Technology Planning

The Herald asked David Elesh (CAS) to reply to some questions having to do with plans for the development of technology in teaching and research.

Faculty Herald: How are decisions made about Temple's technological future?

David Elesh: What the faculty should understand is that decisions will not come from the top. Jim England and Art Papacostas will not unilaterally make these decisions. Nor will Peter Liacouras and the Board of Trustees. They will act on recommendations from the faculty and the Council of Deans. Fundamentally, these recommendations will arise from departmental and school and college plans. At the Health Sciences campus, the Health Science Computer Planning Committee creates a health science plan from the school and college plans.

At the university level, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable (TLTR), a group of 35 faculty, administrators, and staff created by Jim England and the Council of Deans in the fall of 1994, is the focal point for crafting overall recommendations. What all this means is that the limited funding available will flow toward where there are plans with well-defined educational objectives.

Chaired until January by Nancy Hoffman and now by Concetta Stewart (SCAT), TLTR has three primary functions. First, it actively surveys what faculty do and want to do with technology. Second, it encourages greater use of technology, particularly in instruction. Third, it develops recommendations for the university's strategic directions and technological investments.

During the past year, TLTR: • recommended (in January, 1995) that the university's highest priority for funding go to phase 1 of the 1994 networking plan created by the University Communications Planning Committee; • researched and wrote a report on classroom refurbishing; • initiated a continuing investigation of distance learning here and elsewhere and proposed and received funding for a small grant program to facilitate faculty development of new courses for distance learning.

"Conducted 16 case studies of the implementation of information technology in the schools and colleges in order to identify factors which facilitated and impeded its growth. These studies revealed four common themes. First, introductions occurred when individual faculty with specific instructional objectives took the initiative to piece together the resources with which to begin. Second, investments of Computer and Technology Fee funds by Art Papacostas were crucial to advancing these efforts. Third, as these efforts mature, significant issues regarding funding for maintenance, renewal, and support arise. Fourth, faculty want students to have the ability to connect with them, each other, university resources, and the Internet; • surveyed what faculty were doing throughout the university to identify and publicize "best practices;" • organized a week-long series of workshops for faculty on how to use the Internet and other resources; • organized a Technology Week to discuss, using our own faculty and outside experts, some of the policy issues we confront in areas such as distance learning and faculty rewards, to assess the specific recommendations for immediate action; • organized a Technology Roundtable; • organized a Continuing Investigation of distance learning for instruction, and to offer workshops in the use of specific technologies.

FH: Where are we going with technology?

DE: In October, TLTR presented its first annual report. This report sets technology goals for the university and makes specific recommendations for immediate action. The Council of Deans endorsed the report on December 6th. But what we should all understand is that this is part of a continuous process in which both goals and actions change as educational objectives and technology evolve and as funds are made available.

The goals were:
- e-mail for all faculty, students, and staff;
- Continued on page 4

The Ambler Report

Following is the executive summary of the Ambler Planning Committee report, submitted to the Provost on December 7 by the committee chair, Jim Hilty (CAS).

"The Ambler Campus has the potential to be a more valuable part of Temple University than it is now. Ambler is ideally located to serve the growing demand for higher education among the burgeoning population and employment centers in the region. To compete successfully in this large higher education market, Ambler must anticipate changes in student needs and student learning patterns and become a center for developing innovative learning and teaching strategies.

Specifically, the Committee recommends continuing and enhancing those programs that have a proven track record at Ambler and developing new ones to serve its three main student groups: recent high school graduates, transfer students, and adult students in graduate/professional programs and continuing education programs. To give the campus definition, we recommend that programs (old and new) be completed entirely at Ambler. The theme for new programs could be "Preparing Students for the Professions of the Future."

"The campus, however, lacks classroom and support facilities essential to sustaining quality programs, nurturing experimental, and accommodating growth. To offer quality programs and to capture a respectable share of the market, Temple must move now to clean up and renovate its buildings, complete the Loop road and ancillary projects, and plan for classroom expansion, upgraded student service facilities, expanded computer operations, and a student-faculty activities center.

"We recommend strengthening administrative authority at Ambler by instituting a more system-based budget and management system, making the Ambler Dean responsible for student and academic services, security, buildings and grounds,
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Shabbiness

Dear editor,
I saw the Faculty Herald today and am writing to protest the pictures and my quote on page six. Contrary to showing the shabbiness of the classrooms, they show my attempts to improve the quality of life for students and faculty at the University: what appears to be a broken chair is a picture of a newly designed "attention-saving and good-posture-developing seating device" (ARGPD); of course, on my quote I imagined the second picture to be a broke coke machine - in fact, if it is a central feature in my programs to improve the health of students and faculty by reducing the sugar content in our campus, below this picture is my most recent move to be certain that all classrooms are equipped with fresh air and avoid the possible dangers associated with the "over-tight buildings syndrome." This problem was only identified by the EPA in the early '90s, so not all people are aware of its critical nature. Below that is my newly designed "target-tunnel syndrome protection" for corners of the chair in front of a desk holding an apparently broken speaker's stand is a subtle move to reduce the amount of lecturing in small classes in order to encourage an interactive style of teaching/learning/intelligence. Frankly, I don't know why you included a picture of our kitchen at home in this set of pictures, at least it looks like our kitchen shortly after I have finished cooking dinner. Delighting the picture of our kitchen, this is a kaleidoscope of recent advances in educational facilities.

James W. England, Provost

Bio: We apologize for the mix-up of negatives in the question is not in fact a picture of the Provost's kitchen, but rather of the washroom in the lavish Faculty Herald office suite after our annual prayer breakfast. We must also apologize, restricted as we are to stupid computer devices, for the unfortunate mistake of showing pictures of the University's student satisfaction questionnaire. What are some of the concerns?

