Eventually, But Why Not Now?

“Eventually, why not now?”

- Advertising slogan for Gold Bond Flour

“Explicit is better than implicit.”

- The Zen of Python, Tim Peters

Over the past few years, the Faculty Senate has asked for various bits of information from the administration. We have also requested clarification of a number of policies. Some of these requests have eventually been granted, and we appreciate that. Some, however, remain in abeyance. It seems to me that the end of this academic year may be an appropriate time to enumerate some of the information we are still missing.

● After several years, we finally received an initial report on faculty diversity, and we appreciate that. It has, however, been more than a year since we requested that those data be expanded upon and clarified. There was an agreement to do so, but the detailed data have not yet appeared.

Editorial continued on page 3

A New Era for the Teaching & Learning Center

By Stephanie Fiore, Senior Director, Teaching & Learning Center

The Teaching & Learning Center is seeing some exciting new changes, and I invite you to come see what all the fuss is about. The new Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) is the result of the merger of the Teaching & Learning Center (TLC) and the Instructional Support Center (ISC). This merger makes a lot of sense as both units have the same mission—to advance great teaching at the university. And, of course, combining the training the ISC delivers on instructional technology tools to support teaching with the discussions on pedagogy that take place at the TLC is a model that has the potential to provide more holistic and complete faculty development opportunities. The newly integrated team is dreaming big—figuring out how to provide a seamless experience for faculty, deciding what kinds of enhanced programming we can offer, and identifying promising new initiatives to pursue. We’re talking a lot about the importance of serving our customers—that is you, dear faculty colleagues—in the most ro-
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Integrating Adjuncts into TAUP: Amending the Constitution & Bylaws

By Art Hochner, Associate Professor, Fox School of Business & President of TAUP

Since the beginning of this year TAUP has talked with hundreds of members to discuss the proposed changes we need to make to TAUP’s Constitution & Bylaws to bring adjunct faculty into membership and leadership.

I want to give an outline of the changes proposed by the Executive Committee. As you can see, we are building a vibrant and engaged TAUP for all faculty who teach in the bargaining unit schools and colleges.

What are these key changes?

A new Mission Statement that focuses on ideals and activities:

TAUP is a democratic union of faculty, librarians, and academic professionals that protects academic freedom and faculty governance in 11 schools and colleges at Temple University. We are committed to the historic mission of Temple University, to our
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Peter Liacouras: The Man Who Bent History

By Richard Englert, Chancellor

History Professor Emeritus Jim Hilty, in his terrific book on Temple, said it best when he summed up the contributions of former President Peter Liacouras with the following assessment: “... Liacouras bent history and changed the flow of events with transforming ideas and dreams.” (p. 219, Temple University: 125 Years of Service to Philadelphia, the Nation, and the World, 2010)

Peter did indeed bend history and shape the flow of events not only of Temple but also of public higher education in Pennsylvania.

To understand this, let me provide a very brief background sketch. Peter took over the presidency in 1982, a challenging time in our history. Just prior to his taking office, the university’s financial situation was so dire that many staff and faculty members (including tenured ones) were terminated. Student enrollments had dropped; Temple was overwhelmingly a commuter university with little campus life. Too many people from the suburban communities of Pennsylvania and New Jersey saw Temple only through the windows of their cars as they sped up and down Broad Street. Temple’s academics was excellent because of an outstanding faculty, but access to that excellence was seriously impaired by external circumstances well beyond the faculty’s control. At one time during his tenure, there were very serious

Liacouras continued on page 2
attempts at the state level to eliminate the direct appropriations for public universities, including Temple.

Peter was a master strategist and outside-the-box thinker. His genius was his vision that Temple University could become a destination campus with strategic investments in facilities and ambience and the right kind of marketing. He had Tyler School of Art students design a new logo with a stylized “T” that quickly become iconic and continues to be a widely-recognized symbol internationally. He imagined a vibrant, residential campus full of activity day and night. In the face of the opposition of some, he envisioned a convocation/entertainment/athletics facility that would get people to step onto campus and experience first-hand Temple’s excellence. Peter believed that once people were actually on campus, the University and its strong academics would sell themselves.

On January 25, 1996, there was a groundbreaking ceremony for that facility (now called The Liacouras Center). Since that date, Temple’s undergraduate student body on Main Campus has grown by a phenomenal 90%. Trying to walk around campus during the times in between classes is now akin to navigating through Grand Central Station. The neighborhoods around the campus are bustling with commercial activity. Peter’s vision of an anchor facility that would spark development not only on campus but also in the local community has become reality.

At the state level, Peter was a staunch defender of public higher education. In the 1990s he personally led a coalition of public universities to defeat attempts to drastically change the state’s funding approach and to effectively turn Temple into a private university with no state appropriation. Peter knew that would have made Temple’s tuition unaffordable for too many working-class students and would have resulted in an abandonment of our historic mission. Other public university presidents at the time credited Peter with saving public higher education.

Peter understood that academic excellence needs a sustainable, supportive infrastructure. Peter deserves our collective gratitude for laying the foundation to ensure that Temple’s infrastructure is as strong as it is today.

Some final observations about Peter the person. He didn’t shy away from conflict, yet still was a warm human being who was especially considerate of and sympathetic toward those who were most in need or most hurting. He supported the underdog, loved Philadelphia, never forgot his working-class roots, hated burdensome bureaucracies, championed diversity and was utterly committed to students. He showed me his true passion when he taught an undergraduate Intellectual Heritage course (now Mosaic), in addition to his law classes and a graduate class in higher education (which he co-taught with me) after stepping down from the presidency. He really was an academic at heart. And he was a dear friend, mentor and colleague not just to me but to numerous Temple people at all levels of the institution.

Peter Liacouras was Temple’s president for 18 years, longer than any other Temple president except for our founder, Russell Conwell. Last Thursday, Peter passed away at the age of 85 after a long illness. Whenever you walk past the Liacouras Center or down Liacouras Walk, think of the man who bent history and had transformational dreams. His lasting legacy is an institution that is financially very stable, has the capacity to dream new dreams and continues to shape the flow of events for its own future. ♦

Peter J. Liacouras, Seventh President of Temple University
Eventually, But Why Not Now?
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- During the April 2014 Representative Faculty Senate meeting the following three motions were approved:

  Recommendation 1:
  That the Senate be informed, in writing, of exactly what changes have been made to the 2011 Presidential Guidelines document and receive written clarification that these guidelines are still in effect. That an explanation be made to the Senate as to whatever amendments have been made, and the process, if any, by which faculty were consulted in the making of these amendments. That the current guidelines be immediately posted on Temple’s web page where those guidelines are readily available to all faculty. That the current guidelines developed by schools and colleges be placed on Temple’s website so that all faculty of our various schools and colleges, can easily find them.

  Recommendation 2:
  That the President and Provost shall convene a joint committee composed of leadership from the Faculty Senate and the administration, and jointly chaired by representatives of the Faculty Senate and the administration. That this committee would be tasked with evaluating recent amendments, taking into account the considerable diversity among our schools and colleges and their various programs, and recommending any additional changes that seem appropriate.

  Recommendation 3:
  That under exceptional circumstances where a decision by the President or Provost reverses a uniform, positive recommendation from the departmental/college and dean’s levels, the President and Provost should follow the spirit of the TAUP contract by providing written explanation, at least to the candidate, of the compelling circumstances occasioning this decision. That the written explanation shall be made available to the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee in the event that an appeal on the case is taken to that committee.

Although bits and pieces of these motions have elicited some informal response, I would argue that the spirit of these requests has been largely ignored. As we move further and further away from 2011, when the most recent Presidential Guidelines were developed, in consultation with the faculty, this document becomes increasingly irrelevant. The TAUP and Law School contracts have changed. Current practices have changed. It is time for a new set of Presidential Guidelines to be presented to the Temple community. It is unfair for all pre-tenured faculty that we do not have a current set of such guidelines.

- The problems listed in the second bulleted point, and other matters as well, are exacerbated by the fact that the most in-aptly named committee at Temple University, the Standing Committee on Continuous Revision of the Faculty Handbook, has not met meaningfully since my first term as Secretary of the Senate, nearly a dozen years ago. The Handbook was seriously out of date even then. It has kept abreast of neither changes in the TAUP and Law School contracts, nor of changes in day to day practice. The Handbook matters. It is the governing document for those schools and colleges not covered by one of the union contracts, and also for those issues about which the union contracts are silent. It is high time that we set about the business of fixing this.

- Finally, the contracts negotiated between Temple and the TAUP during the last couple of decades have been “kicking the can down the road” with regards to intellectual property. Contract after contract has included language stating that intellectual property matters will be negotiated later. As far as I am concerned, it is time for “later” to become “now.” Faculty members should not, for instance, be expected to willingly engage in distance learning without knowing how the product of their work may be used. I personally would be loathe to permit making video copies of my lectures with no ability for me to control how that content would be used. Could Temple continue to use such materials after I retire? In absence of contract language, I am guessing “yes.” Even if the material becomes so out-dated that it is an embarrassment to me? Again I suspect the answer is “yes.” We are far too deep into the information age for these matters not to have a negotiated, contractual basis.

I would hope that in the next academic year, the Administration and the Faculty Senate might find some way of beginning jointly to address these vital, unsettled issues. I would urge the Senate to re-affirm this commitment – that we continue to prod the Administration into helping us settle these matters.
Fly In Four: What Have We Learned?

By Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies

Temple University has long been recognized for its ‘mission’ of access to high quality educational opportunity. More recently, Temple has generated interest in its commitment to enhancing student retention and time to graduation, and to reducing student debt. Fly In Four is one such commitment. After two years of operation we have an opportunity to reflect on the goals, the implementation and the early impact of the program.

Fly In Four is just one example of a range of programs being implemented nationwide to try and reduce student indebtedness. Tuition and fees at private four-year institutions have increased 167% in the last 30 years and tuition and fees for in-state students at public institutions have risen 257%. As annual costs increase, a student’s final debt burden is very much tied to the amount of time taken to complete a degree.

During the past decade there has been an increase in the number of institutions developing programs that seek to enhance on-time graduation as a way of reducing student debt. Some of the plans focus directly on cost – either freezing or reducing tuition. Others specifically target time-to-degree, with fast-track programs that enable students to compress four-year of coursework into shorter time frames, partial to full.

In 2014 Cleveland State University offered to rebate 2% of tuition plus $100 per semester in book expenses to undergraduates who completed their academic year in good standing with at least 30 credits. In the same year, California Senate Bill 15 proposed a graduation incentive plan which would provide students who completed at least 30 credits per academic year with a $1,000 incentive grant after the first year, $1,500 after the second year and $2,000 after the third year. The University of Minnesota chose an alternate approach – one that was to be the template for Temple’s Fly In Four. Under Minnesota’s Four-Year Graduation Agreement incoming students would commit to an agreement with the university by which they would work with advisors, register on time, maintain adequate progress to degree and notify the university immediately if any required course were unavailable to them.

In return, the university committed to providing course substitutions and priority registration to maintain on-time graduation and, if needed, to pay any tuition costs beyond four years.

Temple’s Fly In Four program was announced in February 2014 and implemented for the 2014 entering class. It reflected President Theobald’s commitment to tackle student debt – the first of the six commitments he described in his October inaugural address. The program has many similarities with that of Minnesota.

Students commit to:
- Affirmatively accept the agreement
- Consult with an advisor each semester and plan ahead
- Register for classes during early registration
- Advance in class standing (complete 30, 60, 90 credits first three years)
- Complete graduation review prior to senior year

Temple commits to:
- Provide a 4-year degree plan for every major
- Offer access to quality academic advising
- Provide progress reports for every student
- Conduct a graduation review
- Ensure alternatives are available when a required course is not
- If a student meets all obligations of the Fly in 4 agreement and still cannot graduate in four years, Temple University will enable the student to complete his or her degree free of charge.

In 2014 Temple commits to:
- Providing four-year degree plans
- Tuition and fees at private four-year institutions have increased 167% in the last 30 years and tuition and fees for in-state students at public institutions have risen 257%. As annual costs increase, a student’s final debt burden is very much tied to the amount of time taken to complete a degree.

The early results from Fly In Four are encouraging but suggest there is room for continued development and improvement. Student sign-up rates for Fly In Four were 89% in 2014 and 93% in 2015. For the 2014 entry cohort program participants were more likely to be retained to their second year - 90% for participants and 86% for non-participants. Of the 3,973 2014 entry cohort students who signed on to Fly In Four 1,363 (34.3%) did not meet program requirements and were demitted at the end of the academic year.

In some ways the results from the first year of the study grant program are intriguing. For study grant students who met Fly In Four program requirements, retention to the sophomore Fall semester was 98.6%, an exceptionally high success rate for this student group. However, of the 500 who received study grants, 147 (29.4%) did not meet Fly In Four program requirements, were demitted and lost their study grant. Of this group, 98 (66.7%) were retained to the sophomore Fall semester and 49 (29.4%) dropped out of Temple. At this point we do not have data to enable us to explore the confounds of the causal relationship among Fly In Four, study grants and retention. What is clear, however, is that for some students the challenges of successfully completing the freshman year are beyond even the additional benefit of a $4,000 study grant.

