our most immediate job is to create the core University questions. We did that & we have reduced them from 16 to 5 Q's. One that students fill out: How many hours per week do you work on completing course assignments & then the 4 cores: We are replacing: Instructor was well organized & prepped for class. There are several more. At this time, the 3 open ended questions are under discussion by the committee & will be available in the near future.

The new form was piloted in the Law School, Fall, 2019. In Spring, 2020: it's being piloted in the Law & Pharmacy schools. (Both of these are professional schools with graduate level students). The forms will go completely live university-wide in Summer Session 2, 2020, which starts the new academic year, to check for glitches during a typically low enrollment time frame. There is a draft item pool from which questions can be chosen. The plan is to have them widely dispersed so that schools & colleges can choose, so that the colleges & departments can choose to include or not from the item bank.

What you get back, as a faculty member, are your own data with a comparison. The data are translated into the U & L letter system. Nobody is thrilled with that system. There's been discussion about what that might be replaced with. We're looking at a number of ways that other institutions do this. One of the College

departments has been asked to design a better form for us.

Finally, & most critically, the committee has been working on & will be finished with a document (several currently exist & are very good) about how to use and how not to use SFF data. This will be widely distributed for discussion. One that's very well done is on the Penn State Faculty Senate's website.

In the new Faculty contract, there is new language saying something to the extent about how the use of SFF data are used for P & T & the rehiring of contingent faculty. Whoever is in charge in terms of what that might look like, the AIC would be happy to contribute to that process.

Sharyn O'Mara (Tyler/FSSC): Core questions are decided. Open ended questions are under discussion. There are some wording changes. Writing of the document concerning the best use of SFFs & finally the decision about the data about what instructors will get back concerning their own data should have faculty involvement. Intense faculty involvement. There are big differences of opinion & they are very interesting. This must be dispersed.

Dr. DuCette: We would be happy to come to the Faculty Senate to disperse this information.

M. Weinraub (CLA): Thank you, Joe, for your hard work. Where can we find a copy of the PSU document?

Ms. Calzaferri: I will email it to Cheryl.

MW: How is it that you decided not to adopt their form?

Dr. DuCette: It's not really their form, but a statement about the use of the data that they discuss. It's about the way that administrators use it for merit, P & T. It's not a lot different from ours.

Ms. Calzaferri: Currently our system is

developed in house by our IT. We had to decide about buying one. We decided to make it more flexible for our own university this way without the expense. That's why we chose to stay 'in house.'

Dr. DuCette: I've been involved in this committee since Pres Adamany. One of the most prevailing, now owned by IBM, was \$600k back in the early 2000s. I've never regretted what we decided. I think we do at least as well as what they do.

Dr. Sabina (COE): Have you mentioned the delivery of the course (Hybrid, OLL) & CORE vs. elective.

Dr. DuCette: My position on this is "I am absolutely committed to the idea that when we have the first set of data back that we do some real research on it." The University of Toronto has a system, with 4 core questions, that are almost identical to ours. They asked an extensive series of questions about their form. There are many recent publications about SFFs, a majority of which, are negative. What that document did was address a lot of those issues at U of Toronto, saying things like, that is or is not true here. This addressed the consideration of bias against women & minorities. We must look at ourselves very honestly about this and if it is our issue, become a national leader about it. One of the issues about ideas is that when there are winners in that system there are also losers. If you are teaching a very large stem science course, you will be evaluated up & if you're teaching a senior elective course, your course will be evaluated down. Making those questions & answers public, saying here's our issue & here's what we're willing to do about it. The other problem is that when the system is in place (unlike how things have been over the past 15 years), they will be corrected in a timely manner.