1) Perhaps the matter of the greatest concern, one recognized by Mr. Dorph, is the shabbiness of a decentralized, even balkanized, university. Individual units might well be driven to fierce internecine competition for tuition dollars. In order to maximize tuition income, colleges might have no other choice than to draw students back with their own walls, threatening the Core curriculum and discouraging interdisciplinary programs. Expenditure programs there external funding is not readily available, could be sacrificed to more lucrative mass-teaching programs. "Mega-sections" and increased teaching loads could be attractive options, as could withdrawal of support from "unprofitable" programs, which hitherto have been considered central to a university education, and increased support for professional and career-oriented programs.

2) The reply to these concerns is that the role of the Provost would have to be "enhanced" to block destructive internal competition. Yet there is as yet no description of how that would work. Nor is there yet a specific formal involvement of the Senate, EPCC or BPCC in the discussion of RCM's impact on teaching and research programs.

3) Measures to initiate differential tuition schedules, entrance requirements, and graduation requirements - even within a college - would be substantial.

4) In the same way, the pressure for differential salary scales would be a reality, since salary costs represent the vast majority of college budgets. No unionized institution has implemented RCM. After explaining the impact of RCM at the University of Indiana, an official there said that the University was unionized. "Well, then, it can't work," was his reaction. Mr. Dorph admits that there are no obvious answers to this problem.

5) Ambler, an undergraduate campus without its own faculty, represents a particular problem, not only in terms of salary - why should it buy the time of experienced faculty? It would then rely on less expensive staffing - but also for tenure and promotion of faculty assigned to a non-research campus.

6) Since colleges would purchase the services of non-teaching units such as housekeeping, the Admissions Office or student affairs, deans might find attractive the options of establishing their own, less expensive versions of these units or of contacting with external agencies.

6) It is normal, since Temple is the first multi-college unionized university to attempt RCM, that many of these questions are as yet unanswered. To be sure, some faculty members and deans favor RCM, seeing advantages in it if implemented carefully and intelligently.

Having heard Mr. Dorph, we, like many others, oppose it in principle to RCM. We are, however, opposed to its implementation until we as faculty members can participate fully in its elaboration and better understand its impact on our programs and students. We are not insensitive to the irony of a central administration implementing decentralized authority and responsibility not through open consultation, but by ukase.

Plug In

The Herald welcomes comments, information or questions concerning any issue of interest to the faculty. The editor can be reached at: Temple Zip: 202-37 Voice mail: 1-8269 e-mail: jnail (IBM and Courier) Please indicate clearly whether the message is for publication. The editor reserves the right to edit, although he will make every effort to clear any modifications prior to publication.

If you missed this out of the trash or stole it from a colleague and would like to make sure you receive your own copy, let us know.

Letters to the Editor

Domestic Partnership

Dear editor,
The article, "Domestic Partnership Benefits Issue" by Robin Lawson (Faculty Herald, January 22) contends that a favorable resolution of the question of gay and lesbian faculty with respect to domestic-partnership benefits is overdue because it is the "right thing" to do. It may be politically expedient but it is the wrong thing to do. The recognition of such benefits would entail a tacit acceptance of a public homosexual lifestyle which would be a parody of both heterosexual marriage and same-gender Platonic friendship, as well as a mis-routing of public funds. To extend RCM competition within our faculties, we hope that our students, who are the faculty's key clients, can find some other way of counting, tracking, and helping future educational registers for over-crowded courses.

Moffy E. A. Siegel

Brown University

FEBRUARY 12, 199
President's Report
Karen Kozlara

"Then you should say what you mean," the March Hare went on. "I do," Alice hastily replied; "at least—at least I mean what I say—that's the same thing, you know."

"Not the same thing a bit!" said the Hatter. "Why you might as well say that 'I see what I eat' is the same thing as 'I eat what I see.'"

Temple's December Town Meeting underscored faculty commitment improving the quality of graduate education. It also made clear that much work remains about the designation of a doctoral faculty. In response to controversy, the Program Review Committee of the Graduate Board develop new proposal for restructuring graduate faculty. Unfortunately, this proposal likely to prove just as controversial as its predecessor.

Both proposals provide for designation of a subset of Presidential faculty based on recent peer reviewed scholarly or creative work. The original proposal was to have this faculty subset as policy for doctoral education and chair selection committees.

The new proposal is much more far reaching. Like the original, it calls for identifying a subset of the faculty to be graduate faculty based on recent reviewed work. The graduate faculty would be responsible for examining candidates, making admissions and financial aid decisions, and setting policies— all graduate programs, not just doctoral programs.

The new proposal is presented as an alternative to a two-tiered graduate faculty. Nonetheless, in reality the result would still be two different categories of Presidential faculty. One category would have responsibility for graduate programs, the other would not. It is hard to see this as anything other than the proposal for having a two-tiered faculty, dividing the faculty in this manner seems to have even greater implication, more far reaching implications than did the original doctoral faculty concept.

The major substantive difference between the two proposals is the expanded responsibilities of the identified faculty subset.

Both proposals come from concern about the quality of doctoral dissertations. The current complaint is that creating a doctoral faculty will improve dissertation quality. However, a two-tiered faculty is an operationally weak and indirect method for solving a quality problem. Neither policy guarantees an improvement in dissertation quality. In fact, neither policy even guarantees a change in the faculty currently supervising dissertations. It is quite possible that the same people will be supervising dissertations as before. Those who were dubious that a link existed between a designated doctoral faculty and improving dissertations probably will be even more skeptical about the need to have this faculty supervise all graduate programs and policies.

The new version does away with none of the problems of the first proposal. In fact, it may exacerbate some problems. For example, one shortcoming of the original proposal was that the solution was not fashioned to correct specific identifiable problems. The second proposal would broaden the solution—undermined by evidence of where and what types of problems exist.

Another difficulty with the original proposal was that it made doctoral education a priority at the risk of devaluing undergraduate education. The new proposal more clearly delineates a graduate and an undergraduate faculty—and there appears to be little status associated with being a member of the undergraduate faculty. Thus the new proposal seems to have as much potential for conflict, reduced cooperation and collegiality, and bureaucratization as did the original.