The long term effects of Fly In Four reach well beyond college. A recent report showed how student loans, created to be an engine for social mobility, are in fact limiting young peoples’ ability to achieve financial success:

- 27% of respondents said they found it difficult to buy daily necessities because of their student loans
- 63% said their debt affected their ability to make larger purchases such as a car
- 73% said they have put off saving for retirement or other investments
- 75% indicated that student loan debt affected their decision or ability to purchase a home

Survey respondents indicated that in addition to limiting their ability to make major purchases, student loan debt also impacts their important life decisions:

- 30% responded that their student loan debt was the deciding factor, or had considerable impact, on their choice of career field
- 47% indicated it was the deciding factor, or had considerable impact, on their decision or ability to start a small business
- 29% indicated that they have put off marriage as a result of their student loans
- 43% said that student debt has delayed their decision to start a family

At the time of writing the first Fly In Four student cohort is approaching the end of their sophomore year. Current estimates show that about 600 more sophomores than last year are on track to graduate in four years. If they stay the course to a 4 year graduation they will collectively save more than $15 million in college costs. These savings will recur—and even grow—with each succeeding class. The impact of such savings on the lives of these students is incalculable.

Temple’s Fly In Four program does have an important additional element — the four year study grants. Temple research on risk factors found that students are most likely to drop-out during their first year if they had committed to work 15+ hours for pay, usually off campus. National research not only confirms these findings, but shows that working students are more likely to register for fewer credits, earn lower grades, take longer to graduate and increase their level of debt. Many of these students are from low- and middle-income families. To address this challenge Temple has committed to provide 500 study grants of $4,000 per year to those students with the highest financial need. Fly In Four study-grant recipients are required to maintain Fly In Four standing, commit to not working for pay for more than 15 hours per week during the academic year, and to using their additional time for academic study.

Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
Integrating Adjuncts into TAUP: Amending the Constitution & Bylaws
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obligations to our students, and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We uphold the ideals of Opportunity, Quality, and Accountability and maintain that faculty, librarians, and academic professionals, on all tracks and of all ranks, must be treated as professionals. TAUP seeks to improve the working conditions of faculty, the learning conditions of students, and the well-being of the wider community through collective bargaining, organizing, political action, community engagement, and the work of our members.

Bringing adjuncts into TAUP membership:
Until the first contract including adjuncts is negotiated, a signed membership card will suffice for adjunct faculty to be TAUP members. All members will have full and equal rights to participate in TAUP decisions, elections and contract ratification.

A revised leadership structure.
1. Currently we have:
   a. 3 Officers – President, Vice President & Treasurer, elected at-large for 2-year terms
   b. 15 Executive Committee members elected at-large for 3-year terms, plus the three officers.

   Current Executive Committee (voting members in rose)

2. Proposed changes to the Executive Committee, which would have up to 12 members, comprising:
   a. 3 Officers – same as current – three elected at-large
   b. 4 Constituency Chairs – (a) Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty, (b) NTT faculty, (c) Adjunct faculty, (d) Librarians – chosen by 4 Constituency Councils
   c. 3 At-large faculty Constituency representatives – chosen by the three faculty Constituency Councils
   d. 1 Academic Professional
   e. Retiree chapter president (restricted voting, i.e., not on legal matters, contract approval, etc.)

3. Constituency Councils, which will be advisory to the EC
   a. Members elected directly by TAUP members in each constituency
   b. One Council member per 100 bargaining unit members in that constituency; that means approximately 7 for TT Council; 6 for NTT Council; and 14 for Adjunct Council
   c. Duties are:
      i. Organize, engage, and recruit members in the constituency
      ii. Represent the views and needs of the constituency
      iii. Communicate and meet with constituents

   Proposed Executive Committee (voting members in rose) and Constituency Councils
A New Era for the Teaching & Learning Center

Fiore continued from page 1

bust way possible. What we know for sure is that, as always, we will deliver programming and services based on the evidence about how people learn so that students develop the capacity to think deeply and engage more meaningfully with course content, and so that faculty feel greater satisfaction in their professional work. We chose the word “Advancement” in our new name intentionally as it conveys best what we are about: we want to advance our professional practice by drawing on the evidence available in the literature on how people learn, but also by creating a collaborative space in which colleagues can learn from each other and support each other to maximize instructional quality. We also seek to advance our professional practice by contributing to the scholarship on teaching and learning and encouraging faculty at Temple to do the same.

The Center for the Advancement of Teaching serves all faculty at the university on every campus here and abroad, as well as at our medical affiliates throughout the state. Full-time or part-time faculty and TAs can use our services for their online, hybrid or bricks-and-mortar classrooms, studio, clinical or lab environments. In this fiscal year, the CAT consultants will serve faculty over 9,000 times, either through individual confidential consultations, attendance at a training, workshop or conference, drop-in help at the ISC lab, classroom observation, or a request for resources. Some faculty may wish to take advantage of one of our more immersive opportunities. For example, Faculty Learning Communities are semester or year-long interdisciplinary teaching circles on specific topics. This fall, we are leading Faculty Learning Communities on teaching international students, teaching with digital pedagogies, and applying the science of learning to the classroom.

The Provost’s Teaching Academy (PTA) is an intensive summer faculty development program where participants study topics such as human learning and adult development, integrated course design and assessment, and teaching methods that promote engagement and collaboration. In our Teaching with Technology Fellows program, undergraduate students provide hands-on assistance to faculty in implementing technological solutions in the classroom. For those who are serious about delving into professional development, the six-credit Teaching in Higher Education Certificate offers a graduate-level credential for study in the theory on how people learn as well as the practical applications for that theory in our teaching.

But why should you join us at the new CAT? Here are four good reasons:

Put your good teaching into overdrive. Let’s dispel immediately the notion that our center is only a place for remedial help. We can certainly assist faculty who struggle in the classroom, but the majority of faculty who attend our programs and use our services do so because they are already accomplished instructors who care about providing the best learning environment possible for their students. They know that we can help them think about how to get where they want to go with their teaching—supporting them as they implement innovative teaching methods, assisting them in how to improve student motivation, or seeking out new methods for supporting critical and thinking. This year, for instance, in our annual panel discussion with the Lindback and Great Teacher Award winners, it struck me how many of the awardees referred to the transformative power of their time spent in TLC programs as an integral part of the reason they had become the teachers they are.

Boost your facility with technology, even if you choose not to use it. With all of the emphasis on technology these days, you might imagine that I will say that faculty absolutely cannot teach without all the technological bells and whistles available to them. But, in fact, technology is a tool that should be used when it is the best choice for helping your students to learn. You may decide to teach “naked” or you may choose to soup up your course with every technological tool you can get your hands on. Without knowing what is out there, however, there is no way to make an informed choice. The important thing is to understand which tools are available, what their best pedagogical use is (and then, if you choose to use them) how to embed them into your course so that you achieve the results you want. Something as simple as automatically-graded Blackboard quizzes can provide opportunities for students to engage in self-assessment of their understanding of course concepts (and streamline your grading too—a nice benefit!). And more advanced tools like the screencasting software Camtasia Relay can help you flip the classroom to create room for a more active learning experience during class time. At the CAT, we can support you to learn about a variety of tools—techie or not—that you can use to support good teaching.

Get out of your silo. Faculty are so enmeshed in the demands of work within their own departments and colleges that they often have no opportunity to discuss their work with others on the outside. When I was a full-time faculty member, whole days went by where I never left the fifth floor of Anderson Hall and rarely saw anyone outside of my department, much less had a meaningful interaction. At the CAT, you can participate in conversations with faculty from every discipline at the university. It can be incredibly enlightening to hear how others address teaching challenges in their disciplines, and can breathe new life into how you think about your own pedagogical practices. Those rich interdisciplinary conversations also feed a more nuanced understanding of the connections between our disciplines, ones we can reference to help students make those important connections. The networking is a real perk as well. I have witnessed a number of instances where colleagues at our programs have made plans to collaborate across departments so that students on both sides benefitted. These serendipitous possibilities are facilitated by giving colleagues these moments of interaction and collaboration.

Connect to your community. In our three-legged stool of professional activity–research, teaching, service–we collaborate with colleagues, debate ideas, and receive feedback in research and even in service, but rarely in teaching. Stanford University’s Lee Schulman (also President Emeritus of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) argues that teaching in isolation means that we miss opportunities for the feedback, reflection, and a lively exchange of ideas that lead to ever more increased quality in our teaching. Connecting to members of our intellectual community is essential for just this reason and the CAT is the place where this regularly happens, either in individual and confidential consultation with a faculty developer or in a group dialogue with other colleagues. The validation of our practices or perhaps the nudge we sometimes need to look at things in a different light makes us better teachers and better professionals. Just as interaction with our peers makes our research better, it hones our teaching skill as well.

Since I took over as senior director of the center in September, I have been asked on numerous occasions how I like my new job. My answer is always the same: “I have the best job on campus.” In any given week, I get to engage in spirited dialogues with the smartest folks around—faculty colleagues from all over the university. I get to hear about the questions and problems that each discipline grapples with and that they try to help their students understand. I get to problem-solve, building solutions to sticky and sometimes stubborn teaching problems. I get to engage in scholarship that contributes to the knowledge in the field. Who is luckier than me? But here’s the thing—you can experience all this too. You just have to join us at the CAT.
University Faculty Senate Action

On Thursday, 4-21-2016, the Temple Faculty Senate Steering Committee presented the following resolution to the Temple University Senate. This resolution had been brought to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee by the Senate's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns Committee.

The University Senate approved it unanimously.

Whereas: The purpose of a just society is to promote well-being among its citizens while also advocating for a position of inclusion and empowerment; and:

Whereas: Recent legislative measures in the states of North Carolina and Mississippi are targeting the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) community, effectively allowing for discrimination against the LGBT community in the public sphere; and

Whereas: Academic institutions have a responsibility to ensure that all members of a university community are dealt with in a civil and decorous manner; and

Whereas: Current anti-LGBT legislative measures in the States of North Carolina and Mississippi are antithetical to the principles of higher education; and

Whereas: These measures can effectively legitimate discrimination against the LGBT population on campuses of higher education; and

Whereas: Students, faculty, and staff are viable and important members of a community that deserve to be regarded with the same civil rights and safety of other citizens; and

Whereas: The current legislation of North Carolina and Mississippi prohibits the free and safe expression of identity related to sexual orientation and gender identity; and

Whereas: These measures remove the agency of individual communities to enact local legislation; and

Whereas: Communities of scholars are concerned with the impact of this legislation on the experience of campus life; and

Whereas: Institutions within these states, including Duke University, several cultural venues, and international governmental bodies have raised ongoing concerns with the impact of these acts of legislation; so

THEREFORE: On behalf of the Temple University's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns Committee, and the Temple University Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and the University Faculty Senate, we stand in solidarity with other academic, civic, and corporate organizations against House Bill 2 of The State of North Carolina and House Bill 1523 of the State of Mississippi

Quartet for Piano and Strings [2016] by Professor Jan Krzywicki

Your editor attempts, with greater or lesser success, to keep abreast of what his colleagues across the University are up to. One of those greater successes was the pleasure it gave me to attend the premier performance of Quartet for Piano and Strings [2016] by Professor Jan Krzywicki (BCMD) on Sunday, May 15, 2016. This work was commissioned by the Philadelphia Chamber Music Society and beautifully performed by the Clarosa Quartet. I have neither the standing nor the skill to write a review, but I can say informally that I found it to be a stunning and engaging piece of chamber music. Following are the program notes written by Jan describing some aspects of the composition.

"Quartet for piano and strings is a four-movement work consisting of character pieces that lasts about twenty-three minutes. The opening Scherzo, a playful yet restlessly serious movement that gains in weight, is followed by a restful Pastorale that was inspired by the quiet and majesty of Yellowstone Park in winter. The ensuing Toccata, in effect a second scherzo, is a whirlwind of driving, biting motion that proceeds without pause to a Fantasia which reworks materials from the preceding three movements, forming a culmination and resolution.

Throughout the work the pianist is called upon to produce various sounds inside the instrument: "stopped" notes (a note muted with a finger that produces a blocked or pizzicato-like sound), plucked notes (with finger or plectrum), and notes strummed in a glissando-like manner.

Quartet was commissioned by the Philadelphia Chamber Music society for premiere by the Clarosa Quartet as part of its 30th Anniversary season. Over the years I have been fortunate to have heard several of my works on PCMS programs; I am very grateful for their support and to the Clarosa Quartet for their very dedicated performance of the Quartet."

Copyright 2016 by Jan Krzywicki. Used by permission.
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D. Negotiations
1. Negotiating Team - must include at least 1 representative of each Constituency Council; members appointed by EC.
2. Negotiating Process - similar to current practice
   a. Negotiating Team must vote in favor of a tentative agreement in order for it to advance to the EC, which must vote in favor for it to advance to a membership vote for ratification. (NB: Both NT and EC have representatives of all constituencies)
   b. Simple majority of those voting is needed for ratification

E. Membership Duties
We propose to change the current structure (which has mostly been in place since 1993), with a small increase and to set membership dues for adjuncts.

