



Imbalance of Power



Paul LaFollette,
Editor

While the Pobble was in the water some unidentified creatures came and ate his toes off, and when he got home his aunt remarked:

*"It's a fact the whole world knows,
That Pobbles are happier without their toes."*

Which once again is funny because it has a meaning, and one might even say a political significance. For the whole theory of authoritarian government is summed up in the story that Pobbles were happier without their toes. - "Nonsense Poetry" (1945), by George Orwell

The desire of some of our adjunct professors to unionize has once again brought up discussion of the proper relationship of the Faculty Senate and the union which represents a large portion of our faculty. Reading through the excerpts from the 1970s *Heralds* which appear in this issue's Wayback column makes it clear that this was a vexing question right from the beginning of faculty unionization at Temple. Then Senate President Tessie Okin expressed a vision of cooperation between the Senate and the AAUP which

Editorial continued on page 4

TAUP, The Senate, and the Administration: We're In This Together



Art Hochner,
President of
TAUP
and Associate
Professor
of Human
Resources
Management

Recently, a friend opined that maybe TAUP's successes had inadvertently undermined the power of the Faculty Senate. I disagreed.

Since he came to Temple about eight years ago, he only knows the recent past. I've been on the faculty for 37 years. The union and the Senate have co-existed since 1973, when Temple AAUP, TAUP's progenitor, was certified as the bargaining agent. Before I was tenured in 1985 and afterward too, the Senate was the scene of vigorous debate and widespread participation. The collegial assembly of the Fox School forced the removal of two deans, one right before I arrived and one some years after. Unionization and strong, shared governance were not antithetical. On the contrary, they were complementary, and they still are. There's a long history to the relationship of the two and the impact of actions by Temple's administration on both, so I will provide a long view here.

Hochner continued on page 3

An Interview with Nancy Henkin



Nancy Henkin,
Executive Director,
Temple University
Intergenerational
Center

Thirty-six years ago, Nancy Henkin founded the Temple University Intergenerational Center. Now, on the eve of her retirement, she looks back at what she has built.

Paul LaFollette (PL): *One of the things that I am learning as I undertake this job is that there are a bunch of things at Temple that I don't know anything about. The Intergenerational Center is one of them. So, tell me a little bit about the Center and its history.*

Nancy Henkin (NH): In 1979, I finished my Ph.D program in the Psychoeducational Processes department (now AOD) at Temple. Since my dissertation had been related to aging, I was asked to join the Medical School's newly established Institute on Aging to manage a career preparation grant. Soon after, I met Maggie Kuhn, the 80- year old national convener of the Gray Panthers. Maggie's commitment to empowering older adults and her work to help generations work together for social change inspired me to

Interview with Henkin continued on page 5

An Interview with Susan B. Smith

Susan B. Smith, Sr. Associate University Counsel, has been associated with Temple University for many years. In this interview she discusses matters touching on her history here, her work, and how her office can work with and help faculty.

Paul LaFollette (PL): *How did you find yourself working for Temple?*

Susan B. Smith (SBS): Many years ago, I relocated to Philadelphia from Washington DC for family reasons. I telecommuted for a few months, but needed a new job here. This was before the days of the internet, so I leafed through the want ads in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. In its entirety, Temple's ad said something like "Temple University seeks lawyer to handle legal issues in higher education. Salary is not negotiable." At the time, I didn't even know universities had lawyers and had no idea what to expect. I came in to meet with George Moore and his team, and was impressed by the breadth of work and the high caliber of the lawyers in the office. I instantly knew Temple would be a great fit for me.

So it really was a bit of a blow when George called me a few weeks later and said he'd chosen someone else for the job. Somewhat gloomily I suppose, I asked him to keep me in mind if another opportunity came up in the future. About one month and several unrelated job interviews later, my phone rang:

Interview with Smith continued on page 2

An Interview with Susan B. Smith

Interview with Smith continued from page 1

Me: “Hello?”

Gravelly-voiced Caller: “Do you still need a job?”

Me: “Who is this?”

Impatient-toned Caller: “It’s George Moore. Do you still need a job?”

Me: “George Moore? From Temple?”

George: “Yes. Do you still need a job or are you just going to keep asking me questions?”

The rest is history.

(PL): *What do you like about working for a university? What frustrates you about it?*

(SBS): As I know you are aware, Paul, I left Temple in 2008 after working here for 15 years. At the time I left Temple, it was my intention to leave law practice altogether and pursue other interests. But after some months passed, I found that I really missed working in higher ed. I missed the clients, the energy and the collegiality. I began a law/consulting firm from my kitchen working with several higher ed clients, one of which was Temple. Then, in 2011, George asked me to return for a brief stint. I agreed and, eventually, chose to return permanently.

One of the parts of my week I enjoy most is getting together with faculty. I have worked with many of our faculty members on committees, policy development, personnel or student issues, etc. Through these interactions as well as in other, less formal settings, I have developed solid personal relationships that I value. If any of your readers are interested in the work of our office or in just making a contact at the university outside their daily world, I encourage them to call or send an email (1-6542 or susan.smith@temple.edu). I can pretty easily be talked into meeting for a coffee and a casual chat on most days.

What frustrates me about university work? I wish I could spend less time in what I refer to as “reaction mode”. By that, I mean I spend much of my day responding to issues, events, problems, claims, regulatory changes, and the like. This is the life of a lawyer, I know, but I prefer to be working toward creating more positive and constructive programming and opportunities for our university leaders – primarily, for our faculty. This can happen through policy development, workshops on legal issues, training, seminars, etc., many of which I’ve been involved in developing and producing along with the Provost’s office.

PL: *What would you like faculty to know about how the legal department might help them? About when they should contact the legal department? When they shouldn’t?*

(SBS): Big question, quick answer: call us when you think you need us. I emphasize “when you *think* you need us”, because you may be unsure. But don’t hesitate to call and ask the question. If we can’t help you, we’ll try to direct you to someone who can. If you have a question and you don’t know which lawyer to call, call our main number (1-6542) and our receptionist will find the appropriate person to respond to your inquiry.