Some aspects of the new proposal almost guarantee heightened conflict and tension. For example, the proposal states that the graduate faculty will be chosen from among those already nominated last fall. This ignores the fact that the game has changed and the stakes are now different. The issue has become graduate program policies, not just dissertation supervision. It is also inaccurately assumes some consensus existed about the appropriateness of last fall’s selection process.

Like its predecessor, the new proposal involves issues far beyond doctoral programs and dissertation quality. The culture change it would create is fundamental. The magnitude of this change should not be underestimated. It raises very serious questions about faculty rights and responsibilities, as well as the very work we do and how we do it. Its implications go far beyond policies affecting graduate programs. This issue is gravely important to all faculty. Therefore, the new proposal’s objectives, implications and alternatives should be fully discussed with the entire faculty. Under no circumstances should the policy be implemented without the general agreement of the faculty. Delay may be annoying, but living with the consequences of rushed decisions can be very costly.

And just as we say, "The king is in his council chamber," his subjects used to say, "The emperor is in his clothes closet."

Disability Studies: What it is and why it is needed
Diane N. Bryen
Siegleinde A. Shapiro

U. S. Census data from 1990 indicate that 49 million Americans have some type of disability. Using the World Health Organization’s (WHO) definition of disability, the 1992 “Digest of Data on Persons with Disabilities” by R. C. Ficke reports that 14.1% of the population is disabled in terms of an activity limitation and 20.6% is disabled in terms of a functional limitation. The United Nations estimates that 10% of the world population has some type of disability. Whatever statistics are adopted, it is a fairly safe assumption that individuals with disabilities constitute the largest single minority group in our nation and around the world. Yet, despite its size, the “community” of persons with disabilities remains unknown or misunderstood and experiences significant disadvantage.

According to a Louis Harris survey commissioned by the National Organization on Disability and conducted early 1994, the majority of persons with disabilities in the U.S. are poor, less independent, less well educated and less likely to reach their full potential than any other identifiable group, including ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged individuals. From the perspective of economics, 59% of adults with disabilities live in households with a total income of less than $25,000, and 25% report that they receive all of their personal income from benefits and insurance programs.

In the area of employment, two-thirds of working age Americans with disabilities are not working, yet eight out of ten of those individuals say they want to work. Only one in five working-age adults with disabilities works full-time, while 11% work part-time. Work disincentives play a major role in keeping these individuals unemployed. Fifty-seven percent of them fear they will lose vital benefits and supports if they secure a job; 50% of current students and trainees with disabilities expect to encounter job discrimination and 30% of disabled workers report discrimination due to their disability. For example, in 1998, workers with disabilities earned only 64% of what their nondisabled co-workers earned.

From an educational perspective, people with disabilities are faring slightly better than they have in the past but they remain far behind their nondisabled peers. A much larger percentage of them have not completed high school (25%) than those without disabilities (12%).

Finally, we find that approximately 40% of Americans with disabilities believe that things have not gotten much better for them over the past 10 years despite the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. People with disabilities have lower levels of satisfaction with their lives than those without disabilities.

This is an appalling picture of waste and lack of fulfillment for millions of individuals with disabilities who live in a nation which has dedicated itself to equal rights and opportunities for all of its citizens. When viewing this picture, leaders in the educational arena should ask: "Why is this so? What are the root causes of these problems?" and most importantly "What can we do to alter this situation?"

One answer is to see that those who are being educated in our colleges and universities are provided with more information about people with disabilities and the issues and policies that concern them. The typical portrayal of individuals with disabilities is as victims of affliction who must be cured, helped to overcome their "deficiencies," cared for and pitied. The plethora of such images interfered with rare glimpses of "extraordinary" people.
Interview with Martin Dorph
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no final decision has been made, but there will probably be fifteen to twenty responsibility centers, following traditional groupings: colleges, schools, programs such as Ambles, Rome, TUI, and so on.

FH: Will RCM entail the reconfiguration of schools and colleges?

MD: Not necessarily, although there will be pressures to investigate other options. It would perhaps be preferable to have responsibility centers of more or less equal size. Right now, college budgets range from 2 million dollars a year to 70 million, and that kind of imbalance creates difficulties.

But that is not my decision to make. It will be up to the Provost and other officers of the University to determine the best configuration of programs.

FH: What will be the criteria for determining each school's share of the budget?

MD: Each school will have a budget equal to that school's direct costs plus a share of the State appropriation provided by Harrisburg. That budget will fund the school's direct costs (faculty, deans, other instructional costs, etc.), plus a share of the indirect costs of the University, such as central administration, space costs, library, etc. We already have a good handle on direct costs, and the direct revenue — tuition, fees, indirect cost recovery, and some other items — can be calculated once some basic allocation decisions are made.

The challenge before us is to develop fair and reasonable methods for allocating the State appropriation to the schools and for charging indirect expenses. We want to be budget-neutral — since the university as a whole has no overall budget, we want it to be able to start each unit off with a balanced budget. But that may mean some schools that are inherently more expensive to run get a larger share of the appropriation. We will need to be very careful in making these decisions to be sure that schools are not unfairly penalized or favored by the allocation formulas for: costs and State appropriation.

FH: And the timetable for implementation?

MD: We hope to have a system in place for the 1995-1996 year. But we won't implement it all at once. One present thinking is to budget next year in the same way we have in the past. Along with the traditional budgeting process, we will run a parallel RCM budgeting process, a kind of dress rehearsal, which will not be operative, but which will allow budget heads the opportunity to identify problem areas and to fine-tune the process. Operational implementation would then be phased in beginning with the 1997-1998 budget.

FH: We're sure you have identified some real problems with all of this. Can you enumerate some of them?

MD: Well, there are three big ones to begin with. First, how do you increase the authority and responsibility of deans, for instance, and at the same time maintain the identity and well-being of the University as a whole. The Provost, for example, will need to maintain oversight of academic programs.

FH: We will want to come back to that.

