“...Not Everything that Counts can be Counted.”

“It would be nice if all the data which sociologists require could be enumerated because then we could run them through IBM machines and draw charts as the economists do. However, not everything that can be counted, and not everything that counts can be counted.” - William Bruce Cameron

In 2002, Presidential guideline 2.78.14, Policy on Course and Teaching Evaluations, was issued.

The development of a common course evaluation mechanism had been under discussion by a faculty/provostial committee for some months, and the FSSC was also involved in this activity. Initially a short document consisting of four or five questions was under consideration, but what finally evolved was the instrument known as the Course and Teaching Evaluation or CATE. In the Spring of 2010, writing in the Faculty Herald Vol. 40 No. 4, Oren Chein recalled

A Brief History of New City Writing

By Eli Goldblatt, Professor of English

New City Writing is the community engagement arm of the Temple writing program, based in the English Department. Founded in the spring semester of 1997, it emerged from a FIPSE grant in the College of Arts and Sciences to explore ways that faculty could be rewarded for service to the community surrounding Temple. At the time, Professor Caroline Adams was dean of the college (later to become the College of Liberal Arts), and she strongly supported the mission to develop literacy partnerships with organizations in North Philadelphia and other nearby urban neighborhoods. Steve Parks and I wrote the initial charter for what was then called the Institute for the Study of Literature, Literacy and Culture, a long title meant to position the institute among the disciplines of English, philosophy, and anthropology. Parks was the first director, and he soon began referring to the Institute by our “street name”: New City Writing (NCW). When Parks took a position at Syracuse University in 2004, I assumed the directorship.

Much of our initial work involved seeking community-based writing projects and publishing the results. Our first project was to sponsor a graduate...
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4. What will happen to them and to their programs?

5. What will be the timeline for these changes? Will there be opportunities for small departments to hire the necessary additional faculty? Will there be exceptions made for special circumstances and, if so, what are the criteria for these exceptions? Will this policy affect departments at the Medical School and the School of Podiatry?

6. Has there been any consultation with faculty members in the formulation of this policy? If not, why not?

Are there any unasked questions that you would like to answer?

Please assume that any answers you may give will be printed in the Herald.

Thank you for your kind attention.
Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.

In response, Provost Dai invited me to have a discussion with him. This article is the result of that meeting.

Paul LaFollette (PL): The basic question I have is whether there is any basis to the various rumors that are circulating about a new policy specifying a minimal number of tenure/tenure track professors required for a department to exist.

Hai-Lung Dai (HLD): This is not a rumor. We are considering this. It is in the process of being debated. We had a couple of discussions in the Council of Deans, and I also had discussions with President Theobald, but we did not move forward because we do recognize that this is a complex issue which requires more study. I think that as a university we cannot have a single size fits all rule. For instance, the Medical School is run very differently from the rest of the University. So, at this point we have not yet made any forward progress as to whether we should do this or not.

“I think in a department there should be a certain number of tenured/tenure track members, supported by NTT and adjunct faculty… Our intention is that if a discipline is important, we want that field to be strongly supported at Temple.”
- Provost Hai-Lung Dai

PL: The first of my questions was “What problem is this policy attempting to fix?”

HLD: This started when I was looking at promotion and tenure and also hiring. If you have a typical case, and if your department has only two or three faculty, often only one of them has tenure. So the entire process now rests on a single person’s opinion. Just by common sense this could be a problem. Also, sometimes when a department is small and we are trying to grow this department again we have the same issue. One or two people may end up guiding the entire hiring process. We make departmental decisions using the collective wisdom of the department, because we recognize that we are all very subjective in making hiring and tenure decisions. It is easy to see that a small department, purely as a result of the small number of people participating, may not be able to handle these processes as well as a larger department.

When we say we want to fix this, our primary goal is to look at why the department is small. Sometimes there is a reason. For example, the establishment of the department was not accompanied by sufficient support. Based on the findings, we can find ways to address the issue of its smallness.

We could say that we need to do reviews of small departments so that we can decide whether they should become bigger, or become part of an existing larger and discipline-relevant department. We also want to consider whether we need a guideline on the numbers. Using my training as a scientist, when looking at a theory in, say, physics, we always must be mindful of boundary conditions. This means that our model must work at the extremes. In this case, we might ask, “If we don’t have any guidelines on department size, then why don’t we have a separate department for each faculty member?” If we recognize that this does not make sense, then we conclude that there must be some appropriate minimum size to make things work. So now we must consider what is the appropriate minimum size. This size must reflect what we need to cover the essence of the intellectual field. A department of chemistry must have expertise in all the subdivisions of chemistry, organic, inorganic, and so on. This demands a certain size. Each of these divisions needs senior and junior faculty.