FAQs
Q: With 1,400 adjuncts joining the existing union that has 1,300 full-time faculty, librarians, and APs, won’t the adjuncts dominate and drown out full-time voices?
A: No, the new proposed structure ensures that each constituency has a guaranteed voice in leadership and on all policy, legal, and contract issues. Adjuncts will have the same number of EC representatives as TT and NTT faculty. Nevertheless, the various groups of faculty have much in common as teachers, scholars, and artists. The new structure will allow us to work on building those commonalities, while acknowledging our differences. Customarily, important decisions by the EC and the Negotiating Team are made by consensus, and we see no reason for that custom to change. Consensus means that differences of opinion and perspective are listened to with respect and mutual accommodation. Besides, it would be counterproductive for one segment of the faculty to alienate another segment. We need to work together to enhance unity and strength.

Q: What if the adjuncts were to band together and elect adjuncts as the Executive Officers - President, Vice President and Treasurer – who are elected at large by the entire membership?
A: That is highly unlikely, given the vulnerability of adjuncts in general and specifically given that they are employed only semester by semester. Moreover, the new structure is intended to ensure that all segments of the faculty have strong voices and that a unified faculty will work together. As primarily a volunteer organization, TAUP needs leadership that is dedicated, motivated, and skilled. We welcome leaders from all segments of the faculty, librarians, and APs. TTs and NTTs have worked together well in the leadership. Currently, our officers are two TTs (president and vice president) and one NTT (treasurer). In the recent past, we had one TT and two NTTs. Combinations like this are very useful to represent a variety of perspectives. As we integrate adjuncts into TAUP, they will gain much greater awareness of TT and NTT issues, and vice versa. Mutual understanding will help us find mutual solutions.

Q: Won’t full-time faculty dominate the union, as they currently do, thereby doing little to improve adjuncts’ conditions?
A: No, adjuncts have a guaranteed role on the Executive Committee and will be part of any Negotiating Team. The above answers also apply to this question.

Q: What are membership dues used for?
A: We run an office with three full-time staff and one part-time, which enables TAUP to communicate with and involve members, to defend academic freedom, to enhance and defend shared governance, and to do the best job we can of representing our interests at Temple and the wider community. Representing adjuncts will bring more work to our office staff and we will need more staff. Losing department chairs from the bargaining unit reduced TAUP’s income, which we need to replace to enhance our work. Our new structure, however, envisions a union with a more active membership, so that constituency representatives will help greatly in providing answers to questions and taking care of members’ needs.

Q: Why didn’t adjuncts form a separate bargaining unit, as Temple administration said that they could?
A: Under Pennsylvania labor law that would not have been possible. The labor relations board is required to prevent fragmentation of bargaining units under a single employer when there is an identifiable community of interest among groups of employees, such as between full-timers and part-timers. In fact, in 2015 as TAUP’s petition to the PLRB for a combined unit was under consideration, another petition was submitted from the Community College of Allegheny County. There, as at Temple, the full-time faculty has been unionized for many years but not the adjuncts. The union’s petition for an adjunct-only unit was rejected by the PLRB, which insisted on a combined unit. TAUP was aware of the PLRB’s general mandate, which led us to accrete the adjuncts into the existing full-time unit. Besides, with all faculty in one unit, we will better be able to unite our interests rather than being divided in bargaining. We are stronger together.

A Word from the Faculty Senate President

I am honored to write this column as President-Elect of the Faculty Senate for the 2016-2017 academic year. It has been an exciting year as Secretary, and it is certainly a privilege to be elected to be President for the next academic year.

What can you expect this coming year? I have big shoes to fill, as Trish Jones has done an outstanding job as President the past two years. Herbert Hoover, in his 1928 Presidential campaign, promised: “A chicken in every pot and a car in every garage.” I wish I could promise a merit unit in every paycheck and a grant award in every inbox but, alas, I don’t have that power. It should be noted that Hoover got elected and things didn’t turn out all that well (Stock Market collapse, Great Depression – history will not repeat itself here! But I can promise that the Faculty Senate will be responsive to your concerns and will work diligently and energetically on your behalf.

We will have a full agenda, I am sure, some dictated by current events, some perhaps unexpected. The Stadium will continue as a project/issue, negotiations on the adjunct contract between TAUP and the Administration have begun and will perhaps be concluded this summer (this will affect the faculty although the Faculty Senate may not be directly involved), potential changes to Gen Ed, etc., etc. Who knows what will happen in Philadelphia, in Harrisburg, on the road to the White House, …?

One of my main concerns is faculty governance. Alas, faculty governance seems to be fading away, with less and less faculty input at the departmental, collegial, and University level. I will be initiating a substantive conversation on how to reinvigorate faculty governance at Temple University and, as part of this, the role of the Faculty Senate in this process. I welcome your recommendations!

We will also be attempting to move from the 19th Century into the 21st Century with our web presence, via a redesigned web site as well as a discussion board, Facebook presence, etc. We will keep you informed as these upgrades take place.

I am excited to note our Leadership Team will include Elvis Wagner (College of Education) as incoming Vice-President and Sue Dickey (College of Public Health) as incoming Secretary. Trish Jones will transition to Past-President. We thank Adam Davey for great work this year as Vice-President.

My e-mail is msachs@temple.edu. I check it 24/7 – please don’t hesitate to contact me with any thoughts, questions, comments, recommendations, etc. I look forward to serving you as Faculty Senate President this coming year. Have a great summer! ♦
University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 4, 2015

Attendance: 61
Representative senators and officers: 24
Ex-officio: 0
Faculty, Administrators and guests: 19
WebEx: 18

Call to Order:

President Jones called the meeting to order at 1:54 p.m.
Information provided by President Jones on use of WebEx

President recommended moving old business to head of the agenda.
Motion to approve the agenda. Motion approved.

Old Business:

President Jones provided explanation of distinction between Representative Faculty Senate meetings versus University Senate meetings. President Jones explained FSSC discussion concerning Angel’s motion and thought that this would be reviewed at the next Representative Faculty Senate meeting rather than University Faculty Senate meeting. Option of taking Angel’s motion off the table – motion coming off the table would be original motion from September meeting. Note from Michael Gebhardt, University Counsel, that assertion from Professor Angel that the 1992 sexual harassment and sexual assault policy and current policy apply to Trustees as members of the University community. Gebhardt indicated “This assertion is reasonable, and I do not disagree.” (e-mail to President Jones, 5:42 p.m., December 3, 2015) Jones noted that the FSSC recommended not bringing up the Angel motion today because: 1) motions from Representative Faculty Senate meetings should come at next Representative Faculty Senate meeting, not University Senate meeting; 2) would have hopefully gotten information desired by January.

Motion from the floor to take Angel motion off the table and seconded. Open for discussion and action. Angel noted information from Philadelphia Inquirer, local legal newspaper, concerning Cosby defense lawyers’ strategies, especially concerning Cosby deposition. Angel talked about potential conflict of interest for Board of Trustees Chairman O’Connor and Cosby defense. Temple has not taken an official position on Cosby. Angel suggests faculty want action on this issue.

Joyce Lindorff (BCMD) spoke in support of the motion. She discussed two policies from 1992 on sexual harassment and sexual assault, as well as third one on Conflict of Interest.

Art Hochner (FSBM and TAUP) mentioned Philadelphia Inquirer article breaking this story. Suggested conflict of interest because O’Connor was representing Cosby while still serving as Chairman of BOT. Tainted votes concerning this issue. Urged support of motion.

Angel talked about deposition and admissibility of evidence in court. Cited Brown University statements. Suggesting ignoring word “alleged” in news reports.

Angel proposed an amendment to her motion: Calls upon President Neil Theobald and the Board of Trustees to quickly withdraw Cosby’s honorary degree. Amendment seconded, question called. Amendment approved unanimously.

Voting on main motion. Approved unanimously.

Approval of April 16, 2015 University Faculty Senate Minutes: The minutes from April 16, 2015 were approved as amended unanimously.

President’s Report:

Noted for this past Fall semester:
President Theobald’s State of the University Address, October 8th.
Faculty Service Awards brunch, November 17th
FSSC Guests in fall semester
UTPAC Clarification and Election
Endorsement of Tuition Benefits Committee

Presentation of Child Care Committee report: Casey Breslin briefly discussed report of the committee and committee’s recommen-
dations and various options that could be made available to Temple University community

Vice-President’s Report:

Approximately 50 committee vacancies at beginning of semester. Down to small handful of vacancies remaining, and starting appointment of members of new committees. Looking for members for new committees – LGBTQ Committee and Faculty Disabilities Concerns – call will go out shortly for nominations and self-nominations. Council on Diverse Constituencies will be comprised of members of these committees.

Question about UTPAC appointments – no word on Kevin Delaney’s appointments to UTPAC.

Faculty Thoughts on Stadium Issue:

President Jones discussed some background on this issue. No official proposals have yet come to the BOT. Some discussion with Jeremy Jordan (the Faculty Athletics Representative) about this issue. Some discussion with Jordan about reconstituting the PACIA – Presidential Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Q: David Elesh (CLA): We have been told that the cost of this new stadium would not be a cost to the university budget. What about the costs of maintenance and challenges to the building of the stadium? South Dakota State University applies 2% of the construction costs similar to other buildings.

A: Theoretically, it would pay for itself, but it is unclear whether this has happened in practice. Hopefully if and when a proposal comes forward it will address this information.

Q: Steve Newman (CLA): At the last faculty senate meeting numerous questions were raised. In particular, to what degree has the community been consulted? What prior examples do we have of stadia of this size and in light of our competition in terms of revenue? Empirical data are welcome for similar projects.

A: Hopefully the proposal will include this information.

Q: Scott Gratson (SMC): It is also essential to gauge the student reaction to the proposed stadium. We have a responsibility to find out what the student body’s views are about this and it is unclear that they have been included in this discussion.

A: We do not know of any survey data on this topic. The example of selected student sports that were proposed for dissolution highlights the importance of not ignoring this constituency.

Q: Casey Breslin (CPH): Philadelphia Magazine this morning wrote a short article highlighting community dissatisfaction with the proposed stadium last night.

A: The representativeness of this perspective is unclear. Representative Clarke and Mayor-Elect Kenney will need to weigh in.

Jones suggested word is that decision has been made. PACIA serves at the pleasure of the President and hasn’t been called. BOT Athletics Subcommittee meeting will take place next week. Perhaps events will happen during Winter break.

New Business

Jim Korsh (CST): football stadium symbolic of things getting done at Temple without faculty input. We should state clearly that we are not happy with this (or lack of involvement in this process).

President Jones wished everyone a very Happy Holiday season and New
Year! Shared a private concern – hard to talk about issues wherein people are particularly emotionally invested. This body should involve civil discourse and fair process. She was not sure we have risen to this level. If we don’t respect each other, how can we expect others on campus to respect us. If you have any suggestions on facilitating this we would love to hear them.

Call to Adjourn:

Meeting adjourned at 3:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Sachs, Secretary

Faculty Senate Election Results - Spring 2016

Total Votes: 123

OFFICERS:
Senate President
Michael Sachs, College of Public Health
Senate Vice President
Elvis Wagner, College of Education
Senate Secretary
Susan B. Dickey, College of Public Health

ELECTED COMMITTEES:
Educational Programs and Policies Committee:
Robin Mitchell-Boyask

Senate Personnel Committee:
Harold Klein, Fox School of Business and Management
Tricia S. Jones, School of Media and Communication

University Honors Program Oversight Committee:
Vallorie Peridier, College of Engineering
Claudia Pine-Simon, College of Science and Technology
Matthew Wray, College of Liberal Arts

University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee A: Humanities and the Arts:
Fred Duer, School of Theater, Film and Media Arts

University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee C: Social Sciences and Business:
Cornelius Pratt, School of Media and Communication
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, February 26, 2016

Representative Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, February 26, 2016 – 1:45 PM
Kiva Auditorium

Minutes

Attendance:
Representative senators and officers: 23
Ex-officios: 0
Faculty, Administrators and guests: 17
WebEx: 14

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

Agenda approved unanimously.

Approval of January 25, 2016 Minutes
The minutes from January 25, 2016 were approved unanimously.

President’s Report
President Neil Theobald will join us for our next Faculty Senate Meeting, March 23rd, (Wednesday), KIVA Auditorium to discuss stadium issues.

President Theobald is meeting with Collegial Assemblies as these can be scheduled throughout the semester to discuss stadium issues.

Council on Diverse Constituencies Fall 2016/Spring 2017 Symposium
CSoW, FOC, LGBTQIA, Abilities, International Programs eSFF Committee meeting – Numerous issues discussed:
Response rates (average of 61.5% response rate)
Multi-modal teaching evaluations/peer evaluations – so that eSFFs are not only evaluation tool being used
Administration processes for “unconventional courses” (e.g., 7 week courses)
Please let us know if you have concerns to be addressed by this committee.