Ms. Calzaferri: There will also be

	<p>trainings with CAT, for leadership. Deans &amp; Associate Deans will have instruction on how to use the data.</p> <p>Sabina: Is it possible to get scaled scores? These are more appropriately used in high stakes decisions.</p> <p>Dr. DuCette: Stephanie Fiore is on the committee &amp; will arrange to train merit committees &amp; others on how to do the added questions.</p> <p>Corey Ng (FSBM). How will you get the questions that are relevant to one's own school?</p> <p>Ms. Calzaferri: We want feedback from the departments, schools &amp; colleges. We had meetings last semester to figure out what process made sense for them to review appropriate documents and updates. We will follow up on this with the Associate Deans &amp; suggest some work on that. You won't be able to automatically add questions. They will come to the AIC.</p> <p>Dr. DuCette: Whatever you can do to bring this back to the schools &amp; colleges, try to make it happen. There is nothing secretive about this. Look up item banks on Google... there are many. The U. of Illinois has a bank with 789 questions. We're not going that route.</p> <p>Sharyn O'Mara (Tyler/FSSC): I think it's really exciting having TU establishing themselves as national leaders in identifying bias. I'm wondering what tools you have for identifying bias.</p> <p>Dr. DuCette: There are a couple of answers to that question. There is a fairly standard methodology for identifying bias; it's sophisticated. We've consulted them. You've got to get down in the weeds for this to ask what's really going on. Do women get lower scores than men? Are there intersections of gender &amp; race? ... There are not a lot of really good</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>answers at this point. The very least is that we recognize it. It would thrill me if we found that some of this stuff that exists in the literature that doesn't exist at TU. If we do find it, then we acknowledge &amp; fix it.</p> <p>Dr. Williams-Witherspoon (Senate V.P.): Could you please explain that faculty have the right to add 4 questions to this?</p> <p>Dr. DuCette: There are some with the 5-point Likert scale &amp; 3 open ended at the U. level. We call it the course attribute level, like Honors, Gen Ed, etc. There are 2 questions per criterion can be added. The rest are for the Department level, but really, related to the subject code for course, and finally, 4 for instructor level. So the data you add will appear only on your report but would not appear to AOI Committee or leadership. You can choose to give those data to them.</p> <p>Thank-you for the opportunity to be at this meeting.</p>	
<p>2. President Rafael Porrata-Doria's Report</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>The Faculty Herald</i> issue for the fall was published on or around December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. The link was sent to all in the Faculty Senate listserv. If you didn't get the link &amp; would like to see it, please email us at <a href="mailto:senate@temple.edu">senate@temple.edu</a> &amp; we will send you the link. 2<sup>nd</sup> issue for spring, coming out. If you are interested in writing an article, please send us an email &amp; we'll put you in touch.</li> <li>2. Tuesday, Feb. 4<sup>th</sup>, at midnight, is the new deadline for submission for the Faculty Senate Service Awards, after last Friday's deadline was extended. Differences between the kinds of awards were briefly explained. A copy of the awards criteria is in the materials for this meeting.</li> </ol>	

<p>3. Vice President Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon's Report</p>	<p>Vacancies: If you are willing to serve on any of these, please send me a note. If you are rotating off, please check that out. There will be a great deal of turn-around at the end of spring semester. This kind of work is very valuable to the University. Service is normally considered very small next to research &amp; teaching, but our Provost's speaker* just reminded us that it should be considered of equal value from the point of view of how faculty fulfill their roles.</p> <p><i>* Professor Cathy Davidson, City University of New York. The event was held at the Temple Performing Arts Center at 12:30 p.m. on January 28, 2020.</i></p>	
<p>4. Old Business</p>	<p>1. None.</p>	<p>No questions, comments or issues.</p>
<p>5. New Business</p>	<p>1. None.</p>	<p>Initially, no questions, comments or issues.</p>
<p>6. Adjournment</p>	<p>Motion on floor for adjournment. Thank you all for coming.</p>	<p>Adjourned at 2:50 p.m.</p>
<p>Respectfully submitted on behalf of current Faculty Senate Secretary, Lisa Ferretti by <i>Sue Dickey</i> Sue Dickey, PhD, RN, Associate Professor (Nursing/CPH) &amp; Former Faculty Senate Secretary, 2016-18, Spring 2019</p>		

Next meeting: Representative Faculty Senate, Monday, Feb. 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020.