With that said, we do get questions from time to time whether we can help individual employees with personal legal issues, like home purchases or lawsuits unrelated to Temple. We cannot. But if you are uncertain whether we can get involved, call anyway. For more information on our office and the services we provide to the university community, please click on our website: <http://counsel.temple.edu/>.

Another way that the lawyers in counsel’s office can help is in training and teaching. The lawyers in the office all have participated as speakers in classrooms on campus and at professional associations in any variety of subject areas. If we can provide guidance, mentoring or even classroom presentation on an area of our expertise, we would be glad to do so.

(PL): *As regards employee concerns, how do the legal department and HR interact with/complement each other? Does this question make any sense?*

(SBS): You asked about how the Office of University Counsel and the Human Resources Department interact. We work together closely, as we do with all other aspects of University’s operations including (but definitely not

limited to) Student Affairs, Research and Technology, Provost and Deans, Facilities Management, Financial Affairs, Campus Safety, International Services, Faculty Affairs, Environmental Health and Radiation Safety, Institutional Advancement, Purchasing, Risk Management – I’ll stop short of boring the readers by droning on. The point is that our office touches most of offices in the university at some point or another.

(PL): *What is your understanding of the role of the Faculty Senate? The role of TAUP? Do they complement each other?*

(SBS): The Faculty Senate is the university-level vehicle through which the faculty exercises its role in shared governance. To this end, the Senate is charged with assessing and conveying the input of the entire faculty on university matters impacting faculty through its powers of consultation, review, ratification and recommendation. I attend Senate meetings from time to time and have met with many Senate officers and representatives over the years and am always interested to know what they are thinking. The Senate plays an important role at the university and in my orientation toward my work.

TAUP, on the other hand, is the collective bargaining agent that represents a portion of our full-time faculty. Like our ten other labor unions at Temple, TAUP interacts with the university about certain terms and conditions of employment on behalf of the employees it represents. During the most recent round of contract negotiations, I was pleased to be part of the team that worked with TAUP’s leadership to successfully produce a new collective bargaining agreement this past October.

A notable distinction in the roles of TAUP and the Faculty Senate pertain to who each represents. TAUP represents a subset of the university’s full-time faculty members. Excluded are faculty in the Schools of Medicine, Law, Dentistry and Podiatric Medicine. And only a portion of the full-time faculty represented by TAUP chooses to join the union and pay dues. The Senate, on the other hand, represents Temple’s entire faculty body regardless of a single individual’s involvement or personal commitment to it.

(PL): *Let’s talk about your comment that TAUP only represents a subset of Temple’s full-time faculty. TAUP has petitioned the labor board to unionize part-time, adjunct faculty as well but the University has objected to that petition, right? Why is that?*

(SBS): The university’s position on the unionization effort is best stated on [the Provost’s website](#). My feeling is that all faculty, both full-time and adjunct, should critically consider the issue and how it will impact them, their colleagues and Temple students. I hope that everyone will engage the issue in a way that makes them feel comfortable with the ultimate outcome.

(PL): *Should we (the Senate, the Herald, the faculty) do a better job of keeping our non-faculty colleagues aware of interesting events that are happening? Or our faculty colleagues for that matter?*

(SBS): Yes, please! So often I read about a lecture on campus or an exhibit or some other event after it has occurred. Personally, I would love to know more about what our faculty are doing and how I can get engaged either as an observer or a participant. I think that we can all benefit from greater interaction with one another; one way to advance this is through increasing awareness and attendance at such events.

(PL): *How would you like to be remembered at Temple?*

(SBS): First of all, I’m not planning on being “remembered” any time soon. I love working at Temple and intend to be around for a while longer. But when I do leave, I hope I’m thought of as a positive force for change and a bridge builder. I’ve worked hard to bring a sense of community – of university, in fact – to those with whom I work. Oh, and I want to be remembered for my good sense of humor and sunny disposition.

Thank for giving me the chance to weigh in. I am grateful for the opportunity. ♦

TAUP, The Senate, and the Administration: We're In This Together

Hochner continued from page 1

What role does a faculty union play in an academic institution, particularly a research university?

TAUP is typical of faculty unions at universities. We negotiate over salaries, benefits, and vital aspects of faculty life, among other issues. Over the past 15 years, the role of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTs) has changed dramatically at Temple because of negotiated agreements between the union and administration. NTT rights and compensation have become key issues at the bargaining table, with widespread support by all types of faculty. Tenure-track issues too rank very high in priority. The past 10 years have brought significant changes to T&P standards and procedural rights, with a large article in the collective bargaining agreement devoted to it. More changes go into effect in fall 2015 that will strengthen the faculty role and make the process more transparent. Before 2005, unlike other research universities, Temple had no true sabbatical program, just a small number of study leaves, and TAUP worked to make sabbaticals a reality. I could go on listing TAUP's bargaining accomplishments. TAUP has been a strong and effective voice for all faculty and has played a vital role in the positive changes to make this a better university.

What is the relationship between the Senate and the union? In what ways do TAUP and the Senate complement one another?

The TAUP contract has expanded over time to provide legal backing for Senate prerogatives – such as selection of faculty to the University T&P Advisory Committee, to the Sabbatical Committee, and, indeed, for this basic faculty role: “to participate in the formulation and recommendation of educational policy within the University and its schools and colleges, as approved by Temple and its Board of Trustees” (TAUP-Temple agreement, Article 5F).

The Senate has many functions that TAUP does not and cannot have. Foremost among these are the Senate role in curricular matters and the university budget, but there are numerous others. TAUP doesn't and won't interfere in these key Senate prerogatives, though we try to work closely with the Senate when issues overlap. For example, in the 2014-2018 contract, we agreed with the administration on side letters covering childcare, tuition benefits, and workload, which open up an important collaboration between the Senate and the union. Other TAUP leaders and I participate as Representative Faculty Senators, and some have served as college representatives on the Senate Steering Committee and on other Senate committees. We believe in a strong and lively system of shared governance.

How does the presence in the Senate of the four professional schools that are outside the TAUP bargaining unit influence this relationship?

