Parts and Wholes: Who Stands For Temple?

Temple has been making headlines lately, and not in the way we would like. I refer, of course, to the furor over the decision last December to cut seven varsity sports. This has led to a wave of criticism, including a lengthy takedown in The New York Times. Just last week, we were informed that the NCAA has begun an inquiry into whether Temple is in violation of the gender-equity rules set forth by Title IX—a perverse outcome given that one of the justifications for the cuts is to bring us into Title IX compliance.

There is much to be said about this and other aspects of this decision, including the sadly-predictable but still-upsetting exclusion of faculty from the deliberations. And much gets said and said well by Michael Sachs in his column, Like him, I hope that our leaders learn something from their mistakes here; we are, after all, an educational institution.

But it is our status as an educational institution that makes me want to take a step back and ask why, exactly, this decision has generated so much news. There is plenty to debate about the proper role of athletics at Temple, and I’m happy for The Herald to serve a site of those debates, just as it...

Universal Design for Learning: Ensuring Access for All Students

By Ann Keefer, Ph.D., Instructor, English

“What you really needed was a flexibility far greater than anything the technology could provide, some generous, spontaneous gift for accepting surprises.” Michael Herr, Dispatches

Universal Design for Learning, the educational descendant of Universal Design, has the potential to improve learning outcomes for all of our students and to enliven our experience as teachers. An architectural concept dating back to the 1970’s, universal design is all around us: motion-sensing doors at supermarkets, closed captions on television, even the touch screen technology of smart phones and tablets. Universal design positsthat we can create built environments and products which are accessible and useable by the greatest possible number of people and levels of ability, with the lowest exertion of effort. The late architect Ron Mace, who coined the term “universal design”, once described his idea as “design for the built environment and consumer products for a very broad definition of user.”

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) takes the concepts and goals of

Athletics: To Infinity and Beyond…?

By Michael Sachs, Professor of Kinesiology

The recent cuts in Athletics came as a surprise to many, and a few thoughts reflecting on the process and the events seem warranted. I have quoted a noted philosopher, Buzz Lightyear (from Toy Story), in my title, to suggest a dichotomy—the potential effects of the cuts allow Athletics to explore new worlds, to boldly go where no department has gone before (oops, sorry, mixing up my shows). But for the approximately 158 athletes whose sports have been cut, there is no tomorrow, their dreams of playing for Temple are gone, there is no journey towards infinity…

Even the NSA must be impressed by how stealthily the Administration pursued this course of action. One particularly sad part of this process was that apparently there was no (or almost no) faculty involvement—I believe faculty could have contributed significantly to the decision making process. There has been no real explanation for why this was the case. I sincerely hope this wasn’t because faculty couldn’t be trusted to keep a secret. There are many faculty who have long involvement with athletics from past Presidents’ Advisory Committees, etc. We have the knowledge to be helpful; our

Accessibility and Technology at Temple

An Interview with Timothy O’Rourke, Chief Information Officer and Vice President, Computer and Financial Services, and Paul E. Paire, Executive Director, Systems, Computer Services

Editor’s Note: Although CIO O’Rourke has been making presentations to various faculty groups about the changes in Temple’s policies on accessibility, I think it’s crucial that as many faculty as possible are informed about them. So, on January 23rd, I sat down with CIO O’Rourke and Executive Director Paire; thanks to them for spending their time discussing these very important issues.

"Why and How Temple’s Accessibility Policies Have Changed
-Training Faculty and Enforcing Policies
-Budget and Expenditures for Accessibility
-Thought Experiments on Accommodations
-The Make-Up of the ATCC and Accessibility Working Groups
-Cyber-Security"
Accessibility and Technology at Temple
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Why and How Temple’s Accessibility Policies Have Changed

Tim O’Rourke (TO): Accessible Technology in Higher Education is controversial in a way because it is big, it’s important, and there are no clear cut answers. Everybody is always looking for clear-cut, black-and-white answers. “What do I do? Do I do this or that?” But everything we’re dealing with now is subjective, it’s our opinions, we discuss it, and come up with what we feel is the best answers. At the end of the day, what we come up with, we could go to court and a judge could rule against us.

Steve Newman (SN): So these are informed judgment calls.

TO: Right. It’s a lot of judgment calls. We’re trying to be compliant, but I don’t want to do anything that is so far out, so expensive that we don’t need to do it. That’s the balance we’re working with right now.

SN: I know you’ve come to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and you’ve made presentations to a lot of different groups. And yet it’s still the case that faculty, like other busy people, often do not pay attention to something until it is actually on their doorstep. So I think it would help our readers if one or both of you could give a quick sense of what has changed. What has changed in our posture toward accessibility, and why has it changed?

TO: OK. I think the big thing that has changed university-wide is an awareness. I think that we’re all aware of the issue. Why? Because there is a myriad of lawsuits out there. Dozens of lawsuits from organizations representing people with disabilities against universities about the use of technology in the classroom. It’s a very interesting phenomenon. We use technology more and more and more in education. Constantly. Every year. It’s snowballing. We do so without any thought as to how that technology affects a disabled person. As a result, some disabled people are saying, “Wait. Slow down. This is putting us at a disadvantage.” They have laws on their side. So the reality of it is that I think that all of us in the Higher Education industry in general have to say, “We realize this; now what are we going about it?” But, as I said, there are no black-and-white answers, there is really no, “You should do this or this or this.” So we’re in the process now of learning. We’ve been dealing with this now for almost two years. We have been dealing with it as a result of the Penn State settlement and almost fell off my chair. These are things that never crossed my mind.

SN: It’s global. It’s everything from libraries services to admissions to pedagogy.

TO: It’s everything that has to do with education as a whole, since we’re using technology in every aspect of education. Very few faculty members today write on the blackboard. But even if they did it, if there were a blind person in the room, how would you handle it?

Temple has always done a very good job. We’ve always been aware of people with disabilities. But it’s been our philosophy that if we have a person with a disability in the room, we call Disability Resources and make accommodations.

