

MIME-Version: 1.0
Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 00:10:45 -0500
Reply-To: hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu
Sender: SCAT faculty list <SCATFAC@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU>
From: "herbert w, simons" <hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu>
Organization: Temple University
Subject: Re: Response to task force reports
To: SCATFAC@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU
Status:

Patricia Bradley wrote:

>
> It appears that the Acting Provost is calling for an official SCAT faculty
> response to our task force report sooner than later. Our reaction to
> the task force response should also include our response to the report put
> out by by the performing arts task force. As you may remember, the
> performing arts task force wants study to concentrate on a large
> model that would merge all of SCAT, dance and music into a
> College of Performing Arts, Media, and Communication. Chairs have copies
> of that report if you need to see it specifically.

>
> I have been asked to draft a short response for faculty to examine, with
> the idea that a final response will be authorized at the chairs' and
> Faculty Council meeting next Wednesday and forwarded to the Provost. The
> response is not expected to be elaborate, but indicate general faculty
> sentiment. Please give your comments to the SCAT listserv. If your
> comments are not in this vein, you may want to make a separate report.
> Chairs, it would be helpful if you could distribute hard copies of this
> for our non-e-mail colleagues, so that everyone may participate.

> DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION AND THEATER
FACULTY RESPONSE
TASK FORCE REPORT, SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION AND THEATER
TASK FORCE REPORT, PERFORMING ARTS

>
> 1. The faculty of the School and Communication and Theater
> agrees with the task force report submitted by the team of Breitenfeld,
> Cary and Citron. That report stated, "[W]e found a reassuring
> and logical unity in the School, but needed is an inspiring definition and
> an aggressive exploitation of that coherence." This assessment speaks to
> our belief that the basic structure of the school is sound and effectively
> represents our common purpose. It also speaks to our ongoing call for
> the completion of the dean's search, the appropriate allocation of
> resources to meet the challenges of convergence issues, and
> the necessity for a respected University profile that
> recognizes our contributions.

> Specifically, the faculty at large agrees with the following
> conclusions of the report:
> --The Department of Theater should remain within the School
> --Film and Media Arts should remain within in the School
> --Appropriate parts of the Communication Science Department should
> be moved
> --The Speech Communication program should be enlarged and
> revitalized
> --Lost budget lines need to be restored and distribution
> of resources needs to be addressed
> --Our present initiatives in media technology should be expanded

> and enhanced

>

> The task force recognized our traditional achievements, but
> also viewed the School as being ideally situated to meet the demands of
> the new centery: "SCAT is the ideal place for the intellectual examination
> of the important intersection among the arts, communications and
> technology."

>

> We urge the Acting Provost and the President to give their
> impramatur to this document, to follow its recommendations, and commit to
> a course of action that will permit the School to take its place among the
> leading institutions in the nation.

>

> 2. Performing Arts Task Force

>

> The faculty of the School of Communication and Theater find the
> recommendations of this second task force to be misguided; we strongly
> urge against the serious consideration of its conclusions. Instead of the
> coherence of the present SCAT structure, we are offered an organization
> that strings various disciplines along in a sausage-link
> format that can only trivialize each of its parts. In this odd
> formation, various departments are asked to find common principles when
> some do not even occupy the same neighborhood. What are we to think about
> a report that seems to believe that a nationally known news and
> information program can be tacked onto the back end of a school of
> "performing arts" and not incur either national ridicule or the fury
> of graduates who take pride in their SCAT connection? W

> We note that the trend towards convergence, which this model
> purportedly addresses, is not found on a lateral scale, but in a complex
> model that takes into account various points of entry.

-30-

>

> *****

> SCATFAC is the listserv for full-time faculty in
> the School of Communications and Theater at Temple University.

>

> To post a message to all faculty, send e-mail to:
> SCATFAC@listserv.temple.edu

> *****

Nice work, Pat.

SCATFAC is the listserv for full-time faculty in
the School of Communications and Theater at Temple University.