While the Senate comprises faculty in all Temple schools and colleges, TAUP doesn't represent faculty in the schools of Law, Medicine, Dentistry or Podiatric Medicine. The Law School has its own bargaining unit and contract, which follows aspects of the TAUP contract, such as the T&P procedure. When TAUP was formed in the early 1970s, the faculties of the three (at the time) professional schools petitioned the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) to be excluded from our bargaining unit, which the PLRB granted. So, those schools have their own compensation arrangements, and have to come into line with the overall Faculty Handbook. The Handbook also governs the TAUP schools, with the exception of issues covered by the TAUP contract.

Does the union play the role of opposing party to the administration, while the Senate plays the role of partner?

I believe that neither the Senate nor TAUP ever seeks to oppose the administration; however, TAUP often gets perceived in that light. The Senate uses persuasion when it tries to deal with differences between faculty and administration. TAUP first seeks to persuade, but we have other resources to draw on, too: the law, our members' dues, and our affiliation with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT and AFTPA). With a legal mandate to negotiate over a contract, discussion over issues can't be indefinitely prolonged. Legal proceedings, as with Temple's desire to remove department

chairs from TAUP, may take considerable time, but eventually there will be a decision.

Recently, however, the Senate too often has found itself by-passed, as when the academic calendar was changed twice without faculty input. It was good to hear that the Senate Steering Committee pushed back on this and other issues. Moreover, the Senate successfully lobbied for review of Deans that include a significant faculty voice in the process. We want to encourage the Senate to continue advocating, loudly if necessary, for strong faculty governance.

Was my friend correct about the relative weakness of the Senate? In a way, yes, though the union hardly caused that. Retrenchment of more than 50 tenured faculty in 1982 weakened the power of both the Senate and the union and led to tremendous mistrust between the faculty and the administration. Strikes by TAUP ensued in 1986 and 1990, largely fueled by this animosity, as well as the faculty's perception that the administration, under President Peter Liacouras, neglected the academic side of the institution and disregarded the faculty's voice.

The faculty, in many ways, welcomed the increased emphasis on research and renewal of the academic side that President David Adamany instituted starting in 2000. Yet, the Board of Trustees had already taken full control over the presidential search committee, disregarding the Senate's wishes. Later, President Adamany's policies, particularly the 2002 rewriting and standardization of collegial assembly bylaws, put serious restraints on the faculty role in shared governance, setting deans firmly in control of their colleges. Adamany overrode both Senate and TAUP refusal to agree to creation of a university-level T&P committee, and established his own advisory body anyway. Such moves and the reduced recognition of faculty service activities diminished the Senate's independence and led many tenured faculty members to focus on what they could control, their own teaching and, especially, scholarship.

Since 2006, when President Adamany resigned, the Senate leadership has been able to work more cooperatively with both President Ann Weaver Hart and President Neil Theobald. TAUP contract negotiations, however, both under Adamany in 2004-05 and under Hart in 2008-09 were fraught with tension and rancorous disagreement. Still, TAUP and Temple came to agreement both times, albeit well after the contracts had expired. Our most recent agreement, under President Theobald, was the most cooperative negotiation with Temple I've ever participated in of all nine since 1986. TAUP proposed an interest-based bargaining process and the administration responded positively. A mutual desire to discuss the issues and find resolutions pervaded the process. Of course there was plenty of disagreement, but no disagreeableness.

In the past few years there have been moves by all parties to rebuild trust and work together. For instance, with the planning for and implementation of decentralized budgeting, CFO Ken Kaiser and his predecessor, Tony Wagner, met many times with me and other TAUP representatives to update us and answer our questions.

What can we say about Provost Dai's statements about TAUP and the adjunct organizing campaign?

With the campaign by adjuncts to become part of TAUP, I've read disturbing statements by Provost Hai-Lung Dai. TAUP has represented full-time faculty for 42 years. Yet the Provost's website refers to us as, “Local 4531 of the American Federation of Teachers – also known as the TAUP.” We are consistently referred to as Local 4531, not as TAUP, as if that were some kind of alias (AKA). And we are described as a “third-party intermediary” seeking to interpose our union between the administration and adjuncts.

Please. TAUP's leaders are Temple faculty, librarians, and academic professionals elected from the membership. We are no third-party. The adjuncts want to be unionized, and many of those who have gone out to talk to adjuncts about unionizing are themselves Temple adjuncts. The AFT aids us in this effort because we asked for their support.

The Provost's website says:

The AFT has said that it is not interested in represent-

Hochner continued on page 4

Imbalance of Power

Editorial continued from page 1

at that time was our faculty union. She stated:

It should be clear that I think the Senate can be strengthened if we allow ourselves to be ruled by reason. I am not so insecure as to be threatened by the advent of unionism. "Profession" and "union" are not necessarily antithetical terms. I see myself as one person with a variety of needs and filling different roles at different times. Various needs can be met best by different mechanisms. I hope AAUP will do well by my economic needs! I hope the Senate will do well by my needs and concerns as an academic!

To a large extent, this is the view taken by many union members and many faculty senators as well. During the early and mid 1970s, a member of the AAUP leadership routinely contributed a column to the *Herald*. The Senate-AAUP Liaison committee was active in working figuring out how to make this work.

There have been, however, from the beginning, those who fear that allowing the union to negotiate non-economic matters, such as the processes for tenure and promotion, interferes with what should be a purely faculty function. My personal belief is that having a contractual basis protecting tenure is far preferable to relying on a "gentleman's agreement," but I can respect those who might feel otherwise.

One thing, however, that I believe to be nearly absolute is that the Senate has no business commenting upon whether individuals should or should not belong to or support TAUP. Nor should the Senate involve itself in discussing the internal management of the union. And, of course, it would be illegal for the Senate to attempt to inject itself into or otherwise interfere with union negotiations.

A reasonable extension to that notion is that we, as a Senate, should not be offering opinions about whether the unionization of our adjuncts is a good idea or not. Indeed, earlier this academic year, the Senate adopted a resolution formalizing that idea – the idea that our adjuncts should have the freedom to make that decision without pressure from their full time colleagues. And, given that adjunct professors are the most vulnerable, the most easily exploitable of our teachers, it is clear that any expression of opinion by their less vulnerable colleagues could be felt to be manipulative.