MD: The second issue is the starting point for each unit, in terms of state appropriation. Some units of the University have already been cut; others have some built-in leeway and maneuverability. So, if you start everybody out with sufficient state appropriation to support their current budgets, it could work to the disadvantage of those who have already suffered cuts. We have to work out the methodology of additional fees, a practice already used for the Rome campus, for example. This is a case where a dean can gauge market forces and consider supplementary fees for courses or programs which are more expensive to run.

FH: As we understand it, RCM has never been tried in a unionized school. Since salaries, beyond the control of deans, present an enormous percentage of budgets, doesn't that mean that the budgetary authority by definition severely limited?

MD: Let me give two answers to that. First, the possibility of additional fees, a practice already allowed for the State appropriation. For instance, tuition, fees, indirect cost recovery, and some other items — can be calculated once some basic allocation decisions are made.

FH: And the timetable for implementation?

MD: We hope to have a system in place for the 1995-1996 year. But we won't implement it all at once. One present thinking is to budget next year in the same way we have in the past. Along with the traditional budgeting process, we will run a parallel RCM budgeting process, a kind of dress rehearsal, which will not be operative, but which will allow budget heads the opportunity to identify problem areas and to fine-tune the process. Operational implementation would then be phased in beginning with the 1997-1998 budget.

FH: We're sure you have identified MD: Yes, that is one of the things we are thinking about, and that was the point of my example of mathematic courses. But don't forget: it is academic planning and decision-making which should lead the RCM process, and not the other way around. If the Provost and the faculty believe a university-wide core curriculum is a desirable thing, then RCM will be structured to support that in the most responsible way. The role of the Provost will be enhanced here.

And by the way, whatever decisions we make now are not irrevocable; there will always be fine-tuning to meet changing needs.

FH: We have heard speculation that just because some schools offer programs which are more expensive than others, there will be a move toward differential tuition.

MD: As a state-related institution, we have to be sensitive to our public mission and the restrictions imposed by State law. For that reason, the establishment of tuition schedules will remain a prerogative of central administration.

FH: It still seems that deans might be encouraged to sacrifice some high cost, low-revenue parts of their programs in order to meet budget needs. A number of our universities are facing a huge shortfall in the next year's budget, a kind of crisis that has never been tried in a unionized school. It is not a very pleasant realization that these kinds of things are going to happen. But that is not my decision to make. One part of the plan is to have a substantial central fund available for deans who have large deficits that fail outside of normal budgetary identification.

Funding for a researcher whose work is of value to the University at large might come from that central fund. Or it might be that there is need for start-up money for a project; large one-time expenses to fill an immediate need is another possibility. Remember, we want to strengthen the university, not weaken it.

FH: There are many important sectors of the university which cross college lines: security, admissions, maintenance, etc. What if a dean just doesn't want to subsidize these units out of his or her budget?

MD: Here again, I think this will ultimately strengthen the University. Deans will certainly have the authority to make decisions that they are sure that they are getting the best service for their money. There is the possibility that a dean might discover that it is more economical and efficient to go outside the university to contract for certain services. Deans will be in a position to put pressure on these sectors to deliver the best and most efficient service. They could even choose to directly fund additional levels of service by special arrangement.

For instance, a school may choose to work with the admissions office to set up a special recruiting operation, paid for by that school.

In any case, there will be much more scrutiny of university-wide sectors, and the influence of deans in these areas will necessarily be greater as their budgets are being negotiated.

FH: Intercollegiate athletics, for example?

MD: Deans will certainly exercise influence there, but like other auxiliary enterprises, we expect athletic programs will pay their own way.
Technology Planning
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- an increase in the ratio of public workstations to students in laboratories and classrooms from the current 5 percent (1,500 stations) to 10 percent (6,000);
- workstations for all faculty;
- multi-media/computer-based laboratories to be scheduled for classroom instruction;
- renovations of classrooms for computer and multi-media use and connections to the university network;
- expanding the number of instructional support laboratories staffed with experts in instructional technology and support with equipment capable of fostering innovation;
- enhanced distance learning capability to improve video conferencing and expand its use in courses;
- implementation of school and college technology plans.

Paraphrased and with my comments, the recommendations for immediate action were:

- as noted above, full funding of phase I of the 1993-University Networking plan created by the University Communications Planning Committee. This four-year plan describes the objectives and costs required to sustain and improve its networking infrastructure. Phase I of this plan focuses on the complete refurbishment infrastructure for the university network and adding necessary support staff. It is fundamental to all other efforts;
- funding of phase I of the TLTR Classroom Refurbishing Report;
- funding of phase I of the TLTR proposed computer laboratory and classroom and hardware and software for faculty offices. This proposal draws from school and college plans and projects an investment over three years, for 19 new 25 station labs, and computing for an estimated 960 (out of 1,600) full-time faculty who lack them;
- retaining the audio-visual staff to deal with multi-media and computing;
- hiring additional to 20 percent of 10 full-time equivalent support staff. We try to support the same number of users as Pitt with only half the staff.

During the 1994-95 academic year, accounts on both the astro and imaging technology plans.

The 1994-95-academic year, accounts on both the astro and imaging technology plans.

- create a database of development programs to promote innovative applications of technology to enhance teaching and learning;
- recognize and properly account for most computing expenses as operating rather than capital costs.

FTF: What are we actually doing this year?

DE: First, we will make long-needed improvements to the university backbone as recommended by the TLTR, although the scale and scope will depend upon final funding decisions.

Second, we are completing the renovation of the Kiva Auditorium, Anderson 28, for multi-media, computer projection, and network access; in addition, we are planning to replace the current system carts with projection capability and one cart with a large screen monitor capable of connection to a PC or Mac. If there are funds remaining from this allocation, Kiva Auditorium will also be upgraded.

For the longer term, we will need to engage our students more of our classrooms; many that are served by additional carts, if the rooms were renovated to provide adequate room darkening, lighting control, electrical service, network access, and power over Ethernet. The cost of these improvements is, for an individual classroom, not expensive (although the network cost will be significant). It makes very little sense to invest in these things if we do not also invest in adequate numbers of support personnel, and that is a critical problem. TLTR recommended moving the audio-visual staff to Art Papasostro's position, retaining them in computer and projection systems. The Kervear Report also recommended the same restructuring, but we proposed eliminating those positions and the university did so. Consequently, unless there are more support personnel, we will cripple the renovation effort.