Any department is going to need a couple of assistant professors, because we always need fresh blood. That probably means there will have to be several tenured faculty. Perhaps this suggests that the minimum size ought to be five or six. I am not saying this is cast in stone at this point. And this also needs to be considered in the context of the nature of the department. Many medical schools have only one tenured professor in their clinical departments. But these departments do not have a teaching program, and so we need to have a separate consideration for such departments.

Department is a formal university structure to administer education. For purposes of research, we can have institutes or centers, but educational mission demands a department. I think in a department there should be a certain number of tenured/tenure track members, supported by NTT and adjunct faculty.

If we were to have a policy, we would have to be considerate in its implementation. You may put this in bold, no faculty member will lose tenure as a result of this. This is cast in stone. We are not doing this to dissolve a department in order to get rid of any particular program or faculty. I am saying this on behalf of the president and myself. We are not doing this in order to downsize the faculty. Our intention is that if a discipline is important, we want that field to be strongly supported at Temple.

If we set a minimum number, then, depending on the college, it may be right for a dean to review small departments in context of the discipline. If it is determined that a department must combine with a different department, that would be fine. If the department needs to be abolished and individual faculty members move to other departments, that may also be appropriate. Or, and I would not be at all surprised if this happens, the dean could say that we need to support a small department by helping it to grow. I would expect this to happen for important fields. For instance, when I came to Temple, Geology was a small department with only five tenured faculty members. We are now growing this department and I believe it is now approaching ten.

PL: However this policy eventually evolves, it sounds like your plan is that decisions will first be made at the level of the dean. Will there be opportunities for affected departments to appeal the decisions made for them?

HLD: In our university procedure, to abolish a department is a due process to follow. This is evaluated at many levels. The Provost and the President both make assessment and recommendation to the Board of Trustees. If a department feels they are being improperly treated, there is a process to deal with this.

PL: The other question that I would ask is, how is the further evolution of this going to take place? Will there be some faculty involvement at some point?

HLD: This is a fair question. I began this process by discussing it with the Council of Deans because I wanted to hear their opinions as to whether it is something that should be done. I also have discussed it with the President. There are still many details that need to be considered. When I have a better
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to idea some of these details, and when I have the time to revisit it, I will discuss this with the Faculty Senate and solicit some faculty input.

PL: Thank you for meeting with me and responding to these questions. I think that sharing information like this is always healthy in the presence of rumors.

HLD: I was pleased to meet with you. This is one more way for me to communicate with the faculty.

The Faculty Herald tries to address the concerns and interests of all of our faculty, including tenured, tenure track, and all of the various kinds of non-tenure track and adjunct faculty employed by our various schools and colleges. If you are a faculty member, we would value your contribution to the Herald either by means of a letter to the editor, or the submission of an article for publication.
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student from African American Studies, Suzanne Henderson, to facilitate a writing group for early teen girls in Norris Homes, a housing development bordering Temple to the south. Under the name New City Community Press, we produced books written by and for communities of Mexican farm workers (Espejos y Ventanas/Mirrors and Windows), the Chinese community (Chinatown Live(s)), people with disabilities (No Restraints), and a racially integrated working class South Philadelphia neighborhood (The Forgotten Bottom Remembered). We also published a magazine called Open City that collected writing by people throughout the city. When Parks moved to Syracuse, he took the Press with him, and it continues to publish in collaboration with Syracuse University Press.

Other New City projects involved partnerships with independent non-profits or schools. These projects aimed to support the literacy of children and adults in ways that drew on the strengths of collaboration. In most cases, Temple students helped to further the mission of the community partner, but college students were not meant to be our primary beneficiaries. Indeed, we wanted to afford students the best possible opportunities to learn about neighborhoods and envision their future in a diverse and inclusive world. However, our guiding principle was always to focus on benefit for the community, as defined by community partners themselves. We developed a long-standing relationship with Proyecto Sin Fronteras/Open Borders, a technology education program that served adults in Latino North Philadelphia. We opened writing centers in K-8 schools at a four locations around the city. We developed the Community Arts and Literacy Network, a cooperative venture that connected two grassroots arts programs (Asian Arts Initiative and Art Sanctuary), the Temple Partnership Schools (especially Duckrey and Meade), the Community Arts program at Tyler School of Art, and New City Writing. For these and other projects, we received grants totaling well over $2.5 million from the Knight Foundation, Verizon, the Federal GEAR UP program, and private donors.