It saddens me that our Provost and our deans don't have that same vision of self determination. Since September 2014, the Provost's office has been sending letters, some to all faculty, some to adjuncts only. I will not judge the accuracy of the contents of these letters, but coming from the office that controls the hiring of adjuncts, they are quite arguably coercive. I do not intend to quote from them here, but you can read them for yourself by clicking [here](#).

Worse still is the letter that all the full time faculty received yesterday from the Council of Deans. This letter attempts to set one part of our faculty against another part. It attempts to encourage full time faculty to influence the thinking of our adjunct colleagues. Again, I am not speaking for or against the points raised in this letter. I am objecting to the attempt to suck me and my colleagues into "helping" our adjuncts make a decision that they should be permitted to make on their own.

I will mention in passing that this same letter opens with the thoroughly disturbing sentences, "It is unusual, if not unprecedented, for Temple University's deans to write a joint letter to faculty. But as the group with primary responsibility for safeguarding the quality of education and scholarship at Temple, we feel compelled to speak out in unison on an important issue facing our institution." I am deeply annoyed by the idea that the Council of Deans believes itself to be "THE group" with "PRIMARY responsibility" for maintaining academic integrity at Temple. Integrity is an inherently shared responsibility, and this statement is deeply insulting to me as a faculty member.

When the Senate changed its Constitution to remove the deans (and others) from membership, I heard a lot of comments from various deans to the effect that they were hurt by this action because deep in their hearts they are faculty. Their willingness to sign this document makes that claim questionable. Shame on them.

To return to the matter at hand, it is neither surprising nor improper that someone from management would want to make their case to the adjuncts. I would have not thought it improper to see such comment from the office of the CFO, or from HR. Neither is it improper for TAUP to make its case. But it is inappropriate and coercive for this sort of comment to be brought forth from the Provost's office, or from the Council of Deans. And it is particularly inappropriate for the Council of Deans to invite the full time faculty to join them in this potentially coercive behavior. Let us, as full time faculty, set a good example for our Provost and deans by rejecting this invitation. ♦

TAUP, The Senate, and the Administration: We're In This Together

Hochner continued from page 3

ing the adjuncts who work in the schools of Medicine, Law, Dentistry and Podiatric Medicine, just as they have chosen not to represent the full-time faculty who work in those schools."

As I said earlier, the full-time faculty in those schools chose not to be represented by us. I'm surprised at the bold falsity of this statement.

Numerous scare tactics are being used in communications from the administration to adjuncts and even to members of the TAUP bargaining unit, such as:

A contract may result in a union shop under which all adjunct faculty would have to pay dues every year to the union in order to keep their jobs. The fee could be up to 2 percent of salary. If a faculty member does not pay the required fee, the union can demand that he or she be dismissed.

Really? That's not the case for the full-time faculty. In any case, all provisions in a union contract for the adjuncts would have to be negotiated de novo, as TAUP and Temple agreed in our pleasant contract negotiations in October 2014.

How did the relationship between TAUP and the administration go from cooperative throughout the contract negotiations to hostile in the adjunct campaign? Actually, TAUP hasn't gone hostile. Our message is positive: Adjuncts deserve a voice, they deserve better pay and conditions, and together we can negotiate with the administration to enhance all faculty. After all, the faculty's working conditions are our students' learning conditions.

TAUP and the administration can disagree about many things, including whether adjunct faculty should be unionized. But our disagreements can be discussed in respectful and truthful ways. If Temple opposes the organizing campaign, we dispute their position, not their right to take it. Given the movement toward cooperative dialogue in the recent past, I call on the administration to continue that trend and to forgo these adversarial and specious attacks.

What is needed now?

TAUP, the Senate and the administration can and should work together for the best interests of students, the faculty, and Temple as a whole. We all want Temple to be the best university that it can, given the historical Conwellian mission and our current resources. We can accomplish more by working collaboratively. TAUP is willing and ready to do our part. ♦

An Interview with Nancy Henkin

Interview with Henkin continued from page 1

start the Intergenerational Center. She became my mentor and encouraged me to “dream and scheme” in order to combat ageism and create a better society for all.

When I started this work, I was in my early 30s with a three-year old son. People would ask me, “Why are you interested in aging? You are too young to be thinking about these issues.” I guess part of the reason was that I had a strong relationship with my grandfather, who shared stories about the past and was eager to give his perspective on the present. I watched as he and so many others like him became invisible as they grew older, their views becoming irrelevant in a youth-oriented society. I began to realize that the age-segregated way we live and work fosters age-related stereotypes and limits opportunities for us to learn from each other. I wanted to help change the way we view aging—from an *event* that occurs at 65 years to a *natural process* that begins at birth and ends at death—and to find ways that generations could serve as resources to each other and to their communities.

In the late 1970s, the demographic imperative was not as clear as it is today and very few people were doing intergenerational work. I was able to convince the Director of the Institute on Aging, Dick Adelman, to let me hold a 5-day intergenerational learning retreat at the Ambler Campus. Seventy people, ranging in age from 13 – 100, lived together in the dorms and engaged in discussions about loss and grief, stress, sexuality, and family. It was amazing to watch stereotypes dissolve and trusting relationships develop among people of different ages, races, ethnicities and educational backgrounds. That powerful experience motivated me to create the Intergenerational Center.

In addition to conducting the intergenerational retreats every summer for 21 years, my staff and I started exploring other ways that an intergenerational lens could meet critical community needs. We wrote many grants, most of which were not funded. Then, slowly but surely, the Center developed a track record and we were able to raise over fifty million dollars to support a wide range of programs. We have engaged older adults to serve as tutors, mentors to middle schools children, teen mothers, and refugee women, child care aides, providers of in-home support to families who have children with special needs, oral historians, and health coaches. Young people have taught English to older immigrants and refugees, provided respite to families caring for frail elders, and participated in friendly visiting and chore services to reduce isolation and enabled older adults to remain in their homes. For over 20 years we ran an intergenerational theater group that performed throughout the region, raising awareness of age-related issues. For the past 25 years, we have been operating afterschool programs for children being raised by grandparents and other relatives and providing support to kinship caregivers.

