

## COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Minutes of the Collegial Assembly  
May 8, 2000

Louis Raymon called the meeting to order at 1:36 PM. The following were present:

Biology	Chemistry	CIS	Geology	Mathematics	Physics	College Administration
Amini	Davis	Aiken	Anderson	Chein	Dubeck	Hanna
Hillman, N.	Jansen	Ingargiola	Myer	Conrad, B.	Gawlinski	Platsoucas
Hillman, R.	Krow	Koffman	Terry	Datskovsky	Hasan	
Sanders	Stanley	Korsh		Grabovsky	Intemann	
Sheffield	Strongin	Kwatny		Grinberg	Lyyra	
		Poe		Knopp	Mihalisin	
				Mendoza		
				Raymon		
				Reich		
				Schiller		
				Zitarelli		

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 4 were approved.

### Reports

#### Chair: Louis Raymon

The Dean was congratulated on being appointed permanent dean.

#### Dean.

The College has made numerous offers of positions in the centers for Computer Science & Applied Mathematics and Information Science & Technology. We have also made an offer in Chemistry, and expect soon make an offer of a position in the Center for Environmental Science & Technology. An additional offer has been made in Mathematics, and we expect soon to make offers in Physics. It is likely that we will not be able to fill all of the positions for which we have authorizations to search, and we hope that we will be able to continue searches for the next year.

One of the most vexing problems facing the College is the issue of building renovations. We have approval to construct the Student Advising center and the Center for Student Professional Development in the ground floor of the Barton B-wing. The renovations necessary for installing the new NMR spectrometer for Chemistry is in the same package. Another project that has been approved is the renovation of Dr. Lim's laboratory in the Bio-Life building. Further renovations in the Bio-Life Building are urgently needed, and a request has been forwarded to Facilities Management. We also

hope to get quick action on the renovations needed to put the new ICP-mass spectrometer into use in the Geology Department.

The central administration has informally agreed that the College need an additional allocation from the Plan to Renew Temple's mission budget for renovations. While we view the charges made by Facilities Management for renovations as high, the University insists on charging us, but gives us additional funds to enable us to pay.

We face a problem of finding space for the Center for Computer Science & Applied Mathematics. Originally, we were given the eleventh and twelfth floors of Carnell Hall. This plan has been revised, and the current plan is to put the center on the third floor of Carnell Hall, with additional space on the sixth floor of Conwell Hall that will become available when Art Papacostas moves his offices to the Bell Building.

The Graduate Committee has given recommendations for the CST Graduate Student Research Awards and Graduate Student Teaching Awards, and for the Dean's Fellowships. There are three research awards and three teaching awards, each amounting to \$500. The two Dean's Fellowships are awarded to doctoral candidates and carry a stipend of \$15,000 plus tuition and a \$800 book allowance.

The College has had a continuing dispute with the Fox School of Business and Management (FSBM) over programs in Information Science. This Assembly has authorized BA/BS and MS degrees in Information Science & Technology, which would move to this College degree programs that had up until now been offered by our CIS department under the auspices of FSBM. . With a new department of Management Information Science, FSBM wants to offer similar degrees. We agree that FSBM should offer degrees in Management Information Systems, while we should offer degrees in Information Science and Technology (IS&T). There is some overlap between these, but not enough to cause objection. Nevertheless, FSBM objects, and seems to want to go beyond the confines of Management Information Systems. Four faculty members in CIS have asked to transfer to FSBM to join the new department, but cannot do so without the approval of the Dean of CST. The Dean stated that he would not approve the transfers until agreement on the degree programs had been reached with FSBM. At this point, our BA/BS program has been approved by the EPPC, and awaits the approval of the Board of Trustees. The MS degree has not been considered by the Graduate Board. One proposal that looks promising is to offer the MS in IS&T as a track within the existing MS in Computer and Information Science. The College had planned to offer the MS in IS&T at Ambler. The Ambler Dean, Sophia Wisniewska, is unhappy that it has not been approved, and can help us to resolve the problem.