In the last ten years, NCW has focused on two main avenues: school-to-college access and Tree House Books. For four years we sponsored a summer writing program for teens called the Temple Writing Academy, thanks to a grant from College of Liberal Arts alumna Sue Wiesen eck and her husband Bob.

Telly Monster Visits Temple Theater Students
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ion. On Tomlinson’s stage, Robinson and Telly The Monster demonstrated acting and puppeteering techniques, talked about his work promoting Sesame Street’s global outreach and about possible internship opportunities with Temple students.

Marty Robinson with Temple Theater Students
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In 1854, David Burk, a shoemaker from Knittingen, Germany, emigrated with his family to Philadelphia. His son Henry became a repairer of shoemaking equipment and later invented a tanning method for kid leather. This method, which allowed the process to be completed in hours rather than days, became the foundation of Henry’s fortune. Based on it, he went into business with two of his brothers, Alfred E. Burk and Charles D. Burk, founding Burk Brothers. This firm grew into largest producer of glazed kid leather in the world.

Henry Burk died in 1903 and Alfred became the president of the company. In 1906, he purchased a lot at the corner of Broad and Jefferson Streets, and hired the prominent architect Simon Bassett to design a house for him. This house was completed in 1907 at a cost of $256,000, which is somewhat in excess of $6,000,000 in today’s dollars.

The mansion consisted of 27 rooms and seven bathrooms. It was accompanied by a carriage house, a garage, and a conservatory. In a Temple News article from Nov. 7, 2002, Chris Powell writes, “According to a 1971 university press release, the legend behind the home is that Burk was jilted by his sweetheart and built the mansion to show her what her home would have been like if she had married him.”

In 1921, Alfred died in 1921 after suffering five months from sciatic rheumatism. In his fifty-six years, he had been

- assigned US patent US538893 A, for “Bar or Tack for Boots or Shoes.”
- President of the Manufacturers’ Club.
- Director of the Market Street National Bank, the Continental-EQUITABLE Title and Trust Company, the Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company, and the Pennsylvania Manufacturers’ Association Casualty Insurance Company.
- A member of the Delaware River Bridge and Tunnel Commission.
- One of the principle owners of the Steel Pier in Atlantic City
- President of the Children’s Homeopathic Hospital

After Alfred’s death, the mansion was occupied by his sisters until 1942. In 1945 it was sold for to the Upholsterer’s International Union of North America for $50,000. This union, founded in 1892 in Chicago, occupied the building until it was acquired by Temple University in 1971 at a cost of $375,000.

In 1969, Temple’s Board of Trustees created the School of Social Administration, previously a department in the College of Education, as an independent School. The 1971 acquisition of the Burk mansion provided a home for this newly created school. In addition, in 1970 Temple opened a day care center for the children of Temple students and employees. In 1975, the Temple day care program was moved into the Burk mansion carriage house.

In 1995, a fire in the mansion resulted in the closing of the day care center and the relocation of the School of Social Administration. The building has been empty since that time.

Last year, the mansion was renovated to the extent of removing boards from the windows, painting, and adding lighting and landscaping. This was done with the goal of making it look less like an abandoned building. Beyond that, Temple apparently has no plans at the moment to re-occupy this stately property. ♦
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When the actual policy was announced, it read as follows:

Temple University is committed to high quality instruction in graduate, undergraduate and professional programs. Student feedback regarding instruction is an integral part of assuring quality in the University’s educational programs.

Every instructor – each person teaching at the University – is required to have his or her teaching evaluated by students every semester using a standard form adopted for such purpose. The sole exceptions to this policy are:

(a) courses in which student anonymity cannot be guaranteed, including courses with small enrollment (seven students or fewer),
(b) independent studies, and
(c) courses involving one-on-one instruction.

Schools heavily dependent on one-on-one instruction are required to develop and use other means to assess this type of instruction.