Although Philadelphia was our laboratory for model development, in the 1990s we began replicating some of our most successful programs. In 2002 we developed two new national initiatives—*Communities for All Ages*, a 23-site effort that uses a place-based, life span approach to addressing issues such as education, health, safety and immigration; and *Coming of Age*, a program that helps individuals 50+ explore their future and builds the capacity of organizations to utilize the skills and talents of the 50+ population. Both of these initiatives generated a great deal of learning that has been translated into training workshops and resource materials. Over the years, we have helped hundreds of youth, education, aging, civic engagement and community development organizations around the world engage in meaningful intergenerational work. This past fall I had the opportunity to work in Northern Ireland, helping practitioners, researchers, educators and policy makers explore how intergenerational strategies could contribute to an “age-friendly” Belfast and help heal historical divides.

PL: *When my parents first moved into a retirement community, I remember going with them to some of their hobby clubs, and it was amazing to see what incredible talent and energy there was in that community.*

NH: Yes, there are millions of older adults who have incredible experience and skills. Many are seeking ways to be generative- to transmit their knowledge to younger generations. Unfortunately older people, like youth, are often seen as problems rather than assets. We need to change the way society views aging- from a period of decline to a time of contribution- and create more meaningful opportunities for older adults to share their talents and wisdom.

PL: *How have students benefited from the work the Center has done?*

NH: We try to create programs that benefit everyone involved--students, older adults, caregivers, and community organizations. I have received many calls over the years from former students who tell me how transformative their experience with our center was and how much it influenced their career and life choices. Through our programs, students have an opportunity to apply their knowledge to real life situations and develop relationships with people they ordinarily would not meet. Working with older adults who face linguistic or health challenges helps them gain greater perspective on their own lives and develop new skills. I remember a young man telling me about his experience visiting a man with Alzheimer's. He said, “Every time I would go there, he would ask me the same questions. I thought it would make me crazy, but then I realized I am there to support him and it is ok. Now every time he talks to me, I enthusiastically listen. What I have learned about myself is that I can be a patient person.”

Intergenerational experiences also help our students develop empathy. Most students spend very little time with older adults and can't imagine what life is like for them. They see elders as they are now, rather than who they have been and what they have done. There is a poem I often use when training students called [“What Do You See Nurse?”](#) Written from the perspective of an old woman in a nursing home, the poem challenges us to see beyond the frailties of old age and recognize the lifetime of experiences a person has had. It helps students understand that older adults were once their age and...if they are lucky...they will be elders someday.

PL: *Why is this work important today and what opportunities are there for universities?*

NH: Thirty six years ago, people wondered why we were doing this work; now they understand. The demographic revolution has begun and our work is more important than ever. Seventy-seven million Baby Boomers are coming of age. Many are looking for opportunities to give back; others are going to need support services. At the same time, the U.S. population is becoming increasingly diverse. Over 70 % of older adults are white, compared to a young population that soon will be majority minority. Will older adults be willing to invest in young people who are so different from them? Will young people support social security and health benefits for older people with whom they have no connection?

Universities can play an important role in preparing students to live and work in a diverse world. Having been part of numerous colleges within Temple, I can see the value of helping students from a variety of disciplines understand the needs and assets of all generations. Currently there are very few courses in aging offered at Temple, yet jobs in aging-related fields are growing. I would love to see faculty members intentionally infuse a life course perspective into their curriculum and create more intergenerational service learning opportunities. We could also engage retired faculty to mentor Temple students who need extra support, younger faculty members, and/or children in nearby schools. What about inviting older adults to co-learn with our students, particularly in human development courses, or offering opportunities for re-careering? The possibilities are endless.

Wayback: In the Beginning...

This issue's Wayback column takes us back to the early 1970s and features two articles from the *Herald* which may shed some light on the things that were happening here around the time that much of our faculty chose the AAUP as our faculty union. The first is a column from November 2, 1971 - Volume 1, Number 2. It was written by Leon Osview, Professor of Education, and entitled:

Who is the University?

Those of us professors who have come into our middle age still believing that "the faculty is the university" will likely retire still wondering how it came to be otherwise. As one of the losers I can hardly be trusted to say how it happened, but the generalization that we let it happen without much more than a token fight is a truism that needs no credentials for proof.

On our campus I recollect a score of experiences along the way: Faculty "consultations" that were a mockery; a Senate Salary Committee's being handed a statement by the Administration that it was merely communicating to the Senate, not negotiating; elaborate charades "involving" the Faculty in the selection of administrative officers. But most of all I remember the shock of finding out that the Faculty Senate Constitution had to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Being a kind of pol on campus I knew that the old Senate Constitution then being revised bore a notation of approval by the Board. Somehow, Ignorance only knows why, it seemed a harmless bit of protocol, and since no one else seemed disturbed by it, neither was I.

In the Summer of 1968 the President had appointed a commission to re-write the Faculty Senate Constitution. It seemed normal enough; he was the Senate's presiding officer. Apparently none of us really asked himself why the Faculty Senate should be a creature of the President. None of us, that is, until the commission made its report.

Then some of us roused ourselves from apathy long enough to revise the recommended document, introducing a modicum of self-respect into the "sweetheart" agreement with administration which the commission had written in so much time for so little reward. Only a surprise golden watch apiece.

Now the Senate was reminded that its new Constitution had to be approved by the Board of Trustees. By this time some of us were on the verge of putting it together, but not fully. I allowed myself to be appointed to a Senate committee to discuss approval with a Board committee.

We met, and the Board committee could not bring itself to accept those few modest attempts the Senate had made to cloak itself in what might pass for dignity. We argued valiantly, but the Board committee was adamant, obeying its own conviction that the Senate was a sufferance of the Administration.

At last the Faculty committee awoke to the meaning of the argument, and, to its credit, allowed the discussion to end at impasse. We came back to the Senate without Board approval, and we were glad of it. True, the Senate became no stronger, deposing the President as the Senate's presiding officer made no difference in his performance, the University maintained its course.

But the Faculty had been spared the indignity of having its merest citizen rights approved. At least the

Faculty could say that though it had never approved the Board of Trustees, neither had the Board of Trustees approved the Faculty Senate.