Esteemed guests this semester to date:
Istvan Varkonyi, Director of General Education (Gen Ed and possible Summit)
SVP Peter R. Jones
Brooke Walker, Vice Dean of International Students, Division of Student Affairs
Affairs Bargaining Units Liaison Committee
Met this week, Discussions about Contract Process, Regular reporting to FSSC and via to Senate. Ongoing meetings with Temple Administration;
Sharing Senate focus on giving voice to full-time faculty during this process

Faculty Senate Steering Committee has approved processes to provide full-time faculty voice
Discussion blog (on this and other issues) to be opened on Faculty Senate website

March meeting discussion

Private generation of questions

Invitation for responses from TAUP and Temple Administration

Vice-President’s Report
The following appointments were made for senate committees. Thanks to all for their service.

Bargaining Unit Liaison Committee: Bernie Newman, Jim Korsh, and Trish Jones

Committee for International Programs: Daniel Berman, Elvis Wagner, Hiram Aldarondo, Xuebin Qin, and Wilbert J. Roget.

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color: Rafael Porrata-Doria and Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon
Committee on the Status of Women: Donna Snow
Library Committee: Robert Shuman and Donna Snow
Senate Budget Review Committee: Barry Berger and Kenneth Thurman

Student Award Selection Committee: Maia Cucchiara
March 7th deadline for nominations for Faculty Senate elected offices.
Discussion of the General Education “Technology” Course
Guest: Senior Vice Provost Peter R. Jones

Provided full context for Tech course. Two years ago there was an external review of GenEd. Generally positive feedback. Some comments. One point was too overly prescriptive, too many rules. Also, GenEd was 11 areas with no choices, other areas should be looked at (such as technology). Two areas were Technology area and Public Health area. Jones asked Istvan Varkonyi to get ball rolling. He got two faculty with varied backgrounds to develop course. These two faculty (one from CLA, one from CST) got funding for summer stipend, went to conferences and campuses to explore course options.

Came back with two options. Traditional course from one college. Second course (which Stanford and MIT would do now if could) would provide module structure from across disciplines. Coding one module for 4 weeks and 5 modules each for 2 weeks, with multiple choices within modules.

Provost expressed interest in traditional course as well as module interdisciplinary course (which Jones asked to be developed). Both are being developed and ideally will be available for fall 2016 and spring 2017 to test out. In old days courses came to GEEC then back to college. Last few years to college first and then to GEEC. It is important to add that the process for courses that cross colleges requires taking the course to GEEC then to EPPC and that the way this course is being handled is no different than other cross college courses that have been handled in the past.

Ideally course would be available for the fall to be ready for current registration period and available for fall, 2016.

Small offerings (one or two section options, not many students – perhaps 75 in one). Even with this, it would be 2/3 years from comment to put idea into availability.

Course is multidisciplinary, so not ‘owned’ by any one college.
Would need a person to be in charge of overall course (for module course).
Pedagogically unusual for us, but Jones wants the ideas and pedagogy to drive course, not organization of University.

Workload can be divided up by module and semester and is workable. Similarly, revenue can be divided up across colleges.
Innovative course is very appealing.
Discussions on how to adapt eSFFs for courses with many modules – this will be needed for the innovative course developed.

Mini-modules being developed for the course. CLA faculty explained different general categories to be included in the course (with mini-modules under the general categories). Two week micro-courses (mini-modules) within larger course structure.
Will run two versions – the one with five two-week modules and one four-week module as well as a more traditional, more science oriented course with one four-week and three three-week modules will also be offered.
Actual content in mini-modules remains to be finalized (in response to a question from Art Hochner (FSBM). Hopeful this could be a model of sorts for future courses.

Steve Newman (CLA) – compliments to designers. Perhaps in both Science and Technology and Human Behavior areas within Gen Ed. In fall 2016 will probably have only 2-3 modules within each general category – could add more modules later. Students follow individual path through course, choosing modules of interest. Perhaps modules will be hybrid/on-line. Need to bring faculty together to make sure in sync on Gen Ed goals, etc.

Jeffrey Solow (BCMD) – how grade each module which then goes into final grade? How credit people who teach it? These assessment questions are still being discussed. Bring faculty together to discuss/decide this. Credit might be 1/7th for a two-week module and/or 7 times during the semester for a full course load.

Gregory Irwin (CLA) – concerned that PowerPoint of table of course structure not available. Concern with empty seats in Kiva. A toothless body that cannot provide feedback. President Jones noted that the chart provided is simply a visual to indicate basic module structure and the language labels inserted are simply filler (reinforcing Peter Jones statement). She indicated
that it was her decision to ask Peter Jones to present this visual and since it
did not contain substantive content for discussion and decision, it was not
important to provide it prior to the meeting. Concern about approval process
of courses. This course may have taken a different route reflecting complexi-
ties of such a course. This is something we need to consider in terms of
approval processes. Love to have room filled, but do so by having substantive
issues/decisions. WebEx does provide additional opportunities for partic-
ipation.

Peter Jones noted difficulties of having innovative courses within current
framework. Going down a new path means engaging different constituencies
in new ways. Trying to be sure faculty are involved in development of such
a course. Challenges of doing this in an RCM environment!

Maria Lorenz (CST) – from students’ point of view – where in Gen Ed
requirement. Option in one of the Science and Technology of Human Be-
havior areas.

Question – What can we do to accelerate the process of developing/approving
such a course – technology is moving along so quickly. Peter
Jones noted that developing such a course gives a roadmap for future innova-
tive courses. Wish could do it faster but there are constraints within college/
Gen Ed model.

President Jones - FSSC will propose a task force on course innovation.
What options do we have for expediting process as well as facilitating inno-
vative course development? President Jones noted intensely that Administra-
tion has sought/honored faculty input at every level for this course.

Istvan Varkonyi (Director of Gen Ed) summed up progress of course
within Gen Ed review committee. Initially no content, so content was re-
quested. Now committee has six mini-modules to review for course content
to be reviewed after Spring Break.

Discussion about General Process Questions on Adjunct Faculty Con-
tract Negotiation

Questions about process (not arguments) for TAUP/Administration. Index
cards distributed efficiently by Vice President Davey for provision of ques-
tions.

Art Hochner offered opportunity to answer questions for TAUP. Brief
report TAUP offered at Liaison Committee. One, amending TAUP bylaws.
Not sure when changes will be placed for a vote. Process will involve indi-
viduals and small groups – all 700 TAUP members. Getting interaction, get
questions. Two, not sure when negotiations will begin. Survey being con-
ducted on issues for adjuncts as well as other college adjunct contracts.

Hopefully (no promises) constitution/bylaw changes for vote by end of se-
mester as well as sit with management and start negotiating on contract is-
sues by end of semester. No negotiating team yet – adjuncts, as well as ten-
ure track and non-tenure track members on team.

TAUP (Steve Newman) will not take a vote during the summer.

President Jones – Faculty Senate represents all faculty and interested in
sharing questions from all faculty with TAUP and Administration.

Art Hochner reinforced TAUP Constitution only provides for voting during
fall/spring academic year. No stealth changes taking place.

Suggestion that town hall meetings preferable to one to one conversations –
open forum to express points and share discussion.

Old Business
No old business presented.

New Business
Steve Newman (CLA) – question about how faculty and students are being
protected with students going through difficult times. Some concerns ex-
pressed by students and faculty. President Jones said will bring this back up
to FSSC.

Michael Jackson (STHM) – noted e-mail from James Creedon on Cleery
Report and request for information. Keep eyes open – we are biggest pre-
venters of crime.

Gregory Irwin – does FSSC keep minutes. Answer - posted on web site.
Those minutes are public information. Could also send out via listserv if
desirable. Does President Jones think she violated resolution by allowing
Peter Jones PowerPoint without prior distribution? President Jones felt she
did not violate the resolution (note earlier information that this PowerPoint
slide was simply a visual aid not a document with substantive content). Sen-
ate has done a pretty good job getting PP out before meetings.

Call to Adjourn - 3:12. Unanimously approved.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is Wednesday, March 23rd, in Kiva Audii-
torium.

Respectfully submitted, Michael Sachs, Secretary

Honoring Our Retirees

In recognition of their service and in appreciation of their many contributions to Temple University, we record here the names of those who have or will be
retiring during the 2015–2016 academic year.

December 2015
Anthony J. Bocchino, Beasley School of Law (Emeritus)
Sheldon R. Brivic, College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)
Alexander Fiorillo, Center for the Cinematics & Performing Arts/BOYER (Emeritus)
Nikki V. Franke, College of Public Health (Emeritus)
H. Donald Hopkins, Fox School of Business and Management
Jatinder S. Mehta, College of Science and Technology (Emeritus)
Howard A. Myrick, School of Media and Communication (Emeritus)
Catherine C. Schifte, College of Education (Emeritus)

January 2016
Larry Z. Koren, Kornberg School of Dentistry (Emeritus)
Jon B. Suzuki, Kornberg School of Dentistry (Emeritus)
Allan L. Truant, Lewis Katz School of Medicine (Emeritus)

June 2016
Theodore W. Burkhardt, College of Science and Technology (Emeritus)
David R. Dalton, College of Science and Technology (Emeritus)
Alice Drueding, Tyler School of Art (Emeritus)
David B. Elesh, College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)
Dieter Forster, College of Science and Technology (Emeritus)
Sherrl L. Grasmuck, College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)

February 2016
Catherine C. Schifte, College of Education (Emeritus)

Clara S. Haigener, College of Public Health (Emeritus)
David L. Margules, College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)
Muriel C. Morisey, Beasley School of Law (Emeritus)
Jagbir Singh, Fox School of Business and Management (Emeritus)
David A. Sonenshein, Beasley School of Law (Emeritus)
Teresa Scott Soufas, College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)
Charles Christopher Soufas, Jr., College of Liberal Arts (Emeritus)
Alan M. Stark, Kornberg School of Dentistry (Emeritus)
Judith E. Tallichet, Tyler School of Art (Emeritus)
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Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee
Academic Year 2015-16

The current members of the committee are:

Steven Balsam, FSBM, 1-5574, steven.balsam@temple.edu, '17***
Barry Berger, PHARM, 267-468-8565, barry.berger@temple.edu, '19**
Jane Evans, ART, 8-9738, jane.evans@temple.edu, '17**
James Korsh, CST (FSSC Rep), 1-8199, korsh@temple.edu, '17
Catherine Panzarrella, CLA, 1-7324, panzarrella@temple.edu, '19**
Rafael Porrata-Doria, LAW, 1-7694, porrata1@temple.edu, '19***
Bruce Rader, FSBM, 1-5231, brader@temple.edu, '19***
Kenneth Thurman, COE, 1-6018, kenneth.thurman@temple.edu, '19**
Nancy Turner, Libr., 1-3260, nancy.turner@temple.edu, '17

During this academic year, the principal work of the Committee involved coordination with CFO Ken Kaiser, his staff and other senior administrators in connection with the new budgeting system that has been implemented by the University.

The new budgeting system includes a process in which two faculty members participate in the budget conferences held between the Provost, CFO and the colleges and administrative revenue centers. The first such conferences took place this year, and two members of the Committee participated as faculty representatives in all of these budget conferences.

We also met several times with CFO Ken Kaiser and his staff to discuss next year’s university budget.

Lastly, we also met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and another faculty group during the spring semester to analyze, explain and discuss the new university budgeting system.

Respectfully submitted,
Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., Chair

Report of the Course and Teaching Evaluation Committee
(AY 2015-16) to the Faculty Senate

Membership:
Faculty committee members are appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Staff members are appointed by the Provost.

SFF COMMITTEE
Peter Jones, Chair
prjones@temple.edu
UStudies 1-2044

Ina L. Calligaro
calligaro@temple.edu
PHARM 2-4967

Mary Conran
mary.conran@temple.edu
FSBM 1-8152

James Degnan
degnan@temple.edu
IRA 1-4643

Kevin Delaney*
kdelaney@temple.edu
FA&FD 1-3745

Joseph Ducette
jducette@temple.edu
ED 1-4998

Stephanie Fiore*
sfiore@temple.edu
TLC 1-8761

Steven Fleming
sfleming@temple.edu
CST 1-0359

Sally Frazee
sfrazee@temple.edu
IRA 1-8685

Patricia Hansell
phansell@temple.edu
CLA 1-1417

Bernic Newman
bnewman@temple.edu
SSA 1-1205

Michele O’Connor
mocoom05@temple.edu
USTudies 1-0550

Daniel Spaeth
spaceman@temple.edu
CST 1-6772

Dolores Zygmont
zygmont@temple.edu
CHP 2-3789

* New member 2015-16

Chair:
The Course and Teaching Evaluation (CATE-SFF) Committee is a joint faculty and staff committee charged with advising the President and Provost about matters related to the evaluation of teaching at the University, particularly regarding Student Feedback Forms (SFFs) and the implementation of the university’s policy on course and teaching evaluations: http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy_no=02.78.14. The Committee formulates studies and evaluates data on the evaluation of teaching and makes recommendations regarding the methods, approaches, assessment documents and logistics related to course and teaching evaluations.

Meetings:
The committee met twice in the Fall and twice in the Spring semester. In addition SFF materials were reviewed and discussed via email where possible.

Issues Addressed and Decisions/Actions taken:
Committee membership – size, turnover, representativeness. Faculty Senate Committees normally have tenure of 3 years. Most faculty representatives of CATE-SFF Committee have been serving for far longer than three years. The value of long service on the committee was recognized.

