

FSSC Meeting 10/7/26

In person: Bognanno (MB); Kolodny (RK); Newman (SN); Curtis, Godel, Gallagher, Gamero, McCarthy, Norris, Solow, Tierney

Online: Ahmad, Jiang, Jones, Minhas, Racano, Schirmer

Absent: Porrata-Doria, Ferretti, Letarte, Bacani

1. Call to Order – Dr. Mike Bognanno, Senate President - 1:03 PM

- Welcome
- President's Report
 - MB discussion with Temple Secretary to the Board of Trustees Michael Gebhardt confirmed that a proposal would be forthcoming to include faculty members as members on board committees - Executive Committee, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Investment.
 - MB reported on the student retention audit from the National Institute for Student Success at Georgia State; the overview was delivered on 10/5:
 - Challenges facing Temple Include:
 - Retention rate trending down
 - Most of the students leaving Temple are transferring to Community College system
 - Support at Temple for first-year students is inconsistent
 - Support is not scalable, 1:1 and labor intensive
 - Initial support is weak
 - We make weak use of data and AI and predictive analytics
 - Advising is inconsistent in practice and training
 - Little or no anticipation of financial needs
 - Almost half of students change major after their 1st year ; this increases time to degree and decreases graduation rate
 - Racial disparities in attrition rates
 - Big variation in D,F, and W by section of the same course
 - 325-500 student per advisor

At this point, MB stopped his report to welcome our guest”

2. Guest: Jennifer Wood (JW), Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (VPFA) – 1:10pm

- Composition of departmental promotion committees

MB: We are running into a problem because of the lack of full professors in departments across Temple.

JW: The TAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, provides good guidance for schools throughout Temple. If you don't have anybody in your department, look at other departments in your college. If you can't find appropriate expertise in your college, look to others. There is analogy to be drawn between this situation and college committees; Deans are allowed to consult with a faculty member with someone who could be assigned. Faculty can always consult with the VPFA office.

Be well acquainted with school/college and departmental bylaws (if your department has bylaws; a few do not)

You may need to revise your bylaws to adjust to this. You need at least 3 actually there to deliberate and vote, and bylaws should be checked to make sure they are in alignment with college/school bylaws

SN and MB: Could associate professors with expertise in the field of the faculty member going up for full act in a consultative role: advise? letter writer advice?

JW: It is not inappropriate to solicit a letter for such a faculty member, but I am leery about associates participating in deliberative process. They could be approached by the Chair of department or of departmental committee or candidate could approach them that draws on expertise. This should be done carefully, and faculty and Chairs should notify VPFA office if this step is being contemplated.

Member: If we're from a non-TAUP school and we lack full professors, what should we do?

JW: There have been discussions with Dentistry on this. Consider expertise in other schools and colleges.

Member: We have to clarify this, given that we are facing a new situation with a lack of full professors.

JW promises to discuss this with Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs group

Member: Does every school have a separate Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs? Ours doesn't.

JW: 75% of schools and colleges have associate deans designated for faculty affairs

SN: What is the status of the report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Task Force convened by Interim Provost Boardman?

JW: The Provost has not yet received the report b/c there is NO report; we are starting to brief her on what they've collected, some ideas about guidance documents re: workload.

SN: I have heard from many faculty members concerned about this report, especially given the make up of the task force and the general lack of transparency. I urge that the administration clarify the process going forward and include faculty in any discussions on these matters.

JW: I understand. Right now there are different strands of work that have been done but no report as a whole. .

Q: Will this apply to the professional schools as well?

JW: Yes.

Member: Guidelines for promotion to full vary. I am evaluated based on my research but we are also squeezed to take over lots of other things re: teaching and service

JW: I understand that that's a problem, and I encourage you to have conversations with the Chair and Associate Dean. We have to be aware of the sets of guidelines at the various levels. The "administration" is not monolithic.

Member: I've been trying to push this for years. Other faculty members and I who prove themselves as good at teaching and service are just given more and more of this. Conversations with Chair and Associate Dean have been fruitless. I am struggling to find funding in this environment and then asked to chair another committee.

MB: In most departments, the crucial standard for promotion is research. The problem is that we have a shrinking number of faculty, especially tenure track faculty, but the service load stays the same. We shield the assistant professors, but associates and fulls who are dependable get more put on them.

Member: It's a very sticky point. At my school we have metrics that also tie salary increases heavily to research. Many of us haven't gotten a salary increase in years. What is our incentive to devote time to teaching and service?

Member: Service has increased due to there being fewer people. We need to evaluate which committees need to continue and how many people need to serve on each. Evaluate which committees need to be continued and how many people need to serve.

Member: How do those on the clinical track get promoted?

A: Their primary criterion is their work as a clinician, without a significant research burden.

Member: We do not sufficiently recognize leadership as criterion for promotion and then we bemoan the fact that people don't step up to leadership.