The recollection has a point beyond the one of reminding us that we have only negative triumphs to sustain our identity as a Faculty.

Soon there will be an opportunity for us to become a bargaining unit, by definition of State law. Three organizations have been soliciting us to join them. An election will be held, and though more than a few of us will neglect the referendum and many will back a losing contender, one of the three will become our bargaining agent. It's high time we had a privilege every other salaried man and woman has had for four decades. But really it isn't enough. The real issue is whether or not the faculty will ever have the power to influence the course of the University, not just its own salaries and fringe benefits.

No, this is not an anti-administration diatribe, in general or in particular. I've taught educational administration long enough to know that administration is not only indispensable to the uses of the university as an organization, but to gaining the objectives and goals of the faculty, too. I advocate no mindless counter-culture notion that administration should concern itself only with the trivia of housekeeping, leaving the higher order education's decision to faculty and students. I value administration for its leadership function. No faculty, let alone one as large as ours, can get along without that.

What we need as much as leadership, though, is a means of mounting a Faculty power strong enough in its countervailing influence to be a necessary factor in making all sorts of University decisions. What we lack now is the power to protect the integrity of the Faculty's judgment on matters which affect us all - faculty, students, administration and the people of the state who pay for our work. We are allowing the Administration to speak for us, as though we were merely employees of some depersonalized corporation, even when manifestly it does not.

In matters vital to all our interest what has the Faculty had to say to the Pennsylvania Legislature: How was our judgment as a Faculty represented to the Governor, to the legislative leaders, to citizens when decisions were made about the future of higher education in the Commonwealth? When everyone knows that financing decisions affect everything we do as a faculty, by whose fiat are financing decisions only the Board's and the Administration's?

Finance is only one area of policy from which we are excluded by our powerlessness. But if all we ever want to influence in finance is salaries and its fringes, we may become wealthier, but we'll be no better off.

The preceding column touched on the relationship of the soon to be union and the Faculty Senate. The next column appeared in *Volume 3, No. 2* - October 3, 1973., shortly after the AAUP became our bargaining agent. It is an interview with the newly elected President of the Faculty Senate and gives her vision of the respective roles of the Senate and the union.

In the Beginning...

Wayback continued from page 6

Senate President Expects A Fruitful Relation To Develop With AAUP

Not to make a gesture for Women's Liberation but out of confidence in her capacity for leadership, the Senate last spring chose Tessie Okin to be its president. Recently the Herald asked her some questions.

Herald: *Mrs. Okin, many of us believe that this year is likely to be the most difficult and therefore, perhaps, the most important in the Senate's history. Many problems confront you. Perhaps the most difficult and certainly the newest is unionization. Does the advent of collective bargaining reduce the importance of the Senate?*

Mrs. Okin: *My premise is that both groups should survive and indeed grow stronger. Each has a valid function to perform which can strengthen the University. Competition or hostility between the two can, in fact, weaken each of them.*

The history of salary negotiations with the University Administration suggests that the Senate has been weak in this area. The facts about inequities among colleges, within colleges, and even among people in the same departments are pretty well known and need not be belabored. There is a range of economic issues which need immediate attention.

The advent of collective bargaining merely means that negotiations with the administration will be regularized and policy will have the force of law. This is all to the good for all parties concerned.

The Senate was, is, and will continue to be concerned with university governance and academic matters such as curriculum, research, study leaves, the library, etc. No one debates this. Our discussions with AAUP to date reveal no conflict about this matter: the economic areas lie with AAUP, the academic with the Senate.

GREY AREAS

Of course, there are many grey areas and, with the best will in the world, some of these may be troublesome. For instance, if a professor is denied tenure for what he considers inappropriate reasons, does he appeal to the Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate or to the Grievance Committee of the AAUP? In my view, the first step clearly is to go to the Senate. If we fail to help him, the next step is the AAUP and its machinery. In such an arrangement, each body respects the jurisdiction of the other; the professor deals first with the academic Senate; the administration knows that there is always a court of appeal with legal clout.

In short, in the areas of overlap, the Senate and the AAUP must work to establish orderly procedures which include cooperation, consultation, exchange of information, and maybe even joint action if such seems necessary. But first of all there must be open dialog. If we are divided we shall be conquered.

I do not agree with those of my colleagues who think that the AAUP wishes to destroy the Senate. The subliminal message is that they wish the Senate to destroy

the AAUP. I consider such fears and such wishes to be grievously wrong.

TWO SENATES PERHAPS

Of course I do not know whether the status quo will obtain indefinitely. It may well be that two senates will emerge, one in the Broad and Montgomery campus, on at the Health Sciences Center. It may even be that eventually there will be a "congress" of sorts. The point is that each constituency has the right and need for its own instrumentality to carry out its own wishes and purposes. Perhaps the non-teaching professionals will eventually give thought to creating a structure to deal with their non-economic issues. In any event, the appropriate academic instrumentality for the faculty is the Faculty Senate. I wish to maintain it, strengthen it, assure its future.

If we focus on building linkages we may develop a non-industrial model of collective bargaining and university governance which will break new ground in the field of social organization.

It should be clear that I think the Senate can be strengthened if we allow ourselves to be ruled by reason. I am not so insecure as to be threatened by the advent of unionism. "Profession" and "union" are not necessarily antithetical terms. I see myself as one person with a variety of needs and filling different roles at different times. Various needs can be met best by different mechanisms. I hope AAUP will do well by my economic needs! I hope the Senate will do well by my needs and concerns as an academic!

Herald: *What is the greatest drag on the effectiveness of the Senate? What can the faculty do to make it a more effective body?*

Mrs. Okin: *The greatest drag on Senate effectiveness has been the previous administration's unwillingness to accept a partnership with the faculty. The scene has changed. I am convinced that Mr. Wachman and Mr. Spiegler wish for a strong Senate. The obstacles today are cynicism and indifference. Certainly not lack of talent. There are among the faculty outstanding competencies in educational administration, planning, curriculum design, budgeting, counseling. In short, every talent possessed by the administration is matched or surpassed in the faculty. Our task is to put these talents to use in education for our students, add to the existing store of knowledge, and ultimately enhance the quality of life.*

I wish every faculty member would undertake to devote some portion of his or her time to service in the university. He might serve on one committee every three years; he might serve three years on, then three years off. On a rotating basis, everybody could do a stint of trying to shape the University in some way.