SN: It’s been ad hoc.

TO: It’s been ad hoc and making accommodations. And we’ve done a terrific job of that. Our Disability Resources is as good as they come. But that’s not enough. That’s not enough anymore. What does that mean, "that’s not enough?" We don’t know. We’re trying to figure it out. We’re taking baby steps, trying to figure it out.

Almost everything we’re doing now, we’re questioning: “How do we do this? Is this OK?” So, what have we done? First of all, we set up a website. Everything I’m going to tell you is available on accessibility.temple.edu. We also set up a policy. One, a general statement: We will be accessible. There’s no argument there. Two, and I think probably the most controversial thing in here, is: “The person responsible for providing the technology and information is responsible for making it accessible.”

SN: Yeah—I have that in bold in my own notes.

TO: We can’t be in a situation where a faculty member who is teaching says, “It’s not my responsibility to make this accessible; it’s yours.” It’s Computer Services’. It’s the University’s.” You can’t do that. We don’t tell faculty how to teach, what to teach, what to use in teaching; so we can’t be responsible for making that accessible. I think that’s the crux of your piece: What is a faculty member supposed to do?

SN: Yes, that’s my focus.

TO: If it needs to be accessible and it can’t be made accessible, then we need to remove it. We need to change. That’s the policy. And we’ve set up an Accessibility Technology Compliance Committee (ATCC), made up of several really good faculty members, administrators, and legal counsel is a big player in that, to make judgments on this, since a lot of this subjective. I know I did not want to be the one to say yes or no in all these things. So we discuss these things. It’s a very active committee. It meets about once a month. They review exceptions, and I think you [Paul Paire] gave me a number the other day, that something like 30 things have come through and they have reviewed and made modifications and exceptions.

Training Faculty and Enforcing Policies

SN: The requests are coming from faculty members? Departments? How have the exception requests bubbled up?

TO: Right now, the exceptions either come when a faculty member wants to use software in the class or an administrative department want to use software to perform their functions. If the software is not certified to be accessible, then we need to take a review of it and make a determination. I’ll be perfectly honest with you, I think every exception request has been approved. However, in that process of approving them, the committee has made the faculty member sit down and document how they would accommodate a blind student, how they would accommodate a deaf student. So we’re getting these accommodations in writing. And, again, I get back to awareness. We’re making faculty members think about this up front. One thing that can’t happen is that a faculty member prepares a class, “I’m going to use WebEx, I’m going to do this and that.” And then on day one a blind student or a deaf student comes in and they can’t use it. The faculty member can’t just say, “Go to Disability Resources.” At some point, the faculty member may need to totally change the way they do their class. And the law gives them a very short period of time, I think only two weeks. So what we’re trying to do now is to get this thought process going up front.

SN: If I could ask you about the exceptions, so I know where we are. I know this has already been a multi-year effort and we have years to put into
Response to *Faculty Herald’s “Conversation on Good and Bad Teaching”*

By Pamela E. Barnett, Associate Vice Provost & Director, Teaching and Learning Center

**What great teachers do and believe**

Ken Bain’s bestseller, *What the Best College Teachers Do*, delivers on the promise of its title, offering some actions that an aspiring “best college teacher” might take. But one of Bain’s important findings is that success depends not only what we do, but to a significant extent on what we believe. What are our core beliefs about our purposes as educators? What are our beliefs about our students or human learning?

The best college teachers, it turns out, believe that students are naturally curious, want to grow and are capable of learning, but that schooling has often blunted those qualities. When confronted with the inevitable – students who have difficulty or display lack of motivation – the best college teachers examine their own courses and practices. Here’s what the best college teachers do not do: decide that the failure to learn is wholly the fault of students who are lazy, entitled or lacking in intelligence. Rather, they reflect on what they might do differently, often talking with colleagues or studying the literature, because they share a core set of assumptions about students’ capacity to learn and their own role to facilitate their learning, even when it’s hard.

Their actions are also based on the fundamental belief that everything they do must be designed to facilitate and produce learning. In the *Herald’s “Dialogue on Good and Bad Teaching.”* Steve Newman suggests that “bad teaching tends to emerge when the teacher forgets the students.” It may seem obvious, and yet I think we have all experienced teaching that is more about a teacher’s performance than about the students’ capacity to learn from it. Everything we do at The Teaching & Learning Center aims to promote this basic conceptual orientation toward learning-centered beliefs and approaches. A brilliant, well-organized and well performed lecture that represents the cutting edge in the field is good teaching if students learn from it, but ineffective if it goes over their heads. A charismatic or funny classroom presence is good teaching if it motivates students to attend to the course concepts, but just for show if it leads only to laughter and not learning. A test on which the majority of students earn an “A” indicates excellent teaching if it accurately and fairly measures significant learning goals, but is a very bad sign if students do not need to study or stretch to excel on it.

The best college teachers begin with learning-centered teaching beliefs that are then expressed in learning-centered course design, delivery, and assessment. As a few participants in the Dialogue have noted, excellent teachers have clear and significant goals for their students’ learning. Rebecca Alpert offers a prompt that I think everyone who aspires to excellence should ask during the design and delivery of a course: “A year (or more) after this course is over I hope students will...” What do you hope your students will learn or be able to do long after they’ve passed your exam or completed your assignments? Jerry Lanelli is on the mark when he celebrates teachers who “cared more about teaching how to learn than about teaching information.”