To post a message to all faculty, send e-mail to:
SCATFAC@listserv.temple.edu

herbert w, simons,4/26/98 10:03 PM, Faculty Senate action on reorganization

MIME-Version: 1.0
Date: Sun, 26 Apr 1998 17:03:38 -0500
Reply-To: hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu
Sender: SCAT faculty list <SCATFAC@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU>
From: "herbert w, simons" <hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu>
Organization: Temple University
Subject: Faculty Senate action on reorganization
To: SCATFAC@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU
Status:

*SCAT IS Puddles
& flourishes
No dot chair
vision*

Music & Dance

*FILMO
MONA*

*Apprentice
Scholar
discipline
demands
O PA -
public
free*

ASC

*present
during*

I write as your Rep on the Faculty Senate Steering Comm. (FSSC). FSSC is in process of bringing issues of reorg to the Faculty Senate. We had our first such FS meeting on April 20 at which time Pat Bradley, as Chair of SCAT's Faculty Council (FC) expressed opposition to all or part of SCAT becoming incorporated into a new College of Performing Arts and Media (or some such title). You may be surprised to learn that this fairly consensual and relatively longstanding view of SCAT's faculty was apparently news to Provost Corrinne Caldwell (as expressed in subsequent conversation with Karen Turner, Pat, and myself), but that, as Corrinne expressed it to me in a subsequent e-mail, may have been due to a misunderstanding.

In any event, it's now clear and agreed to by the Provost and FSSC that the FS has a contractual obligation to be consulted on matters involving proposals to form new schools or colleges. The FSSC will be taking up all such proposals at the University Senate meeting of May 15, and it probably will schedule an interim FS meeting on May 4. The Task Force report on a possible College of Performing Arts together with any recommendations by affected parties (including SCAT) could be on that agenda. If not on that agenda, it could be on the May 15 agenda.

Be advised that the Performing Arts task force called only for a "year of study" of the feasibility and desirability of a college of Performing Arts. Technically speaking, that's not incompatible with Pat Bradley's report of April 20 to the FS saying that SCAT was opposed to being incorporated (in whole or in part) into such a College. The FSSC could report that SCAT faculty and the SCAT task force prefer SCAT staying as is, with the exception of Communication Science, but that this is not incompatible with the recommended "year of study" put forth by the CPA task force.

As I see it, there are three possible ways SCAT could go between now and May 4. (1) At the meeting of the Chairs and Faculty Council this coming Wednesday, a report can be prepared expressing SCAT's continuing desire to hang together as a separate unit (but for Comm Sci) and its opposition to joining in the "year of study"; (2) At that same meeting it could declare its current preference for hanging together but its willingness to engage in the "year of study"; (3) At that same meeting, it could report that it is deferring action on the matter until SCAT's May 5 meeting. Option 3, if approved, would mean that the CPA issue couldn't get on the May 4 agenda of the FS. Given that the May 15 agenda of the University Senate is likely to be cluttered, it's possible that CPA won't get discussed by the Senate until later in the Spring (at a special meeting called to consider issues of reorg not resolved on May 15.) or deferred until the Fall.

Meanwhile, I believe Temple faces the question of where to house Dance in the coming year. With Music? Possibly, but I'm not certain Music would go for that w/o other performing arts joining in? In HPERD? No:

HPERD is definitely being abolished? With SCAT? You might wish to consider that even though it's not been formally proposed by anyone.

I would urge you to communicate with Pat or with your chairs on these matters before the meeting this Wednesday. I'll be at the meeting as well and would be happy to answer any questions that you might have on the Senate's role in all this. Please be advised that I have no dogs in this race and would be happy to represent SCAT sentiment in the FS and in the FSSC, as I have tried to do since joining the FSSC earlier this semester.

Finally, you may feel reassured to learn that Provost Caldwell recognizes a need to move slowly and to learn more before pushing for a CPA (or CPA and Media and Comm) that includes all or part of the present SCAT. I reproduce below an excerpt from an e-mail response to me that bears on that very point.

> And now about SCAT, true I am interested in exploring a more integrative
> approach to the arts, but I have no predetermined idea about how that will
> eventually line up. For the present I have neither the background nor the
> interest in doing anything more than explore the idea. I harbor the hope
> that we can have a substantive dialogue based on the idea, rather than
> self-protection. (Yes, I know that you do not consider communications in
> an arts continuum and I understand that) I am not in the position to
> impose anything on anyone, on that front, nor do I have any interest in
> doing so.

You may be interested to learn that I joined the FSSC as SCAT's rep simply by volunteering! That shouldn't be. Nor should SCAT be w/o representation at FS meetings. In the past SCAT has been somewhat disdainful toward the FS, and while I can understand the frustrations at sitting through endless chatter on matters trivial, the FS has an important role at Temple.