Faculty will receive copies of the evaluations to be used for self-assessment and when indicated, improvement of their teaching. The summary results of course and teaching evaluations will also be provided to deans for purposes of retention, promotion, tenure and merit decisions and to department chairs and faculty committees that provide advice to the administration regarding the awarding of tenure, promotion, and merit. (Bold type is mine.)

Deans should not use data gathered for courses being taught for the first time or for instructors who are assigned to teach an existing course for the first time for the purposes of retention, promotion, tenure or merit decisions. The results of such evaluations will be provided for the instructors’ personal use but will not be reported to the department chairs or faculty committees for use in merit, promotion or tenure decisions. A Teaching Learning Center shall be developed and maintained by the University so that assessment of faculty teaching can be used to support and enhance teaching skills.

Even though the wishes of the FSSC were ignored in the creation of this policy, it is now widely agreed that in matters of personnel and merit decisions, the CATES (or now SFFs) should be one part of a more balanced approach to evaluation including such things as peer evaluation and portfolios. Indeed, the report of the committee formed several years ago to update and improve the CATES included the following language:

CATE’s were renamed Student Feedback Forms (SFFs) to convey the committee’s strong belief that student reports on teaching should be only one component of a comprehensive plan for assessing teaching, at the individual, departmental, and school or college level.

The 2011 Presidential Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure also recognize this, strongly urging candidates to provide additional evidence of teaching, as do the guidelines of many of our schools and colleges.

Nonetheless, I have heard too many anecdotes of meetings in which personnel and merit decisions are based largely or exclusively upon SFF scores. I have sat in meetings in which it was seriously argued that peer evaluations need to be ignored because we cannot trust our faculty to fairly evaluate one another, and portfolios should likewise be ignored because they are created by the candidates themselves.

In addition, there is a widespread belief among our contingent and pre-tenured faculty that their careers are dependent upon achieving consistently good SFF scores. This can, and does, lead to a strong commitment to teaching excellence, a good thing, but can also lead to grade inflation and simplification of course requirements, not such good things. And exclusive use of SFF data can give an unbalanced picture of a professor some of whose students may dislike his or her methods. Finally, I, and others, remain troubled about the low response to the new eSFFs and at least the appearance this may give that people’s lives are being adversely affected by a small fraction of students.

The desire to rely on SFF data is understandable. It is always easier to justify decisions made by looking at numbers, even when the numbers are not measuring anything of interest, than it is to justify conclusions reached subjectively. Nonetheless, it is time to find a way to encourage the use of broader tools for the evaluation of teaching. The Teaching and Learning Center has been urging this for many years. I would rather see this encouragement take the form of a statement of best practices coming from the Faculty Senate than as yet another Presidential Policy. However, it is easy for faculty and deans to ignore Faculty Senate recommendations, so I would instead suggest that the Senate, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs could work together to develop strong recommendations that no personnel or merit decisions be made on the basis of SFF data alone.

As always, commentary in the form of Letters to the Editor is welcomed, and should be directed to paul.lafollette@temple.edu •

The Second Annual Disability & Change Symposium: Fault Lines, Intersections & Action

Wednesday, March 18th, 10am-4pm
Temple University Main Campus, Student Center South Room 200B

Attend the symposium and explore questions such as:

• Who is included in disability rights?
• How can social movements change attitudes as well as laws and policies?
• How do the fault lines of race, gender, economics and culture operate in various disability communities, and how can understanding their intersection form effective movements for change?

For more information, email the Institute on Disabilities at Temple University: iod@temple.edu •

Institute on Disabilities at Temple University

Paul LaFollette, Editor

Paul LaFollette, Editor
Wayback: The Original Temple Stadium

By Paul LaFollette, Editor

A member of the Editorial Board suggested to me that, in light of the recent discussions and rumors about the possibility of a Temple football stadium, it might be interesting to do a Wayback story about how the Temple community reacted to our leaving, and later razing the Temple Stadium that once stood in West Oak Lane.

After spending the morning scouring Heralds from the pertinent years, I discovered that the Herald records no mention of these events. I still think it is worthwhile to give a short summary of the football stadium we once owned.