In one of my favorite SNL skits, Father Guido Sarducci pitches his “Five-Minute University,” which awards diplomas to students who know just the things that one can expect to remember five years after graduation. For Economics, it is “supply and demand.” For Spanish class, it is knowing how to respond appropriately to “¿Cómo estás?” No doubt Temple students remember a great deal more than Father Guido’s graduates. But I know from countless conversations with faculty members in every department that our goals for our students’ learning are far more ambitious than memorized content. We want students to use information in meaningful ways, to connect what they know to new knowledge, to be able to evaluate new knowledge or arguments, to apply it to examine important questions or solve problems. Newman asserts that “effective teaching typically requires reverse engineering, working backwards from where you want students to go.” In the teaching and learning world, we call this “backwards design.” It seems like such a simple concept: begin with the end in mind. If we first define the outcomes we believe have lasting value, we can then design assessments to measure students’ mastery of these with precision. From there, a teacher should determine exactly what material must be covered, what experiences students must have, what skills must be practiced and honed, in order for students to gain the knowledge and skills we aim to foster. Instead of beginning with the question of what material to cover, course design decisions get made with the learning goals in mind.

This approach does not come automatically to many of us, as we often think of our disciplines as bodies of knowledge to be mastered. In my early years as a professor of English & African American Studies, I’ll confess that I designed more than a few courses by first asking “What great works of 20th century literature must my students read to be educated and enriched human beings?” I’d make a list of great books and then agonize over the impossibility of cramming all of the “must reads” into one semester. Once I decided that one of my goals was for students to closely analyze a complex literary text and privileged that significant learning goal above all, I was then liberated to spend some time on William Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom*, practicing and building analytical skills rather than catapulting ahead to make sure we “covered” another great work. My students learned more by doing more with one text: more research, more writing, more discussion, more thinking…

I don’t want to trivialize the “coverage” question. If students are to progress through a course of study, they must master at least the trunk of a large body of disciplinary material. But it is worth remembering that covering the material is not the same as uncovering the material. If your goals include higher order thinking skills, and you are serious about giving students the opportunities and feedback to hone these, then you are going to have to make some hard choices about exactly what facts, information, and concepts you can address in your fifteen-week window.

**How do we evaluate good teaching?**

This *Faculty Herald* dialogue goes some distance toward an aspiration we at The Teaching and Learning Center have: to elevate the status and practice of teaching by making it “community property,” something for which we feel collective responsibility and something we improve by our shared attention. Stanford’s Lee Schulman, President Emeritus of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, shares a telling story from his first months on the tenure track. As a new Assistant Professor, he assumed that scholarship would be the site of intense introspection and solitude, as he engaged with texts and data in the library and at his desk. He looked forward to getting outside of his own head by engaging with his students, but also with his colleagues about their shared role as teachers. What he found was the exact opposite, experiencing “isolation not in the stacks but in the classroom.” His research was a site of professional community, as colleagues reviewed, discussed, and sometimes challenged his scholarly work. Professional community was advanced as colleagues engaged the latest research and ideas in the discipline at conferences and in the pages of peer-reviewed journals. Unexpectedly, teaching was the professorial activity conducted in solitude.

Schulman was disappointed at the lack of opportunity and culture for sharing ideas about teaching, and also concerned about the consequences of this pedagogical solitude for students. He argues that when teaching is not “community property,” it is devalued. He envisions departmental cultures where colleagues collectively engage around a shared priority to educate. When teaching is conducted outside of the engagement of the professional community, educators also miss opportunities for feedback, reflection, and improvement. Schulman advocates for peer review of teaching that is as attentive as that

Barnett continued on page 6.
Meet Temple University Honors

By Vallorie Perdier, Professor of Engineering, Honors Program Oversight Committee

Editor’s Note: This was originally the second part of a two-part article written by Prof. Perdier; the first part, on the new Freshman-Scholar Summer Stipend Program, was published separately in order to alert faculty to the March 1 deadline.

Introduction. Although several Colleges have an integrated Honors curriculum and an established faculty who teach in Honors, many Temple faculty in fact have relatively little interaction with the Honors program. A faculty member who teaches a regular (non-Honors) course cannot, for example, determine from the enrollment roster which of one’s students are in Honors.

I teach in a College which only recently developed an integrated four-year curriculum of Honors courses for our undergraduate majors. Indeed, for my first twenty years or so at Temple, I was only vaguely aware of Honors, sensing that it was somehow “selective” and that there were special core/Gen-Ed courses designated solely for Honors students. But now, having served both as my College’s liaison to the University Honor’s program, and even more recently on the Faculty Senate Honors Program Oversight Committee, I feel that my perceptions have become somewhat more informed. I have now come to the view that our Honors program serves the University in a rather substantial fashion with comparatively low overhead.

So the twin goals of the following narrative are, first, to provide faculty with a brief synopsis of the University Honors program, including its effectiveness and vulnerabilities. Second, I hope to encourage interested faculty to abet their own research and pedagogical vision by capitalizing on the resources associated with University Honors—especially the students.

University Honors: the recruitment function. Colleges and universities compete aggressively for that comparatively small pool of top-performing high-school students, and with good reason. High-performing students challenge the faculty and elevate the overall quality of the academic enterprise. The success of high-performing students in their subsequent careers confers prestige, reputation, and sometimes donations, to their alma mater. It is in every institution’s interest, including Temple, to attract the highest-quality students possible.

Temple University now fields two specific inducements to the top-performing high-school student. The first is the new Freshman Academic scholarship program, which provides a range of merit-based tuition scholarships. The second is Temple’s University Honors program. The principal inducement of the Freshmen Scholarship program is tuition. In contrast, the principal inducements of the University Honors program are small, challenging classes and the personalized guidance that one normally associates with highly-selective private institutions.

University Honors: the student experience. It turns out that about one in seventeen undergraduates at Temple is a University Honors student.

What privileges does this selective subset of students enjoy? The documented benefits include:

1. Honors students may take Honors-only courses, which average 20 students/class and are taught largely by full-time faculty.

2. Honors students may reside in the Honors-only “Honors Living and Learning Community” (HLLC) if they wish. (The HLLC is a particularly seductive selling point for the parents of prospective Honors freshmen.)

3. Honors students (along with scholar athletes) can register for courses in advance of everyone else.

4. The Honors administration area in Tuttleman incorporates the Honors-program staff, an Honors Lounge, an Honors Seminar Room, and walk-in advising privileges.