SCATFAC is the listserv for full-time faculty in the School of Communications and Theater at Temple University.

To post a message to all faculty, send e-mail to:
SCATFAC@listserv.temple.edu

Delivered-To: Senate@listserv.Temple.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Date: Mon, 9 Nov 1998 21:03:53 -0600
Reply-To: hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu
Sender: Faculty Senate discussion <SENATE@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU>
From: "herbert w, simons" <hsimons@astro.ocis.temple.edu>
Organization: Temple University
Subject: Planning: Questions and Data Needed
To: SENATE@LISTSERV.TEMPLE.EDU
Status:

Things move slowly at Temple. With the Thanksgiving vacation fast approaching, the collective planning process proposed by the Provost for 1998-9 has thus far produced the rudiments of seven task forces and corresponding lists of topics. But there is little sense of the central questions that ought to guide this inquiry, or of the data we will need in coming collectively to reasonable judgments. What data we do have suggest that Temple is in something of a tailspin. As other area colleges and universities report increases in applications and acceptances, Temple registers yet another enrollment decline. Cost-cutting has reduced deficits at Temple, but at the price of a severely weakened administration and faculty. Indeed, one ironic consequence of cost-cutting so far as this investigation is concerned has been the elimination from the Provost's office of a Vice-Provost for Academic Planning! Meanwhile, over in Student Affairs, Jim Fitzsimmons informed me that he could not secure the meager funding necessary to convert data sets on annual surveys of our graduates' job placements and job satisfaction into published reports. The 1996 survey was published last Spring but has been extremely hard to come by. Another consequence of cost-cutting?

To me the most disturbing datum is the paucity of discussion of planning on this listserv. For Fall 1998, the most frequently asked question on the listserv remains: "How do I get off this listserv"? A few people responded enthusiastically to Art Hochner's call for "an independent faculty voice" in the planning process, but neither the faculty who voted unanimously to support Art's call at a Representative Senate meeting nor the Steering Committee charged with implementing the resolution seemed to have any idea what it might mean in operational terms. I take it more as an expression of sentiment: "We faculty are suspicious of yet another invitation to engage in collective planning. We've spun our wheels too often only to be railroaded by the Administration."

In general, the faculty seem alienated and withdrawn, especially in what once was called CAS. There, the prevailing interpretation of the split might be worded as a Faculty Herald headline: "Administration Power Trumps Faculty Reason." (I don't believe the matter was that simple, but neither the President nor the Provost saw fit to make their case publicly in response to the overwhelming CAS vote to hang together.)

Alienated or not, it is in the faculty's interest to join in the planning process. For starters, however, we ought to insist that certain central questions get addressed, and that reliable data bearing upon them be made available to the task forces. In what follows, I identify one central question and corresponding data needs. I invite readers to weigh in on the question and perhaps to suggest others.

IS THE TEMPLE-STYLE MARKET ORIENTATION TO UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION REALLY IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STUDENTS, THE COMMONWEALTH, AND THE UNIVERSITY?

Temple's new market orientation seems to consist of the following: (a) a view of the undergraduate as customer; (b) a view of the customer as motivated primarily by career aspirations, secondarily by the desire for a good time while in college, and only remotely by interests in learning for civic engagement, or for personal growth; (c) a view of career-satisfied alumni as generous donors to their alma mater; (d) a view of the University as obligated to service customer demands; (e) a view of Phoenix-like competitors ready to swoop down on our prey lest we fail to deliver the goods. (Pardon the mixed metaphor.)

At issue for me is whether, in hewing to its market orientation, the University (a) is following where it should be leading (recall Dewey's concerns about education becoming a function of society rather than the reverse); (b) is inadvertently reinforcing disdain for social goods (e.g., Shakespeare); (c) is sacrificing quality of education in its efforts to please its customers (e.g., tolerating increased grade inflation); (d) is fated ultimately to undermine its image by an excessive preoccupation with customer satisfaction.

Data needed: (a) surveys of educational satisfaction, not just career satisfaction (the surveys themselves would send a useful message that Temple cares about preparing students for more than jobs); (b) evidence of "customer" motivations; (c) findings from studies of course innovations designed to improve career-relevant skills while promoting traditional values of higher education.

Note: I don't see any personal winners or losers in this debate. The sides are too evenly matched. Still, this discussion could make Temple a winner as it seeks ways of reconciling opposing values.