

Minutes of Collegial Assembly of September 26, 2007

Dean Hai-Lung Dai called the assembly to order at 4:16 pm

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 11, 2007 were approved.

Dean's Report

Dean Dai reminded the assembly of the CST Faculty and Student Awards dinner, to be held on October 4, and the symposium on the 50th anniversary of Sputnik, jointly sponsored by CST and CLA, to be held on October 5. A featured speaker will be Commander Scott Carpenter.

Introduction of new Tenure-Track faculty members

S. Amini introduced two new Biology faculty members, Drs. Darius Balciunas and Mark Feitelson. R. Levis introduced two new Chemistry faculty members, Drs. Hai-Lung Dai and Jonathan Shackman, and noted that another, Dr. Christian Schafmeister, was away attending a meeting. J. Shi introduced new CIS faculty member Dr. Alexander Yates. R. Tao introduced new Physics faculty member Dr. Andreas Metz. Dean Dai noted that four other new faculty members would arrive in January, and would be introduced at the first meeting of the Collegial Assembly in Spring 2008.

Dean Dai reported that faculty hiring continues, with 9 searches authorized for this year, and a similar number next year.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Old Business

The Dean's Advisory Committee presented for SECOND READING the following MOTION:

A motion to identify the CST Promotion and Tenure Committee as the committee that consults with the Dean on applications for Study Leaves

In accordance with Article 23.A.3 of the TAUP contract, the Collegial Assembly agrees that the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Science and Technology is the appropriate committee to consult with the Dean on applications for study leaves.

J. Korsh voiced concern that the proposed motion would lessen faculty participation in governance. Dean Dai responded that this was not the intent of the motion, that the motion was intended to alleviate the current difficulty in staffing the College's standing committees while also ensuring that Study Leave proposals would be considered by well qualified and experienced faculty members, noted that the number of applications to be considered was usually small and would not overburden the committee, and noted that as

the size of the faculty increased in future years, the issue might be reconsidered. S. Sieburth described the application form as too long and complex, possibly discouraging applicants. B. Conrad noted that in his experience with the committee, there were not large numbers of applications, and that the committee performed a useful role in advising applicants on improving their applications for review by the University committee. J. Sheffield, noting the dual function given to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and asked about the timetable. Dean Dai responded that the work of advising on Study Leaves was completed before the consideration of promotion and tenure cases began.

The question having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION PASSED.

The Dean's Advisory Committee presented for SECOND READING the following MOTION:

A motion to authorize electronic circulation to the faculty of motions to the Collegial Assembly to serve as the equivalent of First Readings

Whereas, although the Standard Bylaws under which the College of Science and Technology conducts itself do not require two readings of substantive motions presented to the Collegial Assembly, it has been the tradition of the College to conduct two readings of substantive motions prior to a vote, electronic circulation to the full-time faculty of the College of substantive motions proposed by any of the standing committees of the College at least ten days prior to a meeting of the Collegial Assembly shall be considered the equivalent of the traditional first reading.

D. Forster expressed concern about inadequate time for consideration, and suggested the motion might be amended to require 20 days advance notification. M. Luehrmann noted that at the previous reading, Forster had offered a preferable suggestion, that if on first reading the Assembly believed further consideration to be needed, it could vote to require a second reading of any motion offered. Dean Dai noted that the motion was offered to respond to the frequent need for decisions on program changes early in the Fall semester so that the College could meet the University's deadlines for approval by the Board of Trustees. G. Ingargiola asked whether the motion required 10 calendar days, or 10 working days. R. Jenkins responded that the intent of the Advisory Committee was to require 10 calendar days. F. Friedman supported the motion, believing that 10 days was sufficient time. D. Forster noted that the motion was directed toward substantive motions, those on which the Assembly did not trust itself, and needed more time. O. Chein asked whether, after electronic circulation, amendments might be made electronically. R. Jenkins responded that amendments could be made from the floor, and that if the Assembly believed that more time was needed to consider the amendments, it could proceed as suggested earlier, voting to require a second reading of any motion. D. Forster MOVED TO AMEND the motion, to require electronic circulation 21 days, rather than 10 days, prior to a meeting of the Assembly. The motion was seconded by O. Chein.. G. Palladino asked for the effect the amendment would have on the motions for program change that were to be offered to this meeting of the Assembly. M. Luehrmann responded

that the program changes would not go to the Board of Trustees in time for implementation in Fall 2008, that the changes would be delayed until Fall 2009, and that changes in future years would be similarly delayed by the requirement of 21 days advance circulation. Dean Dai noted that the intent and effect of the original motion was not to stifle discussion of program changes, that many levels of discussion took place among the faculty at departmental level before changes were proposed, and at collegial level in the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees, and at University level, that the original motion was intended shorten the time required to complete the paperwork required in the early Fall, and that many such program changes would occur in the future.

The question on the MOTION TO AMEND having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION TO AMEND FAILED.

The question on the ORIGINAL MOTION having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION PASSED by a vote of 21 to 4.

New Business

The Undergraduate Committee presented the following MOTION:

that the Collegial Assembly approves the Computer Science Minor proposed in the document to be found at

http://www.temple.edu/cst/facultystaff/assembly/proposal_cs_minor.pdf

G. Baram described the proposed minor as a win for the students, who would gain valuable knowledge and experience, and for the College, which would stand to gain additional enrollments. Noting that the program required only 5 courses, D. Forster expressed concern that we were not requiring sufficient depth in the education of our students, and cautioned that we should not always encourage breadth rather than depth in our programs. M. Luehrmann responded that the University has requirements for minors, and that this program conformed to those requirements. G. Ingargiola noted that our best students always want depth, and that some students want a breadth of skills in order to improve their chances in life. D. Forster acknowledged that if the courses required for the minor were 4-credit courses, 5 such courses would be the equivalent of 6 or 7 Liberal Arts courses. D. Baird argued that the decision between depth and breadth should be left to the students. G. Baram noted that of the required 5 courses, 3 were specified, and 2 were electives, and that students could always choose to take more. F. Friedman noted that the goal of minor is to give students an opportunity to learn, and perhaps to take more courses, and that this is not the same goal as a major.

It was noted that, because the motion to approve electronic circulation of motions to serve as first readings was passed, a vote could be taken upon the present motion. The question having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION PASSED.

The Undergraduate Committee presented the following MOTION:

that the Collegial Assembly approves revisions to the BA/BS degree program in Information Science and Technology as proposed in the document to be found at

http://www.temple.edu/cst/facultystaff/assembly/proposal_IST_revision.pdf.

G. Baram noted that the proposed revisions did not change the number of courses required.

There being no discussion, the question having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION PASSED.

The Undergraduate Committee presented the following MOTION:
that the Collegial Assembly approves revisions to the Minor in Information Science and Technology as proposed in the document to be found at
http://www.temple.edu/cst/facultystaff/assembly/proposal_IST_revision.pdf.

G. Ingargiola noted that of the 5 courses required, 4 were courses taken by majors, and that of the 5, only one was a lower-level course. D. Forster asked why the number of required courses was lowered from 7 to 5. G. Ingargiola replied that 7 was a heavy burden for students completing majors in other fields. To D. Forster's question whether the required courses had prerequisites, G. Ingargiola replied that only one of the courses had no prerequisite.

The question having been called, and the vote taken, Dean Dai ruled that the MOTION PASSED.

O. Chein asked for the status of the CST bylaws. R. Jenkins replied that no action had yet been taken by the Dean's Advisory Committee, and reminded that the previous Advisory Committee had recommended deferring the discussion of bylaws until the standing committees had again been constituted in accordance with the Standard Bylaws, which has now been done.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted by R.J.