Temple Stadium was built in 1928, and was first called Beury Stadium. According to Temple historian James Hilty, the stadium was funded originally by a $100,000 donation from alumnus Charles Erny and his promise to pay the remaining $300,000 construction debt. Some of the cost was offset by renting the stadium to the Philadelphia Eagles occasionally. Originally seating 20,000 fans, it was later enlarged to accommodate 34,000 and once overflowed to 40,000 during a game against Villanova in November 1934.¹ The Owls continued to use the stadium until 1978 when they moved to the Vet.

Coaches during that time include
- Henry J. Miller 1925-1933
- Pop Warner 1934-1938
- Fred H. Swan 1939
- Ray Morrison 1940-1948
- Albert Kawal 1949-1954
- Josh Cody 1955
- Peter Stevens 1956-1959
- George Makris 1960-1969

In addition to the Owls football team, the stadium was used at various times by the Temple Owls Men's Soccer team, the Philadelphia Bulldogs, Philadelphia Spartans, and the Temple Owls Women's Soccer team. The Eagles used the stadium twice and in 1952 attempted to buy it from Temple. In 1968 it was the site of an international friendly game of the U.S. National Soccer Team and the Israel National Soccer Team. In 1970 it served as a venue for a concert including The Steve Miller Band, the Greatful Dead, and Jimi Hendrix.

After the Owls moved to the Vet, Temple continued to maintain the property until 1996 when it was razed at a cost of $334,000.00. In 2001 the land was purchased by the Elon Tabernacle Baptist Church. ♦

¹James Hilty, Temple University: 125 Years of Service to Philadelphia, the Nation, and the World, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010), 158.
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19121 or 19132 zip codes. New City has been a significant contributor to Tree House since its founding in 2005, especially in the last five years with the generous contributions from Sue and Bob Wieseneck.

Recently NCW is pursuing a joint project with Tree House, Duckrey School, a local housing development company named Community Ventures, and the Philadelphia Water Department. Around the school building, Duckrey has a large expanse of pavement, mostly underused and in serious disrepair. This expanse could be redeveloped into a garden/ecology lab/recreation space that would also absorb rainwater runoff to the great benefit of everyone in 6-10 block radius. The cooperating partners have begun a Community Design Collaborative planning process with neighbors around Duckrey to design the new space. Our hope is that construction can start within 12-18 months and that, once completed, the garden will serve to enhance summer programming at Tree House, science education at Duckrey, and relationships between elders in the senior housing nearby and families living in the surrounding streets. New City approaches this effort as a literacy project, one that demonstrates how important local advocacy and partnerships can be in linking issues of education and quality of life. ♦
President’s Report:

In follow up to this fall’s diversity symposium, it was decided that a task force on diversity will be created, and further support will be provided for analysis of data collected during the diversity symposium.

Call to Order:

Faculty, administrators, and guests: 10
Ex-officios: 1
Representative senators and officers: 35

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the November 5, 2014 meeting were approved. There was one abstention.

President’s Report:


In follow up to this fall’s diversity symposium, it was decided that a task force on diversity will be created, and further support will be provided for analysis of data collected during the diversity symposium.

b. Budget Review Committee Best Practices

The workshops to be held this spring will include the CFO and individuals from the college financial offices.

c. Taskforce on Adjunct Faculty Issues (Dec.12, 2014)

The first meeting of the taskforce was held on December 12. A subcommittee has been formed with Leadership Academy. Nine participants to construct a survey for adjunct faculty with a goal of mounting the survey by late February with a report to follow later in the semester. A subcommittee was also formed on best practices within each College and School. Work continues with HR to map the nature of current adjunct faculty.

d. Taskforce on ADR

There is some consideration of the role of an ombudsperson in relation to the VPFA. Initial orientation is that such an independent role would be important and align with practices of peer institutions.

e. Expanded Communication Networks

It does not appear to be possible to offer Faculty Senate meetings via WebEx as long as they are held in Kiva.

f. Shared Governance

The Collegial Assembly resolution was revisited with President Theobald during a meeting with the FSSC on January 13. More work needs to be done to ensure that these bodies are as robust as needed. Susan Smith clarified aspects of by-laws, notably around requests for the by-law revision process, “default” by-laws, and timely processing of by-law revisions by University Counsel.

g. Dean’s Reviews

Two Deans will be reviewed this spring (ENGR, ARTS). Faculty will be selected for participation via collegial assembly nominations, FSSC nominations, Provost selection within unit, and Provost selection external to unit.

h. Strengthening Shared Governance

Clarification of language related to faculty senate committees, examination of F S by-laws, and the Committee on Revision of the Faculty Handbook are areas of work underway.

i. Side-letter and UTPAC Issues

Tuition benefits at other universities, childcare, and faculty workload, and UTPAC changes are all topics covered by side-letters to the contract that will require considerable discussion.