Member – it was agreed the Chair would continue the practice of inviting members at the beginning of each academic year to indicate if they wished to continue or end their service. The committee agreed to add at least 1 undergraduate and 1 graduate student, and additional faculty members could join the committee beginning next academic year.

Chairmanship - It was agreed that the CATE-SFF Committee would hold a formal election for Chair from within the committee at the end of each academic year.

SFF response rates - the 61% response rate for SFFs during Fall 2015 and 58% for Spring 2016 were seen as evidence that response rates for online SFFs were healthy.

Faculty ability to respond to comments on SFFs - changes to the faculty SFF form were being made to include a text field allowing an instructor to indicate at the time of completion any relevant events, experiences or situations that they felt were pertinent context to overall assessment of SFF results in the class for which feedback was being sought. It was agreed that direct response to comments in SFFs was impractical given the significant task of collating and processing instructor responses, and of reviewing, verifying, editing etc. It was agreed that instructors who wished to respond directly to comments made in SFFs should do so as part of their submission of results, rather than as part of the formal SFF process.

SFF processes for 7-week or alternate scheduled courses (not full semester) - Sally Frazee noted that IR was developing ways in which part of term, late start or early completion courses could all be included in the general eSFF process.

Impact of electronic administration on qualitative responses - Joseph Ducette and James Degnan summarized the national research on student responses to open text questions within eSFF protocols. In general, the research shows that with online administration the number of responses is lower than achieved in paper based administrations, but the quality and substance of the responses is generally improved. It was agreed by all faculty present that this was their personal experience at Temple.
Faculty Senate Annual Committee Reports

Course and Teaching Evaluation Report continued from page 13

Need for more multi modal teaching evaluation - TLC and SFF committee are developing guidelines for peer review based on best practices. The use of peer review in addition to SFFs was noted by the SFF Committee in its White Paper of 2011. When the “best practices” committee review is complete the SFF committee will recommend to the provost a review and update of current policy on Course and Teaching Evaluations (02.78.14) to include peer review.

The committee implemented changes to content and access of SFF forms. Changes involved:

Instructor SFF form reduced to just two questions.
Continued development of SFF online site that provides students with limited access to SFF results on 4 questions (selected by the CATE committee) for the last 8 semesters/summer sessions. Data are available during the first semester for all incoming first year students and transfers. Continued access is available only to students who complete SFFs for all their courses in the preceding semester.

The committee agreed that a Dean’s designee from each school/college should be given online access to the same (4 questions) SFF data that is made available to eligible students. Upon request these same data would be provided in a format suitable for analytic purposes.

Amended policy that restricted SFFs process from being available to students in courses with 8 or fewer registered students to courses with 5 or fewer students.

Made recommendations on procedures for handling cross listed courses. During paper administration of SFFs it was not possible to associate any specific response with any specific course in a cross list. As a result the total response set was grouped and counted for each of the separate courses in the cross list (including cross lists of undergraduate and graduate courses). Electronic administration enables each individual response to be assigned to the appropriate course in the cross list. This allows for the grouped results to be reported only once and not for each course in the cross list.

Recommended that text responses to each open ended SFF question be grouped for reporting purposes to instructor into one section rather than current practice of reporting as separate, individual forms.

Recommended that a Dean’s designee from each school/college should be given access to the same selected (4 questions) SFF data that is made available to eligible students. Upon request these same data would be provided in a format suitable for analytic purposes.

Faculty Senate Status of Women Committee Meeting

Monday, April 25, 2016
President’s Suite 1:00 -2:00 p.m.
(The meeting is scheduled to begin after the luncheon with our guest speaker Dr. Valerie Harrison, and other guests)
Agenda
1. Call to Order
2. Minutes (January meeting)
3. Chair’s Report
   ● Diversity Conference Spring 2017 – WS will be represented. We need representatives to work with the Diversity Conference. Those who can seriously devote time should consider and contact Nilgun.
   ● Thank you to the President of the Senate - Tricia Jones, and Cheryl Mack for sponsoring and helping us organize the Spring luncheon.
   ● Focus point for FSSW committee in 2017: Mentorship and volunteering for mentoring; training; brainstorming about how to increase numbers of female faculty among trustees
   ● Introducing (or matching) junior faculty to senior faculty. Need for training in these areas.
5. Child Care and TAUP communication reports – Leora and Bernie
6. Old Business
7. New Business: Focusing on mentorship, training in tenure and promotion; and establishing a network among similar committees in the area colleges.
8. Call to Adjourn

Faculty Senate Status of Women - Spring 2016 Minutes
January 27, 12-1 pm.
Chair: Nilgun Anadolu-Okur

Agenda:
- Selecting Volunteer Representatives for Child Care Committee and TAUP communication:
- Bernie and Leora volunteered.

Attending members:
Michael W. Jackson, Angela Bricker, Leora Eisenstadt, Pei-Chun Hsieh, Elizabeth Matthew, Bernie Newman and Beth Pfeiffer.

Chair: This particular meeting was planned in order to go over some of the issues we have been discussing since September and recapping certain topics, including Child-care, and mentoring at TU. The list includes the following items that were brought forth:
- The Child Care committee’s report needs to be further investigated and communication established with the committee in order to provide insight for our future deliberations.
- Most of the work on child care is done by the Child Care Committee.
- Mentoring should start when someone is first hired. (Beth)
- An inquiry into how students rate international/ethnic/minority female faculty at student evaluations. (Leora)
- Local community around the university was always willing to integrate with TU. (Michael)
- FMLA – how does it apply to mothering?
- "As a mother I want to know how other universities do with child care issues. " (Elizabeth)
- "If we have a question or an issue, we can take it to the Senate meetings. They want to hear from us." (Michael)
- "The plans for the first Brown Bag series is postponed. The plan is to bring a speaker from the Union to speak about Work-Life Balance issue." (Leora)
- "A detailed summary was provided by Michael about "the old days" at TU. Learning Laboratory, during the late 1980s, and early 1990s. We had Day care, Kindergarten, Music program, Basketball camp. LIABILITY issues stopped these opportunities." (Michael)
- "Our children attended these schools and daycare centers which were rewarding for all." (Bernie and Nilgun) Additional concerns were raised on salary differences, merit pay, multinational faculty’s needs, sabbatical leaves, new hires and promotion opportunities for female faculty. The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m. The next meeting will be scheduled for late April or early May. Minutes: Nilgun Anadolu-Okur

BIO-SKETCH
Dr. Valerie Harrison Sr. Advisor to the President for Compliance
Valerie I. Harrison first joined Temple’s Office of University Counsel in 1999. An alum of the Morgan Lewis Labor and Employment Practice and former senior counsel to Joseph E. Seagram & Sons and ARCO Chemical Company, Valerie came to academia inspired by her desire to connect young people to educational opportunities. Valerie returned to Temple in 2015, after 19 years at Morgan Lewis.

Dr. Harrison earned her bachelor’s degree in economics from the University of Virginia, her juris doctorate from Temple University’s School of Law, and a master’s degree in liberal arts and a doctor of philosophy degree in African-American Studies, both from Temple University. A native Philadelphia, Valerie remains active in her local community. She has served on a number of local boards, and currently serves as Chair of the Board of the Art Sanctuary, an organization that uses Black Art to serve some of the most under-resourced Philadelphia communities, and to bring people together in a way that erases differences. She also is a member of the Roger Williams University School of Law Board of Directors. Valerie is the co-author and co-editor of Color Him Father: Stories of Love & Rediscovery of Black Men, a collection of short stories published in 2006.
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Committee on Disability Concerns Annual Report, 2015-2016

Respectfully submitted by: S. Kenneth Thurman, Chair

This committee was newly formed and became operational only during the spring 2016 semester. Consequently there is not a whole lot to report. The committee met twice, once in March and again in May. These meetings were helpful in allowing the members to become acquainted with each other, selecting terms, selecting a chair and beginning to formulate a series of issues to be addressed in the fall. In addition, the committee began to do some data gathering to begin to identify the number of faculty and students who are currently receiving accommodations related to their disabilities. Come fall, the committee plans to meet on a regular basis, likely once a month. Early in the next semester we plan to further flesh out our goals and agenda. Moreover, we will invite Deirdre Walton from HR to come and discuss the procedures by which faculty can seek accommodations. We are also hopeful that we will be able early in the fall to identify one undergraduate and one graduate student to be members of the committee as stipulated in the motion that established the committee. Hopefully by this time next year we will be able to report on some substantive outcomes accomplished by the committee.

The following people are members of the committee:

S. Kenneth Thurman, Chair
Michael Sachs
Richard Pommerantz
Debra Blair
Susan Bertolino
Jeromy Stivek
Aaron Spector, ex officio

Council on Diverse Constituencies Meeting
Monday, February 22, 2016, 11:00 am-12:00 pm
Conference room 404, 4th floor Conwell Hall

Attending: Marie Amey-Taylor, COE, Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color; Nilgun Anadolu-Okur, CLA, Committee on the Status of Women; Mary Conran, FSBM, Committee for International Programs; Scott Gratson, SMC, Committee on Faculty LGBTQ Issues; Tricia Jones, SMC and Senate President; Erin Tucker, STHM, Committee on the Status of Women
Unable to Attend: Kenneth Thurman, COE, Committee on Faculty Abilities Concerns

Tricia Jones convened the first meeting of the Council on Diverse Constituencies and presided over the meeting.

Outline of first Diversity Symposium:
Highlights of the first event were the guest facilitator from the University of Hawaii. Also in attendance were a number of members of the Board of Trustees and Mayor Michael Nutter gave a presentation. There were also a few performances pieces but the main highlight was the round-robin kiosks where attendees answered questions about diversity and filled out comment cards. There were 4,000+ cards with comments collected. A lot of good data but the information gathered has not been analyzed yet. This was a highly successful event and so would like to do it again.

Intent:
The goal for the next one would be what came out of the first Diversity Symposium so the analysis is important. Amey-Taylor mentioned that there was a research person assigned by VP for Research, Masucci to process the information. Jones stated that Masucci did not assign someone; this was initially going to come from Betsy Leebrohn’s area but did not work out. The FSSC and Senate had made the decision last spring to go forward with Diversity 2.0 this year but did not get the budget information in time so decided on fall 2016.

Planning:
We now want to include all the diverse committees. Wants Council to have more of a voice in the process. Jones is only convening the committee; Council will have discussions and conduct planning for event. Wants all diverse committees and have a planning process. Faculty of Color Committee really led the way and did a good job. They are still central but also all of you; all committees represented plus maybe two other committees may be involved. But more is needed in the way of planning and function across all constituencies with an emphasis on carrying an agenda forward.

Order of Business:
Elect a chair for committee: Jones is only convener so committee should elect a chair
Open your conversation with thoughts for the next symposium
Charge for the Council. What other kinds of things would you like to do? What else should Council be doing in addition to the initial charge for the committee (attached).

Introductions:
- Erin Tucker (STHM), committee on status of women representative
- Scott Gratson (SMC), Committee on Faculty LGBTQ Issues representative
- Nilgun Anadolu-Okur (CLA), Chair of Committee on status of Women
- Marie Amey-Taylor (COE) Committee on Status of Faculty of Color (and ACCORD)
- Mary Conran (FSBM) Interim Chair of Committee for International Programs
- Tricia Jones (SMC) President of the Faculty Senate and convener of Council meeting
- Cheryl Mack (Senate Office) Admin. Coord. (note-taker)

Unable to attend today: Ken Thurman (COE) representative for the Committee for Faculty Abilities Concerns

Process:
Each constituent gives a brief outline of his or her committee and its work
Mary Conran, Committee for International Programs:
Everyone else on a committee that represents faculty interests. International Programs is a committee that represents, promotes International Programs for students. It is different from this group. Focus is mainly students
Jones: First symposium had diversity with faculty, staff and students so this committee is relevant. LGBTQ would be faculty but also students.

Conran: Study abroad and international students. The student population is increasing abroad. Has had a shortage of funds but it’s now working out. Efforts for student coming in with needs. Offer resources, prepare English, and joining programs; have more graduate students coming in. Brooke Walker is a resource for help. On the export side there has been a shortage of resources but it now everything back to equilibrium and now working on tightening systems. Working with colleges. It is a well-established committee. We also run the Temple Global Conference in November. Anadolu-Okur: is there a committee or group or committee that represents international faculty? There is not one.

Jones: wants to add another part for international faculty for the International Programs committee. There are so many points of intersection for this council. Jones thinks Anadolu-Okur’s point would be good for the symposium. Anadolu-Okur: International students concern--students in need of guidance when they arrive, feel more comfortable with international faculty, especially if they’re from that region. Mentorship would be very helpful for those students mentoring program.

This is the real power of this Council, because there is so much intersection between the work.

Work of committees. Faculty, staff and students is the (focus?) of committee, might serve that purpose so even you might want to do something in the symposium that picks that thread up. Great idea.