RK: There are more associates serving as Chair, compounding the problem.

JW: University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPAC) members have commented on the variation in college guidelines. We need to look at all guidelines, but the ones for colleges/schools are key.

Member: Do the university guidelines mention leadership? They set the tone for colleges/schools and so we should see if they do, if we're serious about this issue.

JW: Leadership in field is specified in my department's guidelines as is interdisciplinarity.

SN: We are a research university and so it makes sense that for tenured faculty carrying out the tripartite mission that research remains a key criterion.

MB: The length of time before coming up for full can really matter. Too long can predispose people against your case

Member: There are cases where people have fallow periods as researchers, often because they're doing lots of service. UTPAC can see this, but only if they are looking for it.

MB: In producing new NTT promotion standards for my department, I proposed that NTTs in my department who publish research have that count towards promotion, not as a requirement, but as something that would be beneficial. But I encountered pushback from my colleagues, and the idea wasn't supported by the Dean's Office. I had to drop it.

JW: We have to be careful with the track that they're on. That needs to be the primary criterion for their evaluation.

MB: Can you even mention research at all?

JW: Yes, but it can't be an expectation. Other contributions can be weighed.

MB: There's a danger of cutting yourself off from the field if you don't do research.

JW: Does their research inform their teaching?

MB: Sometimes we have people publishing in areas where they are not teaching.

JW: It would be best to frame it in terms of a contribution to their teaching.

SN: This issue has a recent history in negotiations around the 2019-23 union contract, where it was a contentious issue. I would advise MB to reach out to TAUP's PIRC Constituency Council so he can benefit from their views.

Member: There is a danger of “mission creep” if we start expecting research from NTTs.

Member: They are limited in the merit they can receive if it’s not in their primary appointment.

Member: Our accrediting body expects research from all full-time faculty members. But then in our college non-tenure track faculty are limited to merit in 2 out of 3 categories.

Back to President’s Report: 2:18

Recommendations from the NISS Report

- More support for 1st year students
- More and better guidance in the selection of major—informing students about the careers, earnings, etc. of the various majors
- Instituting a summer bridge program
- Bloc schedules to keep students on similar pathways—this increases bonds among students and thus retention
- More use of data and AI—predictive analytics to identify students at risk of leaving. Students’ interactions with Canvas have been found to be a good indicator.
- Students who have failed a section once should take a special section with faculty particularly committed to them. This led to a 20% boost in pass rate at Georgia State.
- Standardized training across campus for advisors
- Track students who receive a C in an intro course in major; these students are much less likely to graduate.
- Avoiding toxic course mixes/pairings/loads
- Make sure students can easily get answers to basic questions. An AI chatbot was recommended.
- Financial Wellness counseling with a predictive aspect; need to be proactive

Most things that have to change are on the administrative side. But on the faculty side the D/F/W rate and variation are things that we have to consider.

Seems clear that we *are* going to follow these recommendations.

Member: Does undeclared count as a major change?

MB: Not sure

Member: We’ve been talking about a lot of these recommendations for years.

Member: Tracking interaction with canvas may be falsified if it's just how long they're on the page.

Member: Any data on community college transfers vs. freshmen?

MB: Students who do well at CCP and transfer to Temple also do well at Temple.

RK: No matter what we have done, CHGs and number of majors still rule the roost. Disincentive to directing them to other colleges/schools/majors that might serve them better.

Member: What was the audience for this report? Admin? All dept chairs? I did receive a random calendar invite but wasn't sure what it was for.

SN: Was course size or other faculty concerns around workload addressed?

MB: Not in the presentation; perhaps in full report.

Member: Students need instruction how to use Canvas.

MB: Another challenge is that college readiness is at all-time low exacerbated by our recent enrollment strategy at Temple. There are also serious racial disparities in retention. At Georgia State, under-represented students benefited most from following these recommendations. I wish everybody could have attended this presentation, but the report will be circulated in some form.

Minutes approved: September 23, 2026

3. VP Report:

There is some interest in the revived Patent and Invention Committee. But we could use nominees from CST and Fox. Steve Nappi says that this is likely to be an 18 to 24 month process of review, which seems right.

4. Unfinished Business

Film and Media Arts move to Klein

SN: There are grave concerns about how this proposal was rolled out and the lack of prior consultation with faculty.

Member: We received an email the day before for a meeting with the Dean where we were informed of the move. No clear rationale for the split, but an invitation to “figure this out together.” Dean Boardman put an embargo on discussion.

Member: The same process was followed in Boyer and it was presented as a fait accompli. presented as fait accompli

Q: Have the enrollments in these programs been shrinking?

A: No.

MB: The reason given by the Deans when we met with them and the Provost on 9/11: It would better serve the students. Not cost about cost savings.

5. New Business

Adjourned 3:02

6. Announcements