Herald: *In the areas where the Senate can operate, what is Temple's greatest need?*

Mrs. Okin: *Temple's greatest need is to examine its organizational structure to bring order out of chaos. More specifically, we need to*

In the Beginning...

Wayback continued from page 7

reduce fragmentation;
 increase horizontal communication among units;
 improve capacity for long term planning;
 develop improved data systems so that we know more about the students we are admitting;
 develop integrated programs and support services for our diverse student populations so that academic excellence can be achieved;
 develop new criteria for evaluating faculty so that excellence in teaching may be recognized and the research-publish or perish syndrome may be modified;
 create a climate which stimulates faculty creativity and allows the development of experimental curricula. For instance, alternatives to the existing system of educating by the clock and the calendar might include special student modules, the use of the winter break for work-study arrangements, and many other changes to invigorate our university.

Mrs. Okin has her bachelor's and master's degrees from Temple, her doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania. As an undergraduate she was a member of the X Group. This was at a time when the words "experiment" and "innovations" were less fashionable than they are today, but in the effort to prepare "progressive" leaders, the education of the X Group broke sharply with tradition. Each of the students had a full year at Tyler, with a heavy infusion of all the arts, and there were trips to such places as the coal regions of Pennsylvania and share-cropping areas in the South.

After a varied experience as a social worker in New York, Philadelphia, and the South Atlantic states, Mrs. Okin returned to Temple in 1965. Besides being president of the Senate, she is a professor in the School of Social Administration, the wife of a member of the staff of the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation, and the mother of two daughters, one of them a senior in Social Welfare at Temple. ♦

An Interview with Nancy Henkin

Interview with Henkin continued from page 5

PL: What lessons have you learned through your work?

NH: Now that I am 67 years old and a grandmother of two, I more fully understand aging as a journey. I am one of those older people I used to talk about. Over the past 36 years, I have had the opportunity to work with remarkable individuals, many of whom became my role models. I have been inspired by the resilience of youth and older adults who have faced incredible challenges with dignity and determination.

I am proud of what the Center has accomplished but see how much more needs to be done to change cultural norms and promote the value of *interdependence* over *independence*. All too often the contributions of people with years of experience are dismissed in efforts to create a "new" agenda for the future. I am hopeful that we can build more bridges between the past, present and future, and mobilize generations to work together to create a healthier, more just society. Although I will be retiring from Temple on June 30, I will be using the skills and knowledge I developed here to build the capacity of foundations, national organizations, and policy makers to engage in this important work. I am looking forward to my next chapter and hope the Inter-generational Center will continue to thrive.

PL: I think that makes a nice summary to end the interview. Thank you for sharing your work and your vision. ♦

Letter to the Editor

Dear *Faculty Herald* Readers,

Have you ever had the need for a new, small computer system – but no one to build it for you? Do you have a large spreadsheet or Access database that you wish was on the web and accessible by multiple people? Do you have a workflow process that would benefit by being automated?

We are looking for project proposals for our Fall 2015 Information Science and Technology (IS&T) student capstone. In this two-semester course students analyze and then deliver a technology solution to a client. We have found that there are many small technology projects in a variety of Temple Departments that just never seem to get done due to resources and budgets. We have developed several systems for individuals within the Student Affairs and Provost's offices, as well as others around the University. Examples of these systems include the Accreditation Management System, the Memorial Award Processing System, the Recreation Therapy Internship System, the Fellowship Advising System and the Dorm Package Delivery Tracking System.

We typically look for systems in which people have a complex Excel sheet or Access database, and are looking for a more robust system. All systems we develop are accessible via the web and on any kind of device. They also follow Temple's accessibility standards. The best part for you? Besides having a positive impact on our CIS student's learning process by giving them real-world experience, you get a fully functional system without incurring any costs. All of the students' development time is part of their course requirements, and the systems are hosted on Temple University servers generously provided by Computer Services at no cost to you.

As I mentioned, this is a two-semester course. In the first semester, the students gather requirements and complete analysis and screen designs. In the second semester, they build and implement these systems.

We are currently looking for projects which will begin in Fall, 2015 and finish in April, 2016. If any of this has peaked your interest please feel free to contact us (email Wendy at wurban@temple.edu) and we can discuss your needs and see if your project is a fit. Also please be free to pass on this offer to other individuals at Temple where you may have heard they have a need.

Best regards,

Wendy Urban and Rose McGinnis,
 CIS 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. Requests that the author's name be withheld will be considered on a case by case basis.



Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, February 16, 2015

Representative Senate Meeting

Monday, February 16, 2015 - 1:45 PM

Kiva Auditorium

Videoconference: HSC, 343 MERB – AMBLER, ALC201

Attendance:

Representative Senators and officers: 33

Ex-officios: 0

Faculty, administrators, and guests: 3

Call to Order:

President Jones called the meeting to order at 1:48 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the January 20, 2015 meeting were approved as amended.

President's Report:

Update on Adjunct Faculty Task Force

Because of the petition for representation by Temple's adjunct faculty, it is essential to wait until this issue is resolved before returning to the planned survey of adjunct faculty.

Update on RCM budget review work

Workshops for each school and college are unlikely to happen this semester. However, an open call to all faculty will be circulated, most likely the week following spring break.

Faculty Athletics representative

Michael Jackson (STHM) noted that a tenured faculty member must occupy this key 5-year appointment. Nominations are sought; interested members should contact Chancellor Englert or Professor Jackson.

UTPAC

More than 60 faculty participated in the Webex and in person meeting on Friday, February 13, on changes to UTPAC under the new contract. Significant ambiguity, short timeline, and a collaborative intent but difficulty navigating these changes were some of the themes that emerged from the discussion. Faculty input is critical now.

Vice President's Report:

Budget Review Committee Appointments

Two appointments were made to the budget review committee. Nancy Turner (LIBRARY) and Jane Evans (TYLER) were appointed and reappointed, respectively.