Marie Amey Taylor, Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color:
Representing two groups, FoC and ACCORD; others for Faculty of Color were not available during this time. Faculty of Color has long history; worked hard to be inclusive of all. In terms of definition of what a person of color is and some of the programming they hope to offer. ACCORD (Academic Center on Research in Diversity) is the brainchild for former Provost Lisa Staino-Coico. Faculty committee who would look into research issues as relates to diversity. Initially as VP for HR she was support from an administrative aspect. Has been a diversity practitioner for 40+ years; does training, coaching and other support in diversity which is defined as broadly as humanly possible or, to cite a 1927 quote, “a culmination of ways in which we are like all, like some others and like no other.” Cover race, gender, sex orientation, age, ability, geographical difference, language is ACCORD mission and inclusive. Also very much involved with FOC.

Anadolu-Okur: Do people become members to ACCORD?
Yes, people join. There was an open house recently. They are now affiliated with the committee. Anadolu-Okur: Do people become members to ACCORD?
Yes, people join. There was an open house recently. They are now affiliated with the committee.
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with IDEAL (Institutional Diversity, Equity, Advocacy and Leadership) and now have a home. Has support of Richard Englert and others.
Anadolu-Okur: some of us are unaware of ACCORD; don’t know what they do and don’t think they are able to reach all of us. Would love to be a member. Some in the department don’t know ACCORD. There is a website (https://sites.temple.edu/researchdiversity/), open houses and conferences for student and faculty. Hoping for more collaboration. Jones: one agenda item should be something like this; there are a lot of resources that people don’t know about.
Anadolu-Okur, Committee on the Status of Women:
First meeting, fall 2015; two meetings per semester. First issue was focused on childcare and eldercare around campus. There was a period of inactivity; low membership but was revived. Now there are 12 members who attend regular meetings. The last meeting had 10 attendees. Scheduled to have another meeting in April. Other issues that the committee is considering are mentoring for junior faculty for issues such as merit, or promotion. There are no set rules for this; everyone is on their own to do this. We need a consensus. This will be voluntary; senior professors for junior faculty and those on tracks. It is a good thing to do – offer encouragement. Assist with issues such as, faculty who may be upset about something or have a grievance and just need someone with whom to talk. The feeling of fear needs to be addressed. Also issues of equal pay, promotion, and just gathering ideas. Will have better ideas as of fall 2016 semester.
Scott Gratson, Committee on Faculty LGBTQ Issues:
First meeting of the committee is scheduled for March 7th. Currently gathering information from student groups and others. Will be meeting with staff members next week. Temple University is leagues behind other peer institutions on this issue. LGBTQ students feel burdened. Issues (outline) for the committee will be:
- What is the overall climate on campus concerning LGBTQ on campus? There was a survey in 2011
- Communication among the groups, and linking the groups together. There is no group on campus that focuses on or deals with LGBTQ concerns.
- Trying to link faculty, staff and student about the concerns.
Met with the president of Temple Student Government and “Welcome Week” LGBTQ group. There is a group, “OUTLaw” in the Law School which represented the Law School students’ LGBTQ group
The basic goals (?) for the group is 1- more collaboration; 2- more information; 3- removing much of the student burden; 4- finding out to create more sense of inclusion like at other institutions
Tricia Jones-Committee for Faculty Abilities Concerns:
Never had a faculty group to speak to faculty challenges at the university, for instance, access to resources that help to do their job, teaching research. Do not have an individual for faculty. Need to have 508 compliant materials to conduct research. The Senate Executive Committee has been meeting with CIO candidates and has discussed the issues with them. No one is leading the initiative of helping faculty who have these needs. Faculty who have difficulty with assignments, teaching resources and issues that haven’t been looked at. Thurman has a group and they will be meeting soon. Also want to note that Eli Goldblatt (CLA) proposed this Council; this was his idea. Group thanked the Faculty Senate for putting out the call for this group. Jones: There was no opposing voice, everyone on the FSSC was supportive as with the symposium; the first vote of the semester was for Diversity 2.0. Suggestions for Chair of the Committee:
The role of the chair will be: to convene the committee meetings; liaison for the committee and the FSSC
There are six committees so there will be one liaison from each group. Major focus: Connection, support, initiate planning committee for Diversity Symposium 2.0
The Council would also have the ability to expand or alter the committee charge (attached) in negotiation with the FSSC. Council to have monthly or bi-monthly report to the FSSC--prefer monthly. Also give a report at the regular Senate meetings. Committee should convene up to the end of the year. Jones could convene meeting and then you could conduct the committee business.
Conran expressed that is a very busy time to take on more tasks. Jones has agreed to be the convener. There was a question asked about how long is the life span for the committee. This is a permanent committee, not an ad-hoc.
Clarification of Diversity Symposium
Jones: wants the symposium to reflect all diversity throughout the university. Faculty Senate committees led the way in initial planning and ours did most of the lifting in getting it going. Wants it to be representative of all divisions working around the university; the Temple community and administration. What are the thoughts of this Council? We want that to be heard as we bring in others in the planning process.
Need to consider dates and venue. There was the suggestion that this should be done as soon as possible. One possibility is the Howard Gittis Student Center. This venue is easier to manage and has break out rooms, etc. Perhaps change the date from the fall semester because of holidays, etc. Had planned for Fall 2016 but could change to Spring 2017 if more time is needed. General agreement that Spring 2017 would be best so that there is time to plan, build, and reach out to other groups. Amey-Taylor mentioned that there was some commitment to the Temple Community to do something this year. There is a workshop on “Microaggressions” scheduled in March. Organized, supported by ACCORD and IDEAL and possibly Faculty of Color and the Blockson Collection and maybe Disability Resources (not sure). Knows that Diversity 2.0 could not happen in Spring 2016 but wants to continue with something to continue the dialogue. Microaggressions is a universal topic.
Jones was not aware of the workshop. This is part of the difficulty in order to get resources from the Provost; letting people know what is going on, what is planned for so everyone knows. Amey-Taylor believes the Provost office knows since IDEAL reports to them. Anadolu-Okur doesn’t know about the symposium; no one received the invitation. Who is arranging this and how can we be a part of it? Amey-Taylor will forward the invitation.
Tucker teaches a Meetings and Conventions class and offered to let the students service the event. Offered the help of the class as a resource to help with logistics and planning. Perhaps with support we can do the event in the fall.
Jones: the issue is money. She didn’t get the invitation either. Would help to get budgets. Needs to know what’s going on so that we can plan for these things. If the FOC is supporting this, we would like to get word out to the faculty.
Amey-Taylor will make sure everyone gets invitation. Also outlined plan for the group.
Question of how received funding for last event? Jones asked Provost for funding and he gave. Stated he cannot always promise last-minute funding. Needs to be added to winter budget request cycle which is now (for the following year).
February/March: broad outline for symposium and budgetary goal. Last time it was $8,000--small. This time maybe $20,000-$25,000 to do more and bring in more speakers this is on top of regular Faculty Senate budget. (Noon: CM left meeting, Anadolu-Okur continued notes)
COUNCIL OF DIVERSE CONSTITUENCIES
Charge:
1) Facilitating discussion among faculty committees charged with the special concerns for diverse constituencies in the university community;
2) Making recommendations that enhance faculty’s ability to meaningfully include students who identify with groups who have not been adequately represented on campus; and
3) Providing liaison between the faculty and university offices that provide support for diverse constituencies. The committee would include, but not be limited to, the Committee on Faculty of Women of Color, Committee on the Status of Women, the LGBTQ Committee, the International Programs Committee, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Disabilities Concerns.
Composition:
Membership shall consist of six faculty members who represent appropriate Faculty Senate committees, both ad hoc and standing, to serve three-year terms with initial appointments to be staggered with two one-year terms, two two-year terms and two three-year terms. Initial appointees may be reappointed. No appointee may serve more than two consecutive three-year terms.
(Approved by FS December 4, 2015)
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General Education Executive (GEEC) and Area Coordinator Committee

In August 2015 Dana Dawson came on board as the newly appointed GenEd Associate Director. As a result of this, during this academic year the two GenEd (GEEC and the Area Coordinators) committees, which convened together during the previous academic year due to the vacancy of the associate director position, returned to meeting separately.

Each committee: The GenEd Executive as well as the Area Coordinators met for a total of 15 meetings over the course of the academic year, roughly once every two weeks.

Issues Addressed/Discussed by the Committee during the Year:
The Provost charged GEEC to help develop and review a new Technology Literacy course. In the process of developing the course, it became apparent that two pedagogically different courses were needed. GEEC worked diligently to get the two new tech courses approved for piloting during AY 2016-17: “Demystifying Technology,” and “Tech Horizons.”
The Office of Digital Education and GEEC have been working on adapting the Quality Matters standards for GenEd online courses. The GenEd Program will have a standard brand for all of its online courses to be rolled out in AY 2017-18.

The Provost has also charged GEEC to develop a restructured model of the GenEd curriculum. The moratorium for the development of any new courses for the GenEd inventory is still in place.

Decisions and Actions Taken:
GA waiver also granted to the Theater Department (Center for the Arts) so that they are now in alignment with already existing waivers in the Boyer College of Music and the Tyler School of Art, all now within the Center for the Arts.

Approved for piloting during the AY 2016-17 are the following two courses: “Tech Horizons,” and “Demystifying Technology.” Total of eight (8) new courses were approved by GEEC/Area Coordinators and added to the various breadth areas of the curriculum.

As part of a revived internal assessment practices in GenEd, a series of focus groups were implemented over the course of the spring term. Student, faculty, and staff each had separate meetings in order to help inform the future direction of the program.

In May 2016 GEEC’s proposed model will be presented to Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, who will bring it forward for discussion with the Provost.

With the continued new course development moratorium being in place, it was determined, after consulting GEEC and Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost, that the number of area coordinators will be consolidated for the AY 2016-17.

GenEd Course Re-Certification Process:
GEEC has also been actively engaged with the continuation of the GenEd Course Re-certification process. For the academic year under review there are six (6) courses to be evaluated for re-certification. The deadline for the submissions is May 20, 2016.

There were also six (6) courses from the previous academic year (2014-15) which were placed on probation. The departments were asked to submit a plan of action to correct the deficiencies by mid-November 2015. All departments complied. GEEC will be re-evaluating each of these courses this summer based on resubmitted materials. With the assistance of the GenEd area coordinators, GEEC continues to play a central role in maintaining the integrity of the General Education Program.

Among some of the other points of discussion and areas of focus for the committee have been:
Communicating the central role of undergraduate education to university community.
Process for purging some courses in breadth areas.
The role of GEEC in an RCM environment.
The decline of the course learning outcomes as seats ramp up in sections (evidenced by submitted course re-certification documents).
Methods by which GEEC and the Director of GenEd can be more engaged in determining who teaches GenEd courses.
Respectfully submitted by,
Istvan Varkonyi

GenEd Executive Committee /GenEd Area Coordinators AY 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Rank/College</th>
<th>GEEC</th>
<th>Area Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Blair/NTT/STHM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Race &amp; Diversity, GD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Brown/T/Tyler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Gaffney/T/Fox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Human Behavior, GB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Conran/NTT/Fox</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hesson/ NTT/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallorie Perrier/T/Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Technology, QL [GQ, GS])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Latham/T/Boyer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Arts, GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Moore-Martinez/NTT/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(World Society, GG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Walters/T/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Analytical Reading &amp; Writing, GW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Perry/Graduate Student/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Pendergast/TT/Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Schwartz/T/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Intellectual Heritage, GY/GZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Stull/NTT/CST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jensen Varnum/T/CST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(Science, GS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Mancano/NTT/Public Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ingram/NTT/Theater</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Young/NTT/CLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(US Society, GU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Lowe/Honors Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Ketterer/Temple Student Govt.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-voting member on GEEC: Anar Khandvala, Associate Director CLA Advising Unit; Caitlyn Shanley, Paley Library
University Honors-program Oversight Committee (HOC)
Report to the Faculty Senate: May/2016

During the 2015-2016 academic year the University Honors-program Oversight Committee (HOC) met twice in fall and three times in the spring. The committee’s faculty members are: Erik Cordes (biology), Paul Swann (film & media arts), Claudia Pine Simon (computer & information science), Valorie Perider (mechanical engineering) and Lila Corwin Berman (history). The committee also has two at-large members, Therese Dolan (art history) and Peshe Kuriloff (education).

Owing in part to Temple’s extraordinary University Merit Scholarship program, Temple Honors continues to experience particularly rapid growth. At this writing, while the number of paid deposits for the University overall is up nine percent from last year, the corresponding number of paid deposits for incoming freshmen with SAT>1300 is up an impressive thirty-nine percent.

Furthermore, it is good news that Temple University is drawing upon an even more geographically-diverse application pool. Paid deposits to Temple University for non-PA residents is up by nearly twenty-five percent over last year. However, the one-two punch of Temple’s Honors program + Merit Scholarships has proved an especially strong draw for non-PA residents: out-of-state student deposits with SAT>1300 are up nearly forty-eight percent as compared to last year.

This influx of Honors students has put further even greater pressure on the Honors course inventory. Recall that the academic requirements of the Honors program includes the completion of ten Honors courses, with four of these at the 2000 level or higher. The six-course requirement at the lower level is commonly satisfied with Honors Gen-Ed classes. However, the four upper-level Honors courses are often more difficult for students to schedule, and there are two reasons for this. First, Honors courses are capped at twenty students, and it has proved a perennial challenge for the smaller colleges to provide upper-level Honors courses. Second, a sizeable portion of Honors students are in STEM disciplines which: (i) lack upper-level Honors courses in the curriculum, and (ii) have so many programmatic requirements in the major that there is little flexibility for taking upper-level classes outside of the major, Honors or otherwise.