**Aiken** said that the CIS Department needs to discuss these issues. **Ingargiola** said that he assumed that the department would be kept up to date on the negotiations. **The Dean** replied that the department chair had been kept informed.

**Dubeck** said that the Ambler Dean was in favor of having a separate Ambler faculty. The Dean said that he is strongly opposed to any arrangement where faculty would be granted Tenure by Ambler.

**Chein** said that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee was aware that Dean Wisniewska was planning for an Ambler College with its own faculty, but that nothing had been passed. The Dean added that if faculty members are evaluated only on their teaching of service courses at Ambler, they will be service faculty. Dubeck pointed out that in the TAUP contract negotiations, there was a proposal for permanent dean's appointment lines, where individuals could receive an indefinite number of reappointments. The Dean is considering the appointment of an associate dean for the Ambler Campus, and to assign tenured faculty to teach there on a rotating basis. The campus is peripheral, and should not offer programs that compete with the main campus. It should serve as a feeder for main campus programs. Where appropriate, some programs could be located at Ambler.

**Korsh** asked about the \$41 million loss at the Temple University Hospital. Dubeck said that this was an operating loss that was partially offset by approximately \$30 million in investment gains.

#### **Old Business**

##### **Undergraduate Committee: Orin Chein**

**Minor in Geology Second reading.** A copy of the minor requirements were distributed at the meeting of May 4 and are part of the official copy of the minutes of that meeting. There was no discussion, and the motion to approve the minor was carried by unanimous voice vote.

#### **New Business**

##### **Undergraduate Committee: Orin Chein**

**Intra-University Transfer First reading.** A copy of the criteria for eligibility for a student to transfer from another college of the University to CST were distributed at the meeting and form part of the official copy of these minutes. **Chein** made a motion to suspend the rules so that this motion could be voted upon at this meeting. This motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**Gawlinski** asked for a reason that an overall GPA of 2.25 was required for transfer, yet the average grade in the core math courses was only required to be 2.0. **Hanna** responded that the 2.0 requirement was identical to the graduation requirement.

## CST listserv

**Korsh** made the following motion: *The College shall establish an unmoderated faculty listserv that shall serve as the official means of communication for the Assembly.* **Chein** said that the new listserv was intended to take over for the current, moderated listserv. **Dubeck** asked for the reason that this was needed. Korsh said that the faculty have the right to control their means of communication. Dubeck asked who would take responsibility for the listserv, and Korsh responded that the Executive Committee would do so. Dubeck expressed doubt that the Executive Committee existed following the defeat of the bylaws.

**Datskovsky** said that he would not subscribe to a listserv. **Schiller** suggested that we continue with the present listserv, and that when a new Executive Committee is formed, then the Executive Committee could have a listserv of its own. **Koffman** suggested that if there are two listservs, and the associate dean could run both of them.

**The Secretary** said that any faculty member can set up a listserv. The moderated listserv that now exists is moderated because several faculty members had indicated that they would not subscribe to an unmoderated listserv. He intended to continue the moderated listserv, and offered to set up an unmoderated listserv that would carry all official communications of the moderated listserv.

**Sheffield** said that an unmoderate listserv would be a useful vehicle for seminar announcements. **Anderson** said that standing committees should be able to post to the listserv. **Chein** asked if the Dean's Office was willing to post notices from standing committees. The Secretary said that it was willing to do so. **Kwatny** pointed out that the unmoderated listserv could run by itself.

**Dubeck** offered an amendment to Korsh's motion: *There shall be an official, mosderated listserv, and a separate listserv that is unmoderated.* **Korsh** stated that unlike the notorious Faculty Senate listserv, there was no danger that this one would generate excessive e-mail. **The Question** was called on the Dubeck amendment, and it passed by a vote of 17- 15.