Language changes for Senate Committees

Changes were implemented to the language of the senate committees to align them more closely with current practice. Specifically, two consecutive terms will normally be permitted.

Elections process

Elections materials will be due for elected positions on faculty senate committees by Monday, March 9, 2015. Appointed membership on two additional committees (tuition benefits and childcare) will circulate in the near future.

Mark Rahdert (LAW): The nominating committee timeline differs from the elections committee. A slate of candidates is required a week before they are due to the faculty senate. Thus credentials and supporting documents will be required by February 25 so that it can be considered in time for full review. Additional nominations can be considered up until March 9.

Old Business:

There was no old business.

New Business:

Resolution on Faculty Senate Neutrality on Adjunct Faculty Unionization

The Resolution on Faculty Senate Neutrality on Adjunct Faculty Unionization approved by the FSSC on February 2, 2015 was read aloud. Gregory Urwin (CLA): Why is this resolution necessary?

Jeffrey Solow (BOYER): The absence of statement leaves our position open to interpretation and potentially misinterpretation.

Trish Jones (EDUC): Many groups are unsure of where the faculty senate stands. This resolution can serve to clarify our position. We are a deliberate body that believes in self-determination.

Wilbert Roget (CLA): What are some of these "better ways" of supporting adjunct faculty at Temple?

Trish Jones (EDUC): Adjunct faculty are not always at the same level of voice in garnering support and resources for their work as full time faculty.

The resolution was approved by a hand vote, with eighteen in favor, four opposed and no abstentions.

Open Discussion of Initial FSSC Consideration on UTPAC

UTPAC is being reshaped into 3 separate and independent discipline-based committees

(A: Humanities and Arts; B: Sciences, Life Sciences, and Engineering, C: Social Sciences, Business, and Law)

If changes to the committees should be indicated, can the contract be modified? If so, what is the process? Specifications worth consideration include the lack of communication between Committees A, B, and C and whether the number and designation of committees sufficient to cover the scope of professional work and scholarship at Temple University.

Suggestions include that each committee's members should come from disciplines centrally identified with that committee. Protocols guiding operation and process of all committees should be provided to insure predictability in process.

Aspects of UTPAC operation should be a possible focus of faculty rebuttal statements following negative recommendations. The appeals process should be clarified.

Questions: Do current UTPAC members cycle in to the new committees? If not, how will staggered terms be enacted? What is the timing of elections to these committees? Can a case be seen by more than one committee at a faculty member's request? Should term limits apply to all UTPAC members, both elected and appointed?

Suggestions: Each program/department should be asked to identify under one of the UTPAC committees by the end of spring, 2015. Each faculty member should have the right to petition for review under a UTPAC committee different from their program.

Questions around self-identification were presented on President Jones' slides (distributed via listserv).

Consistency with other policies: Recommendation that President Theobald convene a task force to revisit existing presidential P&T guidelines to ensure that they clarify UTPAC role and re-emphasize the primacy of local and consistency of review expectations.

Deans have been asked by the Provost to update college/school P&T guidelines. Grandfathering should be considered in cases currently up for review.

Faculty handbook must be revised to include changes to UTPAC

Changes and clarifications to UTPAC constitution and operations should be announced by the end of Spring, 2015 (i.e., prior to summer).

Art Hochner (FOX, TAUP): What full time tenure track professional faculty feel they do not fit into the current structure? Nothing in the contract precludes faculty from chairing these committees. The VPFA is the convener, but does not weigh in with substantive considerations. What is the rationale

Minutes continued on page 10

Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, February 16, 2015

Minutes continued from page 9

for requiring the three committees to communicate with one another?

Robert Mason (CLA): Several departments, such as GUS or Psychology, span multiple disciplines. Different mechanisms may be required for them.

Catherine Panzarella (CLA): Does this same process apply as well to promotion for non-tenure track faculty?

Katherine Bauer (CPH): Communication between committees seems imperative for interdisciplinary committees to prevent “drift” in committee missions over time.

Looking at Workload and CA side letter discussions

Changes in academic calendar and scheduling (e.g., multiple potentially overlapping summer sessions) have implications for workload. What constitutes a “fair” distribution of workload is important. What is the faculty input into this workload?

Jeffrey Solow (BOYER): This year’s calendar with fall and spring adjustment resulted in high levels of faculty dissatisfaction.

James Korsh (CST): It might be helpful for the faculty senate to communicate directly with the deans about the role of the CA in these matters.

Susan Dickey (CPH): CPH has not had any collegial assembly meetings this year; the next scheduled one is in May.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Adam Davey
Secretary

Next Meeting: Representative Faculty Senate, Wednesday, March 18, 2015, 1:45 pm

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>

Faculty Senate Editorial Board 2015–2016

Paul LaFollette, Editor, College of Science and Technology
Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor, College of Liberal Arts
Deborah Howe, School of Environmental Design
Gregory Urwin, College of Liberal Arts
Anna Peak, College of Liberal Arts
Philip Yannella, Chair, College of Liberal Arts
Andrea Monroe, Beasley School of Law
Will Jordan, College of Education
Terry Halbert, Fox School of Business

Faculty Senate Steering Committee 2015–2016

Tricia S. Jones, President, College of Education
Deborah Howe, Vice President, School of Environmental Design
Mark C. Rahdert, Past-President, Beasley School of Law
Adam Davey, Secretary, College of Public Health
Jane Evans, Tyler School of Art
Teresa Gill Cirillo, Fox School of Business and Management
Ragbir S. Athwal, Temple School of Medicine
Kenneth Boberick, Kornberg School of Dentistry
James Shellenberger, Beasley School of Law
Catherine Schifter, College of Education
Michael Sachs, College of Health Professions
Joseph Schwartz, College of Liberal Arts
Karen M. Turner, School of Media and Communication
Cheri Carter, School of Social Work
Jeffrey Solow, Boyer College of Music and Dance
Michael Jackson, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management
Michael Jacobs, School of Pharmacy
Matthew Miller, Theater, Film, and Media Arts
Jim Korsh, College of Science and Technology
Li Bai College of Engineering
Paul LaFollette, Editor, *Faculty Herald*



TEMPLE
UNIVERSITY®