The current Honors-program work-around for students who lack upper-level Honors-course options is a device called "contracts." In an Honors "contract" the student, in lieu of an upper-level Honors class, either: (i) negotiates with the professor of a regular undergraduate class to do extra work, or (ii) takes a graduate course. In either situation the Honors advising staff must monitor the students’ individual compliance with their respective contracts, and the arrangement has administratively ballooned owing the substantial increase of Honors students in STEM where these contracts are especially commonplace.

So in this academic year a substantial portion of HOC’s deliberations was taken up with the question of whether or not the academic requirements for Honors should be modified, given the difficulty in providing upper-level Honors courses. However, a prudent compromise was ultimately settled on that preserves the current academic requirements of the Honors program. It was decided that the Honors program would expand its pre-existing Honors "petition option" to enable students, who cannot complete the Honors Program academic requirements through standard course options, to apply for permission to substitute either an additional contract or a co-curricular-experience waiver.

Additionally, HOC participated in the revision of the Honors Program mission statement, which now more accurately conveys the vision of Dr. Ruth Ost and her extraordinary (and growing) staff of academic advisors.

Respectfully submitted,
Vallorie J. Perider
Associate Professor Mechanical Engineering

LGBTQ Faculty Concerns and Issues Committee Report

The LGBTQ Faculty Concerns and Issues Committee was formed through the Faculty Senate Steering Committee at the end of the fall, 2015 term. Members include: Hiram Aldarondo, Jeffrey Boles, Jeremy Jordan, Carmelo Galati, Robert Bettiker, Richard Pomerantz, Michelle Scarpulla, Michael Sheridan, Jeremy Sivek, and Dorothy Stringer. Initial meetings occurred in February and thereafter in April.

Action Items:
1) Campus Climate: A campus wide survey was conducted in 2011 to ascertain campus inclusion of and attitudes toward the LGBTQ community (results are included here: Temple LGBTQ Inclusion Report). Believing that it is prudent to not only measure Temple's campus climate since 2012 but to also determine future efforts, the committee will be working to conduct a new survey by spring, 2017.
2) Campus Inclusion Efforts: Nationally, college LGBTQ inclusion efforts are assisted by Campus Pride, an independent organization that evaluates the efforts of hundreds of campuses regularly. To date, Temple University has not submitted any materials for evaluation. A submission will be forthcoming in Fall, 2016.
3) Labor Resources: Realizing that collaboration across platforms is vital for increased progress, the committee will be working alongside TAUP to ensure equitable and fair labor practices for LGBTQ faculty members and librarians. A meeting between the chair of the committee and the vice president of TAUP occurred in the spring term, with expectations for increased TAUP and committee collaboration on labor measures.
4) Admissions: Nationally, recruitment efforts have increasingly featured LGBTQ inclusion and programming. Upon meeting with the director of admissions, increased presence by members of the committee will be featured at open houses for prospective students starting in the fall term.
5) Student outreach: Several meetings and conversations occurred with student groups. These groups included QSU (Queer Student Union), QPQC (Queer People of Color), Out Law (LGBTQ Law School Student group), Out TU (welcoming event for LGBTQ students in the fall), and representatives from Temple News. Students expressed concerns over visibility of the LGBTQ community on campus and are hopeful for increased faculty and staff involvement in promoting inclusion efforts both in and outside of the classroom.
6) Student inclusion efforts: A survey to measure levels of LGBTQ awareness and inclusion efforts are underway through the Department of Athletics. Students have also expressed interest in seeing the survey being conducted. The survey is currently under consideration with the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR).
7) Facility inclusion efforts: Committee members discussed the increased need for Temple University to ensure equitable access to physical facilities for transgender members of the campus community.
8) LGBTQA Welcoming Event: Along with the Wellness Center and several organizations on campus, the committee is excited to take part in the 2016 LGBTQA Out TU second annual welcoming event at the start of the new academic term. The committee will be included in a resource guide for incoming students.
9) Cross-Collaboration on Campus: The committee, along with other LGBTQ associations on campus, held an information event at the IDEAL office in April. Additional collaboration is being planned across organizations for the upcoming year. The committee helped sponsor this event following an allocation of $3,000 from the Faculty Senate. The committee discussed additional possible expenditures, including financing the campus climate survey noted above as well as the possibility of other campus wide events.
10) Finally, the committee proposed and the Temple University's Faculty Senate passed the following resolution in response to anti-LGBT legislation from North Carolina and Mississippi. It is our hope that other institutions of learning will do the same. We are proud to stand with our colleagues and the citizens of these states, and hope that our solidarity can bring about much needed change and inclusion.
Whereas: The purpose of a just society is to promote well-being among its citizens while also advocating for a position of inclusion and empowerment; and:

Whereas: Recent legislative measures in the states of North Carolina and Mississippi are targeting the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) community, effectively allowing for discrimination against the LGBT community in the public sphere; and

Whereas: Academic institutions have a responsibility to ensure that all members of a university community are dealt with in a civil and decorous manner; and

Whereas: Current anti-LGBT legislative measures in the States of North Carolina and Mississippi are antithetical to the principles of higher education; and

Whereas: These measures can effectively legitimize discrimination against the LGBT population on campuses of higher education; and

Whereas: Students, faculty, and staff are viable and important members of a community that deserve to be regarded with the same civil rights and safety of other citizens; and

Whereas: The current legislation of North Carolina and Mississippi prohibits the free and safe expression of identity related to sexual orientation and gender identity; and

Whereas: These measures remove the agency of individual communities to enact local legislation; and

Whereas: Communities of scholars are concerned with the impact of this legislation on the experience of campus life; and

Whereas: Institutions within these states, including Duke University, several cultural venues, and international governmental bodies have raised ongoing concerns with the impact of these acts of legislation; so

THEREFORE: On behalf of the Temple University's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns Committee, and the University Faculty Senate stand in solidarity with other academic, civic, and corporate organizations against House Bill 2 of The State of North Carolina and House Bill 1523 of the State of Mississippi.

Vote to appoint new Chair: A vote to elect a new Chair of the Faculty Senate Subcommittee was made at the 1/25/2016 meeting; Mary Conran was unanimously elected as the Chair for the Subcommittee.

Update on Charge: The committee has voted to agree to recommend to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee the following changes to the wording of the committee charge. These revisions are being made to reflect changes in the structure of offices dealing with study abroad and international students, and the creation of the International Affairs unit.

Proposed change to Charge (changes highlighted)
To advise Education Abroad and Overseas Campuses, International Student and Scholar Services, International Student Affairs, and the university community on matters of consequence to Temple students studying abroad, international students studying at Temple campuses, and American students from other universities who wish to study at Temple University campuses abroad.

In addition, the committee will support efforts to infuse an international perspective across the TU curricula through courses, experiences, and learning communities. The committee has advisory, consultative and interpretive roles in serving all the colleges and campuses of Temple University.

Meetings: In fall 2015, subcommittees of the IP met to work on various aspects of Global Temple. In the Spring of 2016, the full-committee met the following dates:

- 1/25/2016
- 2/24/2016
- 3/30/2016
- 4/28/2016

Reports Generated/Reviewed, Issues Addressed, and Actions Taken:
Global Temple Conference Update: The Global Temple Conference was very successful; over 600 students, faculty and staff attended and/or presented. The plenary session was well-received, and the addition of the Global Information Fair worked very well. Plans for the 2016 Global Temple Conference, which will take place on November 9, 2016 (this is an updated date), are underway; highlights of the 2015 conference included (see also infographic):

International Programs Report continued on page 20
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*International Programs Report continued from page 19*

**Status Report on International Students**

International student enrollments continue to increase: 3,264 international students are currently enrolled at Temple, about 60% of those are undergraduate students and 40% are graduate students. About 43% of international students are from China, but the office of International Affairs has made a concerted effort to diversify where students are coming from. Recent recruitment efforts have targeted Vietnam, India, Thailand and Malaysia. There has also been an increase in interest from students in Central America. Unfortunately, the number of students from Brazil has decreased as a government-funded program is ending. A request for additional detail was made (see following).

**Update on International Student Enrollments – Martyn Miller**

- Fall Data sets (F 2011 – 2015) GROWTH with exception of English Language Data
- Review of country specific numbers (F 2015) based on University (not IIE #); over 100 countries represented.
- Growth in certain areas, Result of govt’ and private sponsored programs (SE Asia more private funding).
- Report of International Programs across the university (notably, Fox, CST, Engineering).
- Questions about the nomenclature of Taiwan/RoC; it is suggested that we use IIE standard and note Nation of Citizenship (Passport).
- Recruitment has centered in Asia (we now have an office of international recruiting - Nathan Jones- under Martyn Miller).

**Report on the new office of International Student Affairs - Brooke Walker, Vice Dean**

- Mission: partnership with Stakeholders with a focus on student retention by focusing on student support. Key objective is to create a sense of “place” for international students. Office is located 11th floor of Carnell Hall.
- TU loses about 10% of international students (using GPA as a metric for at-risk students; below 2.0 and b/w 2.0 and 2.25). Of the at-risk students, the loss rate is 58% in first 2 semesters; this statistic indicates early support and intervention is critical for student success.
- Services include international orientation (before freshman orientation – supported by differential student fees), activities, and engagement.
- Office is there to help students to identify and understand resources available.
- Office hosted the International Student Success Forum (2/25)
- Difference in this new office from previous services is that the engagement continues beyond enrollment and seeks to overlay outreach to at-risk students.
- Office will also use internal database to understand if there are patterns for at-risk students (in recruitment, standards, etc). Office will also compare retention issues b/w international and domestic students; are there the same issues (acculturation, first year aggravation, diet, etc)
- Office to act as bridge for international students to resources across the university; in this role, it will offer accessible office hours and outreach activities; right now, triage focused on at-risk students.

**A reminder about C.L.A.S.S. – Martyn Miller reminded the IP that C.L.A.S.S. is the primary tutoring center for university; and it can offer tutoring in native languages (Martyn surprised people are unaware of this resource). The IP Committee (supported by Martyn Miller) will work up a plan to promote awareness of C.L.A.S.S.**

**Planning for a Fulbright Information Session – CIES/IIE administrators to discuss Fulbright opportunities is scheduled for on Study day (12/13/16) of the Fall Semester. IP will form subcommittee to work with Barbara Gorka (Dir of Fellowship Advising) to host this event to create awareness of Fulbright opportunities and processes.**

**Expanded engagement – IP is now part of a newly formed Faculty Senate Council on Diverse Constituencies. The IP committee was asked to participate in planning and hosting Diversity 2.0 event (sponsored by Faculty Senate w/Ideal and Accord, etc)**

**Report on TUJ from Alix Howard, TUJ Associate Dean for Academic Affairs – Alix Howard provided an update to the committee on TUJ; highlights included:**

- Dealing with high enrollments/capacity issues, eg in Advising unit
- Faculty development & addressing labor law contract changes
- Focus on academic quality
- Listening to students & faculty, including better SFT response rates
- Assuring Faculty professional development & training; evaluation for adjuncts

**Managing Assessment: learning outcomes & curriculum mapping**

- High impact practices (per AAC&U) incl faculty-student research
- Honors offerings for Gen Ed
- Texts and instructional costs
- Gen Ed
- Writing across the Curriculum
- DRS
- Veterans affairs

‘Fly to Philly’ (TUJ students studying at TUM)

**Improved Japanese instruction**

**Report on TU Rome from Dean Hilary Link – Dean Link provided a comprehensive introduction and update on TUR; highlights included a need to:**

- Invigorate curriculum and create a hands-on understanding of real-world issues
- Expand curriculum to partner with more schools and colleges and to allow more TU students to study in Rome
- Create thematic clusters of courses: possibilities include “Immigration, Nationality and Globality” “Gender and Identity,” “Mediterranean Studies,” “Sustainability and Consumer Culture,” “City as Creative Space,” “Rome and the Foundations of Modernity”, “Word and Image”
- Consider courses/experiences which explore the “messiness” of contemporary Italy; the historical layering; the interdisciplinary nature of studying in Rome
- Enhance opportunities for research with local scientists, experts, scholars; hands-on internships and other experiential opportunities
- Make TUR a destination for serious Italian students
- Make TUR a destination for TU Faculty studying/researching in the EU
- Add Gen Ed courses across multiple disciplines: Art of Rome, Workings of the Mind, Race in the Ancient Mediterranean, Sacred Space, etc.

**Emergency Protocol for Students Abroad:** Denise Connerty gave a brief summary of the Education Abroad response to the November attacks in Paris and the March attacks in Brussels. Although TU only had 5 students studying in Paris in November, and none in Brussels in March, the Education Abroad staff had to account for all students studying throughout Europe at the time, because students often travel to other European cities during their time abroad.