In debate over the amended motion, **Krow** asked who determines which committees can post to the moderated listserv. The answer was that standing committees could post. If a committee was not a standing committee, could it post? For example, a bylaws committee is not a standing committee. **The Dean** said that this would be considered on a case-by-case basis. **The Question** was called on the amended motion, and it passed unanimously.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Bylaws. **The Chair** recalled that at the May 4 meeting, the Executive Committee was

considered, and the following alternative was preferred: *Each department elects a representative. In addition to this, three at-large members, with staggered three- year terms are elected by the Assembly. No two at-large members can be from the same department.* This discussion would be on other important issues.

**Term limits** In CAS, membership on standing committees was limited to one three-year term. Proposals for CST bylaws include limiting service on the Executive Committee and the Tenure and Promotion Committee(s) to one three-year term or at most four consecutive years. **Chein** favored term limits, but thought that a limit of two consecutive terms was appropriate. **Anderson** asked why Chein favored allowing two terms. Chein said that it allows flexibility, and conforms to the practice of the Faculty Senate. **N. Hillman** said that she favored allowing each department to set its own rules regarding term limits. It was pointed out that term limits on the Promotion and Tenure Committee(s) would prevent a member who was holding someone back from being able to do so permanently.

Term Limit Preferences a straw vote

Alternative	Number favoring
No term limits	1
Limit of two consecutive terms (1 term for Promotion & Tenure)	10
Limit of one term for all committees	15

**Combining committees.** To simplify the committee structure, it has been suggested that some committees be combined. Promotion and Tenure could be one committee, and the Executive Committee could serve as the Budget & Planning Committee as well. **Chein** said that then Executive Committee is too busy to take on additional tasks. **Gawlinski** said that the Executive Committee and the Budget & Planning Committees required different skills. **Ingargiola** said that members of the Executive Committee would be capable of doing the work of the Budget & planning Committee. **Jansen** suggested that the Budget & Planning Committee was unnecessary. **Korsh** said that the two committees had separate functions, required separate skills, and that the information prepared by the Budget & Planning Committee could be summarized for the Executive Committee.

Combining the Executive and Budget & Planning Committees a straw vote

The Assembly was overwhelmingly in favor of keeping these committees separate.

It was proposed to combine the Awards Committee, the Research & Study Leaves Committee, and the Merit Committee. **R. Hillman** stated that the Awards Committee involved a lot of work. For several awards (the Stauffer Award was an example) a large dossier has to be assembled. **Sheffield** said that if the committees are separate, there is nothing to prevent the same person from serving on more than one of them.

Combining the Awards, Research & Study Leaves, and Merit Committees a straw vote

The Assembly was overwhelmingly in favor of keeping these committees separate.

The structure of the Promotion and Tenure Committee(s) was discussed. It was recognized that this is a sensitive issue. The following proposals were to be considered:

- (1) The Dean should have some influence in forming the committee(s).
- (2) There should be more “standards” incorporated into the Bylaws regarding eligibility to serve.
- (3) The committee should not be elected in the manner proposed in the old Bylaws.
- (4) There should be two separate committees.

**Dubeck** asked how the members of the committees were selected in CAS. **The Chair** responded that the members of the committees were selected by the Executive Committee in consultation with the dean. There were three members from each division of the old college, serving staggered, three-year terms.

Proposition (4) was considered first, and by a vote of 13 in favor, 7 against, the institution of two separate committees was preferred.

Proposition (3) was considered next. **Dubeck** said that it was his opinion that we should follow the example of CAS, where these committees worked well. He thus favored appointed committees. A vote was taken, and appointed committees were preferred over elected committees by 17 in favor of appointed committees, 7 in favor of elected committees.

**Dubeck** said that the Executive Committee and the Dean could set the standards, rendering proposition (2) unnecessary. **Datskovsky** added that standards are only needed if the committees are elected. A vote showed a nearly unanimous preference not to establish standards.

**Dubeck** urged that with regard to proposition (1), that we again follow the CAS example in which the committees are appointed by the Executive Committee in consultation with the Dean. A vote was taken, and the vote in favor of Dubeck’s suggestion was nearly unanimous — there were three dissenting votes.

**Mendoza** suggested that each committee should have one member from each department. This suggestion was favored by a vote of 17 in favor, none opposed.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bruce Conrad