Vice President’s Report:

Steven Balsam was reapproved to serve on the Budget Review Committee.

Provost Hai-Lung Dai:

The Provost described work on development of a 2+2 program in Shenzhen, China that is eventually designed to serve approximately 200 students. Significant faculty involvement is expected around curriculum design.

Plans are in place to establish a viable career services office, working with Peter Jones.

Work is underway in the research office regarding issues such as compliance and technology transfer, and research business management.

Faculty should have received information about targeted research area grants emphasizing interdisciplinary research and the President’s initiative in the humanities and arts.

Most colleges are at or above last year’s target of having 60% of NTT faculty on multi-year contracts. This year’s goal is 67%.

The alumni giving rate currently stands at 6.5%. Work is underway to increase this number.

To graduate with a Temple degree, students now need to earn 60 credits from the university, up from 45. The transfer credit minimum requirement has been changed from C- to C. One goal is for greater transparency in which credits students may transfer in to Temple (e.g., calculator like at Penn State). Faculty supervision of trained professional staff is proposed in order to ensure that transfer students bring as many relevant credits with them to Temple as possible.

Jane Evans (TYLER): This has been done in the past, notably through EPPC. Is it no longer being done?

Provost: It is being done, but needs to be improved. Faculty oversight will continue, and EPPC is an appropriate mechanism.

Provost: This is something we have not caught until just now and action needs to be taken.

Mark Rahdert (LAW): Supportive of idea of trained professional staff; importance of mechanisms and faculty oversight needs to be underscored with EPPC at the center of it.

Provost: We will certainly adhere to that advice.

Provost: Retention and graduate rates are very high for this group.

Trish Jones (EDUC): [Mostly inaudible on web capture. Please speak directly into the microphone when asking questions.]

Provost: This is an ongoing discussion and will be brought to the Council of Deans tomorrow for further consideration.

Guests: Art Hochner, TAUP President, on side letters

Hochner: Overarching goal was to move the Council of Deans out of the promotion and tenure process and provide greater disciplinary oversight. All dossiers, not just those with less than unanimous support, will now be handled by one of the subcommittees. Workload will be more manageable if each committee considers only a subset of dossiers.

Jeffrey Solow (BCMD): What goes into a side letter as opposed to the contract?

Hochner: Things that are more temporary, generally.

Katherine Bauer (CPH): My understanding is that, at most institutions tenure decisions made at the departmental or college level are typically affirmed by levels above. Given that this is adding an additional layer of review above the college, I would like to understand perspectives on how this process could help faculty, and specifically how it might help to avoid conflicting decisions as we have seen in recent years.

Hochner: Hopefully, this process will improve the situation. The contract states that the standards should be appropriate to the discipline.

Joseph Schwartz (CLA):

Hochner: I don’t know. As was stated many times during the discussion, each of these is an independent level of review.

Trish Jones (EDUC): The FSSC will be considering these issues at their next meeting. First, what are your thoughts on processes and individuals who should have input into the discussions? Second, to which extent do you think we should be taking seriously the language of disciplines and subdisciplines? Mark Rahdert (LAW): We need policies and procedures, thought out in advance, on who makes determinations about which committee should be requested to best perform a review, and when and how that request should be made.
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Gregory Urwin (CLA): What is the possible downside from this approach?
Trish Jones (EDUC): There may be more ambiguity in definition of discipline or subdiscipline.
Trish Jones (EDUC): Sometimes college guidelines do not provide that level of specific guidance and direction.

Hochner: We have them, but now, college and university guidelines are mandated by the contract.
President Jones invited Art Hochner to provide some context on the three remaining side letters
Hochner: Committees will be formed including faculty interested in each issue. More information will follow. Collegial assemblies can deal with the issue of workload.

Hochner: Adjunct faculty have filed a petition with the state labor board for representation and so we are planning to meet with management and preparing for the hearing in anticipation of an election.
Trish Jones reiterated the position of neutrality of the faculty senate on this issue. More information will follow.

Old Business:
There was no old business.

New Business:
There was no new business.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Adam Davey
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