- The Education Abroad staff relied on Facebook, emails, a google doc that was emailed to all students, and other means, to seek students’ whereabouts. She indicated that the staff are also very proactive and, with Risk Management, regularly monitor various sources for the most up to date security information, including International SOS, the Overseas Security Advisory Council, and the State Department.

**Global Temple Update:** The Global Temple Conference will take place on November 9, 2016. Ben Altschuler agreed to serve as chair; Latanya Jenkins, Srimathi Mukherjee, Cornelius Pratt and Wil Roget will serve on the committee.

Report submitted, 5/18/2016 by Mary Conran, IP Subcommittee Chair
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Faculty Senate Library Committee
End-of-Year Report 2015-16

The purpose of the Library Committee is to establish a joint forum at which librarians and faculty meet. For the past year, and continuing into 2016-17, we have been maintaining a broad base: the committee now consists of (13) faculty, representing (10) different schools or programs. Meetings have been held once a semester that have also been attended by members of the library staff, including Joe Lucia, Dean of University Libraries.

Meetings this past year were held twice in the Fall Semester and once in the Spring Semester. Discussion this year has included the design progress of the new Main Library as a significant topic. However, the major topic explored with the Dean this year has been an exploration of the Library’s current and potential roles in scholarly communication and publishing. To that end, meetings this year have also included Mary Rose Muccie from the Temple University Press. The issues surrounding this topic seem to the Committee to be of very high importance for the University, for reasons that range from support of Faculty research to validation of standards of scholarship to the disproportionate impact of scholarly journal subscriptions on the Library’s operating budget. Trends in open access publishing including open textbook initiatives may be altering the landscape of scholarly publishing in significant ways. Because of the importance of these issues, the Library has created the new position of Library Publishing and Scholarly Communications Specialist, and has hired Annie Johnson a CLIR fellow at Lehigh University to fill this position. The Committee would like to bring some of this discussion to the Faculty Senate in the 2016-17 calendar year.

Robert Shuman
Associate Professor of Architecture
Chair 2015/16

Current members of the Senate Library Committee (appointment dates to be confirmed):
- Dieter Forster – College of Science and Technology - Physics
- 2015 David Elesh, CLA – Sociology
- 2015 Paul Swann – Center for the Arts - Film
- 2015 Jacqueline Volkman Wise - Fox School – Risk, Insurance
- 2016 Donna M. Snow - Center for the Arts - Theater
- 2016 Elvin Wagner - Education – Teaching and Learning
- 2016 Adil Khan – School of Medicine
- 2017 Aron Wahrman – School of Medicine
- 2017 Carol Brandt – College of Education
- 2018 Teresa Cirillo – Fox School – Marketing
- 2018 Jose Pereiro-Otero – College of Liberal Arts
- 2018 Jill Luedke – University Libraries (AAL representative)
- 2018 Mark Weir – College of Public Health

Attachments: Minutes of the 10.22.15 and 04.06.16 Meetings
Temple University
Faculty Senate Library Committee
Minutes of Meeting held October 22, 2015

Attending:
Steven Bell (University Libraries), recording
Teresa Cirillo (Fox School – Marketing)
David Elesh (CLA, Sociology)
Dieter Forster (Physics – College of Science and Technology)
Adil Khan (School of Medicine)
Jill Luedke (University Libraries elected AAL representative)
Joe Lucia, ex officio, (Dean, University Libraries)
Jose Pereiro-Otero (College of Liberal Arts)
Robert Shuman, Jr. (Center for the Arts – Architecture)
Donna Snow (Theater, Film and Media Arts)
Paul Swann (Center for the Arts - Film)
Jacqueline Volkman-Wise (Fox School – Risk, Insurance)
Elvis Wagner (Education – Teaching and Learning)
Aron Wahrman (School of Medicine)
Mark Weir (College of Public Health)

Guest: Mary Rose Muccie (Temple University Press)

Chair Shuman began the meeting with a round of introductions since there are several new members.

Dean Lucia welcomed all members and invited them to be engaged with the committee in advising the library and working with us to manage challenging situations, such as three consecutive years with no budget increase. It will eventually impact on our ability to support the university's teaching and research missions in a sustainable way. Members were invited to attend the formal opening of the new Digital Scholarship Center.

Dean Lucia has invited Mary Rose Muccie to provide an update on the Temple University Press and to address some of the challenges in the scholarly publishing environment. Since there is not a likelihood of an increase in funding from the university, the library has been using its budget to help support the Press. We need to consider what the future of the Press is. What should we be doing with the Press, and how to assure it has a sustainable future? How do we make a case to the Deans?

Mary Rose Muccie provided background on the Press, its activities, staff and accomplishments. The Press does not publish only Temple authors. The Press supports student learning through internships and outreach to undergraduate courses. The Press is also looking into app development as a new business opportunity. Can we develop new revenue streams from existing projects? The Press is expanding collaborations beyond Temple and is working with the Free Library of Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania Historic Association. Muccie then outlined several challenges facing the Press, the most significant of which is limited resources requiring subvention from the University and Library. A decline in academic libraries purchasing scholarly monographs from University Presses and the reduction in student purchasing of supplemental texts has dramatically impacted the market for Press books.

Muccie shared several new initiatives being undertaken at the national level to promote innovation in scholarly publishing. For example, home institutions’ funding of faculty books with university presses, underwriting the cost of the first monograph or subsequent books, and then making a digital copy available in open access format. Mellon Foundation is notable for supporting projects that will potentially change the character of open access publishing. While there have been some promising collaborations between academic presses and other institutions, Muccie said the key impact of rising journal costs on Presses is that libraries must reduce their book budgets in order to support increased costs for scholarly journals. Shuman asked if the Library-Press relationship could help to create change in the publishing. The challenge according to Muccie is that there is a need for support to succeed as a journal publisher. The Temple Press publishes two journal titles. That's not nearly enough to support a journal operation. Supporting an open access journal in the humanities is difficult since the authors rarely have funding to support the journal.

David Elesh commented on some of the changes he has seen in the scholarly journal publishing industry that has benefitted the publishers at the expense of academia. Dean Lucia shared some information about these highly profitable journal publishers. Academic libraries need to subscribe to support research.

Mark Weir shared previous experience with a disciplinary wiki that supported the publication of multiple types of scholarly output that could then be made open accessible, with print versions made available through the MSU Press.

There was consensus that the Temple Press is highly recognized for its reputation and publications, but it is often not recognized within the University. We need to find ways to leverage this to promote Temple University and its media assets. Others commented on the RCM model and the challenges it is presenting in the support of new initiatives. There will be a Press presentation to the Deans in a few weeks and perhaps this issue will be
addressed.
Dean Shuman suggested that the Committee should come back to this issue and focus more on scholarly journal open access issues and the Press-Library partnership on scholarly communication and library publishing.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm

Temple University
Faculty Senate Library Committee
Minutes of Meeting held April 6, 2016

Attending:
Steven Bell (University Libraries), recording
Carol Brandt (College of Education)
Teresa Cirillo (Fox School – Marketing)
Dieter Forster (Physics – College of Science and Technology)
Adil Khan (School of Medicine)
Jill Luedke (University Libraries elected AAL representative)
Joe Lucia, ex officio, (Dean, University Libraries)
Jose Pereiro-Otero (College of Liberal Arts)
Robert Shuman, Jr. (Center for the Arts – Architecture)
Jacqueline Volkman-Wise (Fox School – Risk, Insurance)
Mark Weir (College of Public Health);
Not Present: Elvis Wagner (Education – Teaching and Learning); David Elesh (CLA, Sociology); Donna Snow (Theater, Film and Media Arts); Paul Swann (Center for the Arts- Film); Aron Wahrman (School of Medicine)

Guest: Mary Rose Muccie (Temple University Press)

Dean Lucia asked the group to recall the fall semester’s two meetings that focused on scholarly communication and library publishing issues – and wanting to bring the two together. To bring those two together we created a new position for Library Publishing and Scholarly Communications Specialist. We hired Annie Johnson, a CLIR fellow at Lehigh University, to fill this position. This allows us to create some new projects, such as an undergrad research journal. She will be active in connecting with faculty through outreach efforts to systematically develop projects to create awareness about how the scholarly publishing world is changing.

Chair Shuman asked to what extent this is priority in the library and institution. Dean Lucia shared that other institutions have worked with the faculty senate to produce open access resolutions. We are setting up an infrastructure to facilitate that. Foster asked about our relationship with scholarly publishers and how we manage that as we try to rethink how we approach scholarly publishing. Dean Lucia shared some initiatives that are underway that would allow us to participate in a national conversation. Steven Bell shared some developments in the open textbook environment and national initiatives. Mark Weir asked several questions about how this works and in what ways might faculty be rewarded for these efforts. Is it scholarship, teaching or service? Those are issues that need to be considered and Bell mentioned that there is a Temple University Textbook Affordability Task Force looking into these issues.

Chair Shuman suggested that the FSCL could take this back to the Senate so that library publishing and scholarly communications could be a discussion topic, to be led by Dean Lucia, at a fall meeting of the Senate.

Chair Shuman announced that he is in his third year of chairing the committee and asked for a current member to consider taking over as the chair in the next academic year.

Dean Lucia shared architect renderings of the exterior and interior of the new library building.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm

Report of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee
Academic Year 2015-2016

The current members of the Committee are:
John Deckop, FSBM, 1-1933, jdeckop@temple.edu, ’16**
Harold Klein, FSBM, 1-8883, harold.klein@temple.edu, ’19**
Paul S. LaFollette, CST, 1-6822, lafollet@temple.edu, ’18
Rafael Porrata-Doria, Law, 1-7694, porratal@temple.edu, ’18**
Mark Rahdert, Law, 1-8966, mrahdert@temple.edu, ’17

During this academic year, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee considered no cases involving appeals from tenure and promotion denials, as none were filed.

Respectfully submitted,
Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., Chair

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color
Annual Report 2015-1016

Current committee membership list including changes in membership during the 2015-2016 academic year

Committee Members:
Latanya Jenkins, Library, 1-8244, lnjenkin@temple.edu
Srimati Mukherjee, CLA, srimati.mukherjee@temple.edu
Rafael Porrata-Doria, Law, 1-7694, porratal@temple.edu (new member)
Wilbert Roget, CLA, 1-8273, wilbert.roget@temple.edu
Rickie Sanders, CLA, 1-5650, rsanders@temple.edu
Elizabeth Sweet, (Ch), CLA, elizabeth.sweet@temple.edu
Karen M. Turner, SMC, 1-8386, ktturner@temple.edu
Kimnika Williams-Witherspoon, TFMA, 1-8417, kwili01@temple.edu
Sherry Yu, SMC, 1-1904, sherry.yu@temple.edu (new member)

Consultants
John F. Street, (Consultant), CLA, jfstreet@temple.edu
Marie Amey-Taylor, (Consultant), EDUC, marie.amey-taylor@temple.edu

Structural changes to the committee (e.g., creation of new subcommittees) none

Number and frequency of meetings
During the fall of 2015 we met twice a month. In the spring of 2016 we met once a month.

Issues addressed by the committee
Lack of racial diversity among Temple faculty; ongoing need to have access to accurate data on faculty

Decisions or actions taken on issues
Organized and carried out four Chat in the Stacks events
October 8th Diversity and STEAM: Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics
November 12 Black Girls: Exploding the Myths.
February 18th Presidential Primary: Politics and Elections
April 14th Recognizing Dr. Sweet-Territorio Cuerpo-Tierra: My Pathway to a Cosmology of Bodies as Land in the City of Emotions.

Organized and carried out a Microaggressions workshop on March 22nd

Respectfully submitted,
Betsy Sweet
Chair
Faculty Senate Editorial Board 2015–2016
Paul LaFollette, Editor, College of Science and Technology
Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor, College of Liberal Arts
Gregory Urwin, College of Liberal Arts
Anna Peak, College of Liberal Arts
Steve Newman, Former Editor, College of Liberal Arts
Andrea Monroe, Beasley School of Law
Will Jordan, College of Education
Terry Halbert, Fox School of Business
David Mislin, College of Liberal Arts
Karen M. Turner, School of Media and Communication

Faculty Senate Steering Committee 2015–2016
Tricia S. Jones, President, College of Education
Adam Davey, Vice President, College of Public Health
Mark C. Rahdert, Past-President, Beasley School of Law
Michael Sachs, Secretary, College of Health Professions
Marsha Crawford, School of Social Work
Fred Duer, Division of Theater, Film, and Media Arts
Heidi Ohja, College of Public Health
Kenneth Thurman, College of Education
Stephanie Knopp, Tyler School of Art
Donald Hantula, College of Liberal Arts
Teresa Gill Cirillo, Fox School of Business and Management
Raghbir Athwal, Temple School of Medicine
Cornelius Pratt, School of Media and Communication
Kurosh Darvish, College of Engineering
Jie Yang, School of Dentistry
Jeffrey Solow, Boyer College of Music and Dance
Michael Jackson, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management
Michael Jacobs, School of Pharmacy
Jim Korsh, College of Science and Technology
Paul LaFollette, Editor, Faculty Herald
Cheryl Mack, Administrative Coordinator

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

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.
Letters to the editor should be emailed to Paul LaFollette at paul.lafollette@temple.edu.