5. Honors students get graduate-student library privileges.

6. All Honors students get at least one $4000 summer academic-enrichment stipend (new this year).

There are also the subjective benefits. Many Honors students find the classroom experience of Honors courses, including the excellent faculty, to be the most important feature of University Honors. Another important subjective benefit is the quality of the Honors Program staff, which does an outstanding job of advising Honors students in academics, career, and personal issues. The staff also goes to great length to cultivate a community spirit among the Honors cohort.

University Honors: the administration. There are about 1600 Honors undergraduates, and their ranks span most of the Colleges and academic disciplines at Temple. The program is centrally administered by Dr. Ruth Ost, the Senior Director of University Honors, and her staff. They provide academic advising and personal mentoring for the Honors students, and coordinate the diverse curriculum of Honors classes across the Colleges. The Honors staff also facilitates the Honors students’ transition to graduate school, careers, and top-level academic awards like Marshall and Truman Fellowships. In addition, the Honors staff fosters Honors-student peer-mentorship arrangements and peer-recruiting programs, resulting in a quite a distinctive esprit-de-corps within the Honors student body.

Ruth Ost (the Honors students call her “Ruth”; she calls them “the Honorables”) and her staff are quite resourceful for creating the best possible experience in “the Honorables”, and a few examples follow. Ruth and her staff identify, and admit, additional Honors students from both the upper-class ranks and from freshmen admits who failed to satisfy the automated cutoff criteria. Ruth carries out her own internal system of course evaluations so that the Honors Program staff can more effectively advise students on course selection. Ruth conducts mock practice interviews for students who compete for prestigious fellowship awards and scholarships, and Temple’s remarkable track record in this regard owes a lot to the Honors staff. Ruth and her staff write numerous career, personal, and academic references for the Honorables. The Honors program staff train Honors students to mentor each other and to serve as Honors recruiting personnel. The Honors staff also runs Honors immersion/internship programs and cultivate Honors self-governance organizations.

It is rather impressive that this multi-purpose and multi-faceted coordination of all these high-expectation students, in all these diverse programs, is accomplished with just six full-time staff. Indeed, with the important exception of the actual Honors classes, the “perks” accorded Honors students inure relatively little actual, additional expense to the University. Temple’s success at fielding the University Honors curriculum will now be considered.

University Honors: the curriculum. Although Honors students enjoy excellent advising and special perks, the core inducement of University Honors is small accelerated classes taught by great faculty. Honors classes come in two flavors: either (i) an “honors” versions of general course, or (ii) a course unique to the Honors curriculum; in both cases a “9” in the second digit of the course number means it is part of the Honors curriculum. Note that University Honors classes are not merely smaller, selectively-populated versions of regular courses; instead, these courses are generally distinguished by an accelerated delivery and a more sophisticated course content. Indeed, some Honors courses are conducted as seminars, enabling participants to collectively explore topics of particular interest to the class.

To remain in the Honors program, Honors students must take three Honors classes by the end of their freshman year, five by the end of their sophomore year, eight by the end of their junior year, and ten by graduation; four of these courses must be at the 2xxx level or higher. In an ideal world, the Temple University Honors program would field a complete curriculum of courses, from Gen-Ed through upper-level courses in the discipline. In the real world, it turns out that there is a broad array of Honors-course options both in lower-level and cross-disciplinary courses (such as the Gen-Ed classes). There is also a decent selection of upper-level Honors courses in a few large academic programs. However, the provision of upper-level University Honors courses in the major is by-in-large less than satisfactory.

University Honors: the challenge of providing the upper-level curriculum. Most Honors students prefer to take their required upper-level Honors courses in their major. Indeed, some academic programs have so few free electives that students must take their upper-level Honors classes in the major, as is situation in my College, the College of Engineering. Unfortunately, in many disciplines there are few upper-level Honors-course options, and the reason will now be described.

Consider my College as an example of the challenge entailed in offering upper-level Honors
Universal Design for Learning: Ensuring Access for All Students

By recognizing that students come into the classroom with many different kinds of knowledge, aptitudes and needs, UDL breaks down barriers to learning while retaining high standards for every student.

Giving students choices from among a variety of expressions of course material and concept mastery allows them to not only express their knowledge in a method they prefer, it may also challenge them to think critically about their strengths and how they can present their ideas in a polished, professional and engaging way. While department standards or accreditation boards may require students to write papers or reports, perform complex calculations with specific software programs, or give a series of presentations or speeches, many aspects of a course may be amenable to varied methods of expression.

The flexibility inherent in UDL enhances its usefulness for multiple audiences of students, both students with disabilities who have a legal right to accommodations and students who face any sort of impairment or barrier to learning. Students for whom English is a second or third language, a student who must juggle full-time employment with a full-time course load, or students with undocumented or unrecognized disabilities who may not want to disclose their disability status. UDL might be thought of as a curb cut for learners: Curb cuts, in the architectural or urban planning sense, allow people who use wheelchairs to cross streets safely without having to “jump” a curb. But people who are pushing strollers, pulling a wheeled backpack or suitcase, or who choose...
applied to research and creative products. He argues that if teaching is to be held to any meaningful standard for quality, colleagues must review each other’s teaching according to standards developed for their disciplines.

To my mind, Schulman offers some of the best arguments for “getting beyond the SFFs” as the sole measure of teaching quality. These arguments – for enhanced reflection, community, and teaching quality – have been part of the Faculty Senate SFF committee dialogue since the beginning. Even as the group worked on its first charge – to improve the SFF instrument and the process of administration and data collection –we were always also concerned with how to support alternative assessments. The group worked hard to improve the university’s form, all the while agreeing that no matter how good the instrument, it should never be the only instrument for evaluating the complicated work of facilitating learning. That argument was voiced by committee members, and was echoed by faculty colleagues at the several forums and meetings hosted about SFFs over the years.