Third, we will have a university "electronic post office" or mailserver and university email. This is really part of phase II of the University Networking Plan, but it has been pushed forward because of the need to increase our enrollment to its current size, the network that is, roughly 20,000 faculty, students, and staff with email accounts.

This is about half the potential user base, and, as users will know, the existing load has overwhelmed our systems. The new system—actually a cluster of four connected systems—will support between 40,000-50,000 accounts. All faculty, students, and staff will have email access and they will be simpler than they are now. For example, my email address is dleslie@astro.octos.temple.edu. Under a distributed system, what follows that email address will simply be temple.edu. Under current email systems, most of our email is delivered like deleslie because of the constraints of older computer system designs. Under the new system, I can change it for more unambiguous name, e.g., dleslie@temple.edu.

Moreover, I will be able to decide where I want my mail to be delivered to and email mailserver will take care of it. For example, my office computer connects to a Novell-based Novell network server. It would be nice to want all my email sent to and from that server. Others, lacking a local server but they have a central connection, would choose to have "mail" "postbox" on the central cluster. The installation of the new mailserver will happen this summer.

Fourth, though the final decisions have yet to be made, we will expand faculty and student access to computing through Computing and Technology Foo and other allocations for school and college technology plans.

Fifth, we will offer home access to the Internet through the PPP protocol used by most Internet service providers. This will mean that users will be able to use a World Wide Web browser such as Netscape from home.

Sixth, we created a grant program for distance learning initiatives and made several grants to faculty proposing to develop on-line courses. We need to have a better idea of the effort involved, how much they should differ from conventional courses, and where they are most appropriate and effective.

Seventh, although it is a somewhat separate issue and a decision which will be made by a separate group of faculty and staff, the library will decide this year what system will replace GEC. Whether system is adopted, it will integrate more effectively with the university with than GEC.

Eighth, in the proposed new contract, the university has agreed to the TAUP proposal to make interest-free loans to faculty for the purchase of computing equipment. While this has nothing direct to do with internal policy, it does show the university's commitment to helping the faculty keep abreast technologically.

FTF: What is the most pressing, unabridged problem?

DE: Funding. And there are two important aspects to this problem: how the available money is to be used and how much is made available. The TLTR recommended that the university stop treating computing as a capital cost and start treating it as an operating cost, retaining them in computer and projection systems. The Kervear Report also recommended the same restructuring, but we proposed eliminating those positions and the university did so. Consequently, unless there are more support personnel, we will cripple the renovation effort.

The Ambler Report
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Disability Studies
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with disabilities who are successful in sports or other endeavors leaves most with a false image of America's disabled citizenry. The authors encourage us to raise the questions: In what ways are Americans with disabilities being accorded full recognition as equals and being incorporated into the mainstrem of public accommodation, recreation, educational programs and the workforce alongside their non-disabled peers.

Harlan Hahn, a political science profes­
sor at the University of Southern California states: "Without an understanding of policy issues that shape the alternatives available to people with disabilities, persons who enter careers in the health sciences, the helping professions, and other occupations are deprived of valuable resources and a crucial context for their efforts to serve the interests and needs of this segment of the population." (1983, p. 293)

The vast majority of college students today, work business and human service manage­ment, architecture and engineering, social and political sciences, literature and the arts, broadcasting and health care delivery; however, they rarely encounter basic information regarding the single largest minority in this country. These students have little or no opportunity to learn more about their peers with dis­abilities than how to "treat for" or "cure" them if. The little wonder that they fail to hire, accommodate, become friends with, marry or otherwise interact with individu­als with disabilities later on.

Those who choose to work in fields where they will encounter larger numbers of people with disabilities, such as special education, social work, medicine or the allied health professions, receive training which is for the most part outdated, incomplete and irrelevant when it comes to anything that goes beyond the scope of the "medical paradigm" aimed at "fixing" the individual. The real concerns of indi­viduals with disabilities who must make their way in a world such as the one described above, a world which includes devaluation, discrimination and environ­mental barriers at every turn, are rarely addressed. Vital information and resources regarding such areas as disability rights, the independent living move­ment, employment supports and accom­modations, barrier-free design, tax incen­tives, policy development; assistive tech­nology and others support programs and services remain largely unknown and under-used.
The disturbing consequences is the millions of people with disabilities live lives that are separate from the major­ity and they remain misunderstood, unemploy­ed, undervalued, underfunded and unhappy.

In a seminal paper presented at the 1993 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association for Policy Analysis and Management, Gerben DeLong, Ph.D; Director of the National Rehabilitation Hospital Center; Midcetera Research Institute in Washington, D. C. and a well known expert in the disability field states: "Over the last 20 years there has been a marked shift in our understanding of disability policy issues...attributed to the rise of the disability rights/independent living movement. The movement, led by per­sons with disabilities, has fundamentally redefined the problem of disability from one of deficits in the individual to one of barriers in the environment. In this way, the movement has identified public policy as an important environmental component in the lives of disabled people. However, the movement is also aware that academic and analytic capabilities in public policy from a disability perspective remain underdeveloped. Disability policy has not been recognized as a genuine area. We often speak of a health policy, a tax policy, a defense policy, a transpor­tation policy, an income policy, but seldom do we speak of a "disability policy." (p. 56-5)

DeLong accounts for this failure to develop a distinct disability policy area (or the study of disability issues in generic fields) by pointing to the simple fact that people with disabilities have been a devalued group in our society, with their needs and concerns relegated to governmental agencies which are mainly outside the mainstream of our society. "This isolation," says Delong, "has also found its way into the academic community. For too many years, disability issues were considered the exclusive province of rehabilitation counselors and special education programs...The purpose of these academic programs was to train rehabilitation practitioners and providers of services who are independent and at risk thinkers capable of forging national and state policy by working closely together...With such training, the academic community has adopted a four year cycle for a com­puter. About 1,000 computers have been purchased from Computer and Technology Fee and an equal num­ber from other sources. If we replace one fourth of the computers every year, at $2,500, we are spending $750 X $2,500 = $1,875,000 per year. If we move to the TTEGR goals of 6,000 student workstations and assume a four year cycle for a com­puter, the cost jumps to 1,900 X $2,500 = $4,750,000. A five year life cycle reduces the cost to about $3,800,000..." (p. 56).

DeLong, one of the founders of Disability Studies, like African American and Women's Studies, has led an effort in the 1990's to include people with disabilities as part of the dissertation committee of a dissertation. This effort seeks to have in account the myriad of other factors that impact their lives. An example of this is the "human rights" model. It focuses on the rights and needs of disabled people and what it's not. This model is important because it seeks to have an individual's rights be honored, not just their disabilities. A new field of study "Disability Studies" is therefore, inelastic.

Disability Studies: What it is and what it's not

Disability Studies, like African American and Women's Studies, has its origins in the civil rights movement of the 1960's and 70's. It is based on the notion that, as with other oppressed groups, people with disabilities share a history, a culture, and a political alliance, social, political and economic self deter­mination. Through Disability Studies, the collective voices of the disabled, their allies and adversaries form the content and method of instruction that can inform others. The context of Disability Studies includes history, literature, politics, soci­ology, law and economics. Like African American and Women's studies, Disability Studies is designed and taught by people who, as Sara Wason (1994) states, have toiled in and with the disability community and with disability policy and for those who have fought in the real­world disability policy arena individually and collectively.

Potential audiences of Disability Studies are not limited to the traditional audiences or disciplines who comprise the so-called "helping" professions (e.g., health, education, social work, rehabilita­tion and psychology). Rather, stakehold­ers are a much broader group and include business, law, political science, history, economics, public policy, the arts, soci­ology, journalism, engineering, recreation, sports and leisure, architecture, and the disability communities themselves.

Disability Studies is different from the more traditional course work on disabil­ities offered to future disability service providers, such as rehabilitation coun­selors or special education teachers. First, the paradigm for viewing disabilities is quite different. It considers disability as a natural part of the human condition rather than a defect or impairment that needs fix­ing. Second, the focus of "intervention" is paradigmatically different — "fixing" as tem­s that are so accessible to be used usable by people with disabilities rather than fixing people so that they can better fit into existing systems. Third, stake­holders or audiences are different. They include engineers, business people, jour­nalists, lawyers and policy makers, teachers, doctors and social workers. Fourth, teachers and researchers continue to be the "experts." However, as we expanded to include people with dis­abilities themselves rather than solely pro­fessionals, we begin to understand the various medical and educational conditions that have historically defined disabilities. Finally, the outcomes of Disabilities Studies are different. They include an understanding of history, politics, eco­nomics and civil rights, not just an under­standing of diagnosis, prevention, and treatment.

In sum, Disability Studies, is, according to Litvak: "the broad reframing of disability (i.e., not an exclusive medical dominance) as a social phenomenon and social construct with a distinctive cultural and political heritage (in Zoia, 1994)."

Technology Planning
Continued from page 6

Moreover, the unpredictability disrupts planning and decision processes at several levels: departmental, college or school, campus, and university. Planning and expenditures as one level increases, affect planning and expenditures at anoth­er. For example, the rapid increase in the extent of computing networks will place large pressures on the central com­puter networking, and support resources have not been recognized as a great­er area. We often speak of a health policy, a tax policy, a defense policy, a transpor­tation policy, an income policy, but seldom do we speak of a "disability policy." (pp. 56-5)

Funding has had many sources: the Computer and Technology Fee, universi­ty, college, and departmental budgets, grants, contracts, state, awards, corpora­tion, donations, and individual gifts. But the only continuing sources of funds are the C & T Fee and the "107 budget". The Virginia legislature has recently made the "107" budget — a general fund — smaller, really smaller, and somewhat unpredictable.

"The 107 budget comes from the state appropriation and tuition. Over the past several years, the state appropriation has been a decreasing percentage of the uni­versity budget, and there is little indication that will materially change. Tuition...is also unlikely to increase much. This means that, aside from a possible increase in the C & T Fee, the only stable way to increase expenditures for technology is to increase the state appropriation..." (Linton, 1985, p. 293)

The funding problem is at the heart of efforts to plan for a "Plan it! " Renew Temple" announced a year ago. Of the $40 million, only about $14 million is allocated a really identifiable revenue source. That's a $2,500,000 split equally between projected savings from cuts elsewhere in the university bud­get, and what is described as a capital and/or a memorial appropriation. Even if the state makes the appropriation — and history does not make us optimistic — it does not represent the timing of the funding sources we need.

At the same time, I do not believe we can afford to wait until the state makes the appropriation. We have to compete for students and facul­ty. Technology has transformed and continues to transform both the substance and the method of every discipline. While it is true that new faculty may be possible for individual faculty to seize or miss these changes, it is not for the university as a whole. We have to think of the university as a whole and plan for the possibilities, and we have to plan for them with fewer faculty in order to find the money we need. But this faculty planning, large and complex institution engaged in diverse activities. We will need to decide which areas are central and which are peripheral.

Obviously, in this context, it is crucial that well-defined educational objectives drive our investments in technology.

Simi Litvak, one of the founders of the Disability Studies Project at Hanta College expands Litvak's definition, stating that: "Disability Studies reframes the study of disability by focusing on it as a social phenomenon, social construct, postepic and culture, utilizing a minority group model. It is a behind the scenes rethinking about disability in all forms of cultural representations throughout history, and examines the policies and the psychologists of people with disabilities, as well as the experience of disability. Disability Studies both emphasizes from and support the disability rights movement, while advocates for civil rights and self determination. It also focuses on understanding the social, rather than the medical or psychological determinants of the experience of disability. Disability Studies not only examines the experience of disability, but also in the psychology of disability. Disability Studies embodies values based on viewing persons with a disability as a survivor not as a victim, but also on viewing the "disability" as a social phenomenon..."
**Freshman Profile**

Timm Rinehart of the President's office provided the following information to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee at its meeting of January 30th.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SAT Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The average SAT scores exclude all special admit students (approximately one quarter of entering freshmen), including Russell Convell students, athletes, international students, adults and veterans. Including all entering freshmen, the average SAT score for 1991 was 874 and for 1995 was 871.
2. The highest average SAT was 993 in 1981; a steady 10-year drop to 952 in 1991 reflected a national decline in scores as well as the effects of the 1990 strike.

---

**Graduate Board Minutes**

Continued from page 8

applicants, on mentoring. Deans or department chairs may ask or require faculty mentors to participate in such workshops in subsequent years as appropriate.

The Graduate Board had no objections to these additions.

The Graduate Board will continue discussion of this document at the next Graduate Board meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Responsibility Center Management

Dean Nelson reported that President Liacouras has proposed the Responsibility Center Management model for the University. This model would move budgetary decision-making and management to the schools and colleges (centers), and would place the responsibility

---

**Disability Studies**

Continued from page 6

victim, and as one who is limited by social attitudes and environmental barriers rather than an inherent "defect" or "deficiency" which must be remedied.

In the words of Hahn, over the past 20 years a more inclusive conception of disability has evolved "from functional impairment to economic limitations and finally to a sociopolitical perspective. The latter understands disability as an interaction between the individual and the environment rather than something primarily within the person... [Their] difficulties stem fundamentally from their status as members... of an oppressed minority group." (1984, p. 362). This is not what is being taught in most college classrooms.

---

**Highlights of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee**

December 12, 1995;

The FSSC met with Mr. Charles Bush, Ms. Edda Bejarano from Security and Mr. Charles Williams from Student Government to discuss security problems. There have been four robberies within main campus buildings recently. This was considered very unusual. Mr. Bush reported a plan to establish single entry points and controlled access system for exit from main campus buildings. A number of questions were asked. With respect to single entry points, what provisions will be made for disabled students? Many buildings have access already. They will consult with Facilities Management concerning this issue. What is the role of the Philadelphia police? They have had a good response from the city police. With respect to the main campus, this includes undercover police and vehicles. What about guests? They will have to sign in. Mr. Williams noted that students support vigorously the mandatory policy on ID's. They are alarmed at the nature of the crimes... They passed a resolution, at a recent Student Assembly meeting to create an Ad Hoc Committee on Safety and Security.

January 16, 1996;

The FSSC then considered the recent Town Meeting on the subject of the Doctoral Faculty. It was stated that some individuals considered it discouraging. Others had thought that the climate was not hostile. It was noted that most faculty who spoke were against the plan. It was stated that was unclear how the Administration could proceed with the proposal for doctoral faculty. The current status of the proposal was discussed. FSSC members were unsure of this. The possibility of polling the faculty on this issue was considered. The FSSC agenda for the spring semester was then discussed. Issues considered included the infrastructure of faculty governance and Temple University in the 21st century. It was noted that the Kearney Group suggested that Temple look to the future extending beyond a 5 year period. Such discussions would include teaching, research, the CORE, admissions and adult education.

January 23, 1996;

There was extensive discussion with several members of the EPPC and UCPC about the impact of the Core on Admissions and Transfer Students to Temple. EPPC made an extensive evaluation of the Core and streamlined it some. Problems still exist, however, for transfer students. This is especially true for those students who transfer between colleges within Temple, where some departments may not accept certain CORE courses in fulfillment of their CORE requirements. The same problem sometimes exists for transfer students from other universities. Another concern for EPPC is that Temple Traditionally has not accepted AP exams. CLEP, or portfolios because of the objection of CAS. Therefore, a number of top students accept admission to other schools where they can get this credit.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael A. Strover
Secretary

---

**REPRESENTATIVE/UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETINGS**

Senate meetings have been scheduled as follows.

University Senate Meetings will be held in Kiva Auditorium, with a hook-up to the Health Sciences Center. Representative Senate meetings will be held in the Diamond Club.

All meetings will begin at 1:30.

Wednesday, February 14
Thursday, March 14
Monday, April 15
Friday, May 10 (University Senate)
I. Call to order
The meeting was called to order by President Karen Koziara at 1:30 P.M.

II. President's Report
A. The Steering Committee has been discussing "Temple in the 21st Century." What will Temple look like in 10-15 years from now? What strategies must the faculty of the University take to determine the Temple of the future? Several suggestions for proceeding along this path have been offered.

1. Colleges and departments could begin to think about the needs of their disciplines. How are they going? What will they look like?

2. How will the discipline grow? What areas will have declining interests? How will the growth or decline occur over the next decade or so?

3. In the sense of teaching in the disciplines, how will technology affect teaching? How will it be related to the teaching function since we are just now on the cusp of seeing those changes come about?

The steering committee will be contacting departments to discuss these issues in their College or Departmental meetings and will be sending out questionnaires for your ideas. The more we talk about the future the more control we will have over our roles in the future of the University.

III. Report from The Committee on Ambler (Jim Hilty)
This was a committee appointed by the Provost consisting of 4 students, 9 faculty 13 administrators and 3 staff. The report was filed with the President and the Provost.

A. Overview of Ambler
Ambler is described as a full service campus. The academic offerings fall within 3 distinct areas: 1. Daytime undergraduate courses serving about 1,600 students; 2. Evening courses attended by about 1,500 undergraduates (adults); and 3. 1,050 graduate and professional students taking evening courses. Nineteen daytime majors can be taken at Ambler, 13 can be completed entirely there.

B. Committee Findings
1. Ambler's academic mission is unclear; the programs have been neglected;
2. There is the lack of a long-range plan;
3. There is a decrease in undergraduate enrollments;
4. The expectations of students that they can complete their degree on that campus are unfulfilled;
5. Services on the campus are minimal;
6. Residents are only half full because they do not meet the students' needs;
7. Facilities are inadequate;
8. Classroom space is inadequate, thus limiting programs;
9. There is a rich area for expansion.

C. Committee Recommendations
The Committee offered four options:
1. Designate Ambler as exclusively a Main Campus feeder program;
2. Add limits and control on the number of Graduate Faculty criteria; and
3. The planning process questions have been laid out for RCM and we need to begin answering the questions. The expectation is that there will be a "soft" start during the 1996-97 academic year.

VI. Report on Campus Security
Charles Rush thanked everyone for their cooperation over the past week with the new security system. By 2/19/96 everyone will have to have Spring identification stickers. The plan is to have card access to all buildings by student faculty and staff.

J. B. Rush reported the incidents that led to the need for the security changes. Crime reports will be published regularly.

VII. Meeting was adjourned at 3:05 P.M.
Respectfully submitted
Jean H. Woods, Pro-Tem

Graduate Board Minutes
November 14, 1995

Present
Elected Members: Robert Aiken, Phillip Betancourt, Erwin Blackstone, Reza Fasihii, Peter Goodwin, Alison Konrad, Larry Kruft, Nicholas Kripal, Dawn Marks, Roberta Newton, Robert Patterson, Felice Perlmutter, Patrick Peggot, Jeffrey Rush, Katherine Shepard, Michael Soffer, Stephen Willier, Jacqueline Zinn
Ex-Office Members: Jack Nelson, John Zezima
Staff: Sylvia Studenmund

MINUTES of the October 19, 1995 meeting were approved as presented.

DEAN'S REPORT
Request from the Provost's Commission for the Arts
Jack Nelson presented the request from the Provost's Commission for the Arts that Graduate Board member, Jeffrey Rush, be included on the Graduate Board ad hoc Committee for Graduate Faculty Criteria. The Commission reasons that it is important to have a member on the committee who has an understanding of the M.A. experience and who can represent M.A. faculty eligible for Graduate Faculty II status.

The request was approved.

Update on Graduate Program Reviews
The Graduate Program Review Committee and the Provost's ad hoc Advisory Committee hope to complete their review of graduate programs by early December.

Update on Recommendations for Graduate Faculty Criteria
The draft of the Graduate Board ad hoc Committee for Graduate Faculty Criteria Recommendations was distributed to deans for input. The deans have indicated that they will bring the end of December report submitted suggested changes to the criteria document and, if necessary, to the list of faculty nominated for Graduate Faculty II status. In January the Graduate Board Program Review Committee will begin looking at the nominations for Graduate Faculty II status.

REPORT FROM THE GRADUATE BOARD ADhoc COMMITTEE FOR GRADUATE FACULTY CRITERIA
The Graduate Board ad hoc Committee for Graduate Faculty Criteria recommends:
1) That M.F.A. programs be included in programs for which Graduate Faculty II will be responsible.
It was moved and seconded to accept the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

2) Colleges that have programs in Category II (Ph.D., D.M.A., M.F.A.) must have at least one Graduate Faculty II representative on the Graduate Board.
It was moved and seconded to accept the recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

3) Only Graduate Faculty II Graduate Board members may vote on issues specific to Graduate Faculty II programs. All members of the Graduate Board may vote on all other issues.
It was moved and seconded to table this recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

Members of the Graduate Board agreed by consensus that the document, "Draft, Graduate Board ad hoc Committee for Graduate Faculty Criteria Recommendations," will be revised to include M.F.A. programs in every area where there is a reference to Ph.D. and D.M.A. programs.

OLD BUSINESS
Update on the Draft of Recommendations of the Provost's ad hoc Committee on Graduate Assistants - Jack Nelson
The document, "Draft, Suggestions for Implementing Recommendations of the Provost's ad hoc Committee on Graduate Assistants," has been distributed to the deans and has been discussed at a Council of Deans meeting. The Provost would like comments separately as a report. The full report is attached to the minutes and can be reviewed in the Senate office.

V. Ask The Provost
The Provost thanked the Union and Mr. Hocher for the positive outcome of the contract negotiations.

1. He was asked about the outcome from the Ambler meeting and how the report would mesh with the Strategic Academic Plan. The expectation is that there will be a wide discussion across the University about Ambler. A dean's search will begin soon. He expects that there will be a collaborative based planning and that RCM will result in major shifts in relationships.

2. The latest enrollment report has a 4% decline compared to last Spring in Main Campus; 13% decline at TUCCC; and 8% at Ambler.

It was moved and seconded that it is the sense of the Graduate Board that this recommendation should be retained. The question failed. Bullet 4 will be deleted.

Policies (Page 2)
The deans recommended the additions (bold) to the following recommendations:

Bullet 3 - The maximum service requirement for a Graduate Assistantship is 20 hours per week. For students in an area of responsibility for undergraduate courses, the assigned load will include no more than three such courses per year.

The deans suggested that the sentence in bold be deleted.

It was moved and seconded: The sense of the Graduate Board is that this is an appropriate recommendation.

It was moved and seconded to include the phrase as friendly amendment to the above motion added to the second sentence of Bullet 3, and students who are assigned three such courses are assigned to other responsibilities.

Motion passed.

Bullet 4 - No graduate program will be allocated more Teaching Assistantships than it needs to meet its student enrollment within its discipline.

The remaining assistantships will be allocated to the University wide that use Teaching Assistants. These programs are negotiable with departments concerning the allocation of these Assistantships.

The deans suggested that this recommendation be deleted.

Bullet 5 - Graduate Assistants must be evaluated, every semester, by faculty in which the assistant is serving. Teaching Assistants must also be evaluated by the students for whom the assistant is responsible.

These evaluations will be available to the student and will become part of the student file, which the understanding is that early, unfavorable, evaluations may be removed at the request of the student if later evaluations are more favorable.

Bullet 4 - First year Teaching Assistants must participate in an ongoing course or workshop on teaching, meeting, on average, at least one hour per week.

Bullet 5 - The first time faculty are assigned as mentors to Teaching Assistants they will be asked to participate in a department, cognate discipline based, or college wide workshop, as necessary.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 P.M.