When the committee recently finished its work with the SFFs, members decided to continue and make these other measures our primary concern. The work has already begun. Thirty-eight department and school teams have participated in TLC working groups to develop processes and evaluation instruments for standards-based peer review of teaching. I chaired a sub-committee that recommended some guidelines for teaching portfolios which would include evidence from three sources: the instructor, peers, and students. I am happy to report that these guidelines are, as of this fall, institutionalized in CLA’s merit process for non-tenure track faculty. I believe Temple would be an even stronger educational institution if these guidelines were adopted across the board to evaluate the complicated work of facilitating learning.

A teaching portfolio can offer a thorough and nuanced picture of an educator’s philosophy, choices and effectiveness, beginning with a reflective narrative in which an educator tells his or her story. What kinds of approaches have been used, and why? What has the instructor learned from colleagues via peer review or from students via SFFs? What has the instructor learned from investing in his/her own professional development as a teacher? Can the instructor demonstrate student learning outcomes which really are the gold standard for effective teaching? The Faculty Senate committee is interested in promoting additional evaluation methods, and I think we all share a larger goal of advancing a culture of reflective teaching practice and elevating the status and practice of our work as university educators.

**TEXTS FOR TEACHING**

In 2009, the Teaching and Learning Center developed Temple’s Teaching in Higher Education Certificate. There are tracks for matriculated Temple graduate students, but also for Temple and other Philadelphia-area faculty who enroll as non-matriculated students. The following texts are included on the syllabus for the certificate’s requisite course, and we recommend them highly.


Meet Temple University Honors
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courses. The College of Engineering has about 1400 undergraduates and four academic departments, with one in seventeen undergraduates an Honors student. For sake of discussion, assume that Honors and regular undergraduates are uniformly distributed, both across the four departments and amongst the four undergraduate class levels. This means that a typical spring semester of a required junior class (say) will need to serve about ninety students, with about five of them in Honors. Suppose that I, as the instructor of these ninety students in this required course, were to consider opening another separate Honors section for just these five Honors students; would I do it? Note that the Dean of the College of Engineering is categorically supportive of running Honors sections, regardless of enrollment numbers.

Despite the support of my Dean and my enthusiasm for the Honors program, I would not choose to develop and offer an Honors section in the situation described above. This is because most of my College’s full-time faculty already carry a full load, so if I were to develop and teach that new Honors section, either I or one of my colleagues would need to teach an overload. Another option would be to hire an adjunct to teach a section of the regular course, but using adjuncts for upper-level courses in the major is not always desirable. So, it seems that any combination of the three possible work-arounds: (i) teaching non-Honors students in larger sections, or (iii) assigning adjuncts to teach the non-Honors sections, merely pushes the burden of running a section onto the remaining upper-level undergraduate majors. It is for this reason that I have yet to teach in Honors.

Thus it is seen that the limiting operational resource for the University Honors program is neither the scholarship overhead, nor the provision of lower-level courses, nor the various benefits accorded to the Honors students. Instead, the limiting resource in my own College is a restricted number of faculty that, in turn, constrains development of upper-level Honors curriculum in the major. This situation likely mirrored elsewhere the University, particularly in the smaller academic programs. Note also that these difficulties for offering upper-level Honors courses in the major will likely be exacerbated by both (i) the new University budget model, and (ii) our University’s success in recruiting larger numbers of Honors students.

Of course a work-around for this dearth of upper-level Honors courses has been devised, and it is called the “Honors Contract”. In the Honors-contract scheme the student either: (a) does either extra (contractual) work in an existing regular upper-level course, or (b) substitutes a graduate course, to satisfy the requirement of at least four 2000+ level Honors classes.

University Honors: your involvement. In closing, perhaps the reader is now some-what more informed about both the successes and challenges of the University Honors program. If you would like to contribute to this Temple University Honors enterprise, there are three specific possibilities:

1. If your College and/or academic program can support it, please consider developing an upper-level Honors course. (Here, be aware that Ruth Ost is a must-utilize resource person for developing new Honors courses. Also, it is not uncommon for faculty to beta-test a new course by first offering it in Honors.)

2. If you would like engage in a graduate program in a research project (regardless of duration or scope), you might consider recruiting a Honors student, either within your discipline or otherwise. It might evolve into a working relationship that spans several years, benefiting all concerned.

3. If you personally know a talented high-school student, you might let them know about the University Honors program (as well as our competitive new Freshman Scholarship program.)

In Memoriam: Dick Beards, 1934-2013

To the regret of all who knew him, Dick Beards, an associate professor in the Department of English in his 49th year of service at Temple, passed away over Winter Break. Adding to our sadness, the disease that took him worked very swiftly; we had no idea that he was ill and thus didn’t have time to say goodbye or prepare for losing him. The obituary that ran in his local newspaper reveals much about what made Dick special, his blending of scholarly pursuit, care for teaching, and a vital life outside of Temple that included his running an antiquarian bookstore. Our sense of the man was heightened by the memorial gathering put together by Prof. Joyce Joyce, the Chair of English. There, we heard from faculty of all ranks, graduate students, and undergraduates, from those who had known him for decades to those whom he had taught only recently but who had been deeply affected by his generosity. They spoke of his willingness to take risks, such as giving a feminist scholar a graduate class when he was director of the Master of Liberal Arts program at a time when feminism was not to be found—by design—in the graduate offerings of the English Department. They spoke of his extraordinary kindness toward his students, such as making his collection of Native American artifacts available to a Native American student who had never had the chance to touch the expertly-woven baskets of her own people. They testified to his wide-ranging curiosity, always eager to talk with a colleague in the hall about what he or she was working on or teaching.

I had the honor to be among those who spoke, and here’s what I said:

It’s a bit daunting to speak about the passing of somebody who started at Temple six years before I was born. But while the remarkable length of Dick’s tenure should be remembered, what struck me when I joined the department in the Fall of 2001 was that the nearly four decades he had already served seemed not to have diminished his enthusiasm for Temple one whit. He was on the hiring committee that brought me here, and he told me during our first conversation after I was hired that what he was looking for were future colleagues who could teach “our students.” He brought the same focus to a hiring committee I was on a few years later; yes, he was interested in their research; he read the entirety of the files; but brought the same focus to a hiring committee I was on a few years later; yes, he was interested in their research; he read the entirety of the files; but was not sentimental about some of our students’. He told me during our first conversation after I was hired that what he was trying to do was to bring the best out of our undergraduates.

And that’s what strikes me about all of the conversations we had over the next 13 years, most of them in the halls of Anderson as we were going to or from class. We’d talk about how we approached, say, The Rape of the Lock or Hard Times, and I always benefited from his tips. But Dick was most eager to talk about how a particular student did or did not get the text. He was not sentimental about some of our students’ lack of preparation and their occasional lack of effort. But he was much more interested in figuring out how best to work with them than in complaining about them. And while he was willing to teach pretty much anything assigned to him, like Children’s Literature and Folklore, which always filled—as a former Director of Undergraduate Studies, I can’t stress enough how welcome that attitude is—he was also eager to try new things. I recall how excited he was to teach a senior seminar that had his students plunge into diaries by figures ranging from a Quaker who fought in the Civil War, to an Irish immigrant telling his story to a prominent Chicago businessman. And I remember speaking to one of his students who was entranced by the diary he was looking at, the sort of deep engagement with texts that is at heart of what we do, shaping minds and even changing lives on occasion. As you may know, he was at work on editing the diary of Lavina Townsend, a Quaker abolitionist; it saddens me to think that he seems not to have had the chance to complete that project.

His course on diaries also speaks to another very valuable part of Dick’s character. I assume that he acquired those diaries in his role as an antiquarian bookseller. This is to say that he had a very rich life outside of Temple. I recall a party that he and his wife Ginny graciously hosted at his lovely home out in Chester County; it gave me glimpse of how important it is to balance work—and academic work can unbalance even the best of us—with the rest of one’s life.

I am grateful to have had such a wise, good-humored, gentle man and gentleman as a colleague and friend, even though a period was put to his life much sooner than any of us would have liked. Dick Beards was someone who stayed true to this dictum from The Water Babies, a text he knew well and edited for Penguin: “Do as you would be done by.” He did, and I will miss him. ♦

![Dick Beards, 1934-2013](image)
service on such sensitive committees as presidential searches show we know how to keep matters confidential. So why weren’t we consulted? I asked this question at our recent Faculty Senate meeting. The answer was especially disturbing—those in charge never even considered including faculty. Additionally, a comment was made by an Athletics administrator that seemed to suggest that this was ‘their department,’ (not part of a larger University) and why would faculty even be considered when Athletics was trying to deal with what they perceived as ‘their problem.’ This is particularly troubling: The Athletics Department isn’t ‘their department’—we are all part of a larger entity, Temple University, and are all working towards making this an even more amazing place to work. We (faculty) want success for all areas within the University. It isn’t ‘our department’ vs. them’ but all of us seeking to provide the most valuable experiences for the students we teach, whether in the classroom or on the athletic field.

It is clear from my initial comments that I have concerns about the decisions made, both the process and the substance. There are some decisions which have received criticism (such as the timing of the announcements) about which I do not have a concern. There was probably no ‘good’ time to do this, and making the announcements before student-athletes (SA’s) went home was critical to allow those athletes who were going to be cut to decide about transferring or continuing at Temple. Some have already transferred/decided to transfer; others are still considering their options. I also applaud Temple for making the commitment to SA’s who continue at Temple to honor their scholarships and continue to provide advising at the Resnick Center.

This is the right thing to do! It was also right for the President and others (including Board of Trustee members) to meet with the SA’s on January 28th after a misstep in not letting athletes talk at a Board of Trustees meeting shortly after the decision was announced.

Even with these laudable actions, there remain some questions. Among these are whether the same ‘courtesy’ will be given to graduate externs in athletics. One of our first year master’s students is a graduate extern in one of the affected sports—will he be allowed to keep his externship in his second academic year and complete his program? Will Athletic Training students getting clinical hours assisting in the Athletic Training room lose these opportunities because approximately 158 SA’s have been cut? Additionally, comments made after the Tuesday, January 28th meeting, suggest that the President and the Board of Trustees learned some new information at the meeting about which they were not aware. Sorry, but this is REALLY unacceptable. I would have thought that a decision this momentous, affecting 158 SA’s and several sports that are part of the fabric of Temple University, would have REQUIRED that every bit of relevant information be obtained and carefully considered. This is what happens when decisions are made in a bubble and all relevant input (in this case from coaches and SA and faculty) is not obtained. Comments indicated a potentially revised decision would be forthcoming in mid-February—we all await this decision with great anticipation. In my opinion, I would recommend the Administration scrap the current plans and start over, making certain that all stakeholders are represented in this process and the Administration has every relevant bit of information needed before making a decision.

In addition to my reservations about the process are those about the decision itself. There were a number of reasons given for making these cuts—Title IX, spreading the ‘wealth’ amongst a smaller number of teams to make those teams more competitive, and addressing competitiveness issues in terms of facilities (Ambler, boathouse). Additionally, it was stated that these cuts had nothing to do with football and basketball. I will address each in turn.

Point number one: Cuts needed to be made to come into Title IX compliance. It is true that we were on the bubble of being out of compliance, and steps needed to be taken to bring us into compliance. But as a strong advocate of Title IX, I will share rule number one: Do NOT cut men’s sports to bring the University into compliance. Rather, one should expand opportunities in women’s sports. This is the red herring that men’s sports uses against women’s sports to blame them for cuts—there is nothing in the rules requiring or suggesting cutting men’s sports, but this is the easy way out. It is truly sad that some men’s sports (gymnastics and track and field) were seen as sports to be cut to reduce the number of male athletes and bring percentages more in line with Temple’s population. The answer is an ‘easy’ one: Provide more opportunities for women!

Point number two: The cuts will allow the teams that remain to be funded at appropriate levels. It is true that even with a budget of approximately $44,000,000, money was tight in almost all sports (not sure about football and basketball). While there is excitement at the prospect of these resources going to these underfunded teams, the $3,000,000 saved should have come either from additional resources allocated by Temple (I know a hard sell these days) or additional revenue raised by Athletics. Director of Athletics Kevin Clark (an intelligent, experienced, resourceful individual) has been in place only for eight months or so. He and his team should have been given more time to raise funds from donors, renegotiate contracts, and so on, to raise the money needed to better fund our teams. Perhaps a more inclusive process (including faculty input) would still have decided to cut a few teams, but that process didn’t take place. Additionally, at least one team (men’s gymnastics) has raised part of its budget each year since they were almost cut many years ago—could some of the affected sports have been given such a chance to raise some/all of the money for their sports?

Point number three: Facilities. It is hard to argue about the stress on athletes commuting between Main Campus and Ambler: baseball and softball were Eliminated, and soccer is supposedly being moved to Main Campus (but

Helping Student Athletes Affected by the Cuts

A note from the Editor: I am grateful to Justin Miller for agreeing to write a brief piece on how faculty might help support athletes affected by the recent cuts; I also draw the attention of interested faculty to resources put together by Temple Student Government, which can be accessed at http://templestudentgovernment.org.

By Justin Miller, Senior Director, Nancy & Donald Resnick Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes

Student-Athletes affected by the elimination of seven programs may need additional support in and out of the classroom, and faculty can play an important role in assisting them. If you have specific concerns regarding any student-athlete, I urge you to contact me at miller@temple.edu or by phone at (215) 204-9840. Keeping your report confidential if you wish, I can then reach out to these student-athletes to remind them of the services provided by the Resnick Academic Support Center, which reports to the Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies:

- Personalized academic advising
- Tutorial support
- Peer mentoring
- Referrals to various on-campus resources (Tuttleman Counseling Center, Psychological Services Center, Wellness Resource Center)

Each staff member has a close working relationship with the student-athletes on the team(s) they are assigned to and as a result, they can serve as a great point of contact during this potentially difficult time. Thank you for all you do for all your students and especially for your student-athletes. Please let me know if you have any concerns you wish to share.
to use rollerblades or bicycles for transportation, can all use the same curb cut to make movement easier. Having barrier-free design available as a matter of course means that it becomes a truly universal, and useful, aspect of the environment for everyone. Individual accommodations may still be necessary in some situations, but UD and UDL assume that not everyone will interact with the built environment or the learning environment in the same way, so the greatest number of needs are considered and imagined and solutions are put in place from the start.

Professors who have researched and implemented concepts of universal design into their courses, offering many opportunities for alternate engage-

“UDL might be thought of as a curb cut for learners: Curb cuts, in the architectural or urban planning sense, allow people who use wheel-chairs to cross streets safely without having to "jump" a curb. But people who are using strollers, pulling a wheeled backpack or suitcase, or who choose to use rollerblades or bicycles for transportation, can all use the same curb cut to make movement easier. Having barrier-free design available as a matter of course means that it becomes a truly universal, and useful, aspect of the environment for everyone.”

Universal Design for Learning, with its rich background, a large and growing body of research to evaluate its implementation and effectiveness for postsecondary students, and its emphasis on creating flexible learning environments, offers a tremendous capacity to dismantle barriers to learning while maintaining high standards for intellectual rigor and student achievement. Incorporating multiple means of representation, action and expression in teaching can help send a strong message that diversity is valued and that all students will be supported in their learning.

Here are a few relatively low-tech techniques to enhance accessibility in the classroom for learners with a variety of barriers to learning:

- When showing a video, turn on the closed captions if they are available. Captioning is useful not only for students with hearing impairments; captions also reinforce audio information with text. Captioning may help benefit second-language learners, students who process written information more effectively than audio information, and students with some kinds of learning disabilities. (Editor’s note: For help with captioning, contact Viral Mehta in Computer Service or Disability Resources and Services.)

- Audio-record lectures and class conversations (with the agreement of your students), then post the digital recording online. Listening to the recording will allow students to replay information as often as they’d like. This technique can also benefit students who may be unable to attend classes regularly due to chronic illness, accidents, or family commitments. Some classrooms at Temple are equipped with TUCapture technology, which video- and audio-records class sessions automatically, then makes the archived file available to students within about a day of the taping.

- In the process of selecting course materials, incorporate textbooks or readings which can be accessed electronically or in a digital format. Electronic books and materials can be used in conjunction with assistive technology such as screen readers, text-to-speech programs or software which highlights individual words make text accessible for students who have vision impairments, learning disabilities, or other barriers to accessing set-size printed materials. Digital texts also have the added advantage of portability as they can be displayed on lightweight readers or tablets and even on smartphones.
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where! Geasey Field?). At Ambler, the facilities were “average,” to quote an athlete I know who plays out there. I get the impression the athletes had adjusted to this challenge. How closely were they consulted/was this considered? On the other hand, the boathouse situation was a problem. Attempts to resolve this had not been successful and working out of tents, even if the athletes were okay with this, was not desirable. But crew is an iconic sport at Temple, and, saying you can just shift to club sport status because some other schools do this is not the right answer. Why couldn’t crew be given a deadline? Raise $10,000,000 for a new boathouse by June 30, 2015 or we will then have to cut the teams because we can’t have Temple with a crew team operating out of tents. There would need to be a location and the money, but this would acknowledge the place of crew in our culture and give them a chance. There will be additional expenses for Campus Recreation if crew is moved to club sport status. Where will these funds come from?

Finally, it was said the cuts had nothing to do with football and basketball. I believe the Administration when it says none of the approximately $3,000,000 saved (all of which will supposedly be reinvested in athletics) will go to football and basketball. And I agree that football and basketball (football especially) are the engines that can drive additional funds from bigger athletic conferences in the future. This is a fact of life in big-time collegiate sports, and Temple should remain big-time in sports. However, some of the cuts could potentially have come from these sports. I don’t know the precise budget, but I have always been curious about home teams sleeping in a local hotel the night before home games. I understand this from a psychological standpoint (my area of expertise), but is this really necessary? How much could have been saved here? I am certain there are other areas wherein savings could be found without harming the ‘essence’ of these programs. This discussion could continue, but it is not clear it took place (or will take place).

In the final analysis, I think the process and the decisions made were flawed and could have been achieved in a more positive way for Temple athletics and the Temple community as a whole. Faculty input would have helped this process and potentially resulted in a more positive outcome for the SA and the Temple community as a whole. What would Buzz Lightyear say? He has dreams of a heroic future, just like the Board of Trustees and the Temple Administration dreams of prestige, national exposure, and untold riches from successful football and basketball teams. But in the ever-changing athletics landscape, it is uncertain whether these dreams will ever be realized. What does seem certain, if the decision to cut 7 sports teams is not modified or reversed, is that Temple’s 158 SAs will not even be allowed to “fall with style,” as Buzz describes his final drop into the backseat of Andy’s car on his way to a new home. In order to do right by their dreams, we should revisit this decision, using a process involving all stakeholders, and make the best decision for all.

Michael Sachs is a Professor in the Department of Kinesiology. His area of specialization is exercise and sport psychology. He can be reached at msachs@temple.edu
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video features interviews with award-winning U Colorado faculty who discuss their own techniques and students who benefit from both UDL and the accessibility it offers.

http://www.washington.edu/doit/ Do It: Disabilities, Opportunities, Internet-working and Technology, offers specific information to educators working in STEM as well as valuable overviews of assistive technologies for students in many different disciplines. The home page also provides background on the “hot topics” of veterans with disabilities and students with invisible disabilities, two populations which are increasing at Temple University and colleges and universities everywhere.

http://enact.sonoma.edu/udl This website was developed by the faculty and staff of Sonoma State University, and incorporates some of the video “case studies” originally created for the Merlot/Elixir website. Accessibility is also featured as a topic, with useful checklists to ensure that your course materials and presentations are as accessible as possible for the greatest number and variety of students.

http://elixr.merlot.org/ This website offers video “case stories” of exemplary teachers and techniques. The site offers some background on UDL as well as some case studies that focus on applying UDL concepts and techniques in a variety of disciplines.


Video on UDL:

http://accessproject.colostate.edu/udl/ “Best Practices Through Universal Design for Learning,” ACCESS Project at Colorado State University. This fourteen-minute video emphasizes both the value of UDL for diverse learners and the uses of assistive technology for students with disabilities. The website for the video includes a text transcript and an audio description track to maximize accessibility and model best practices.

Books and articles on UDL in Higher Ed:
Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice Eds. Burgstahler, Sheryl and Rebecca Cory. Boston: Harvard Education Press, 2008. (Professor Burgstahler is the director of the DO-IT program at the University of Washington.)

http://accessproject.colostate.edu/assets/PDFs/Schelly,%20Davies,%20Spooner%202011.pdf


Notes:
this. In some sense this is going to be a permanent effort, since things will keep emerging and there’s no reason to think this law will change. And I have to think that faculty want Temple to be accessible.

TO: That’s the beauty of this.

SN: What I’ve read about Universal Design [link to Keefer piece] shows that it benefits all students. But back to the exception requests. Is that because the faculty member has him or herself gone out of the way to say, “I know about this policy. Is this software going to meet the standard?” Or are you all going to start a survey college by college or department or department and say, “That could be a problem area.” How have the faculty members even known to make an exception request?

TO: Well, a lot of the exception requests have come through with a purchase of new software. Purchasing new software comes through Computer Business Services; they see it and say, “Wait! Is this accessible?” They’re being a pain about it, to be perfectly honest. However, before that question would never have been asked. Now, we’re asking it. We’re going back to vendors with this. In a lot of cases, the software isn’t accessible, but the vendors recognize that this is a problem, and they give us roadmaps to make it accessible. Within six months or a year, they’ll make it accessible. This is affecting not only us but also the vendors we purchase from. That’s the big point, we now stop and question this.

That’s number one. Number two is that every college and school has a liaison on accessibility issues. We meet regularly with them. So they’re raising the issue. “I have this faculty member doing this; what should we do about it?” Again, I get back to the fact that there’s no black-and-white answer. We have this committee and we discuss it. We come up with options just sitting there and say, “If you need it, you could do this.” You’ll see through the exception process that those discussions are occurring.

“I would be very concerned if a faculty member made a statement to a student, “You can’t take this course because you’re blind.” Then we have a problem. I don’t think that should ever be said to a student.” — Timothy C. O’Rourke

SN: One of my questions is about what resources have been and will be provided to faculty. It sounds like the committee itself is a resource.

TO: Yes, two things. The committee itself is a resource, and the Instructional Support Center works very closely with the committee, and very closely with Paul so that they can go to them and ask the questions. If they don’t know the answers, they will either come with an answer or figure out what they’re supposed to do. There is an Instructional Support Center on each campus. On Main, it’s in the Faculty Wing of the Tech Center.

SN: I notice you have on your list of things to do is, “Train faculty members, web developers, web designers, and system programmers.” So is there right now a set training that we’re hoping to cycle faculty through, or is it conducted on a case-by-case basis where a faculty member feels as if he needs help and goes to the ISC? I’m thinking of this both in terms of what’s happening thus far and what is planned for the future.

Paul Paire (PP): There’s an ad hoc component of it right now, but the Instructional Support Center has developed training materials for how to make MS-Word and PowerPoint documents accessible. That will be available as an in-person training session during the Spring Semester. That’s going to be one of the options. For the web designers and developers, we actually had a vendor come out and do some training on how to use a tool to check for accessibility. Not that that impacts the faculty very much.

SN: But the infrastructure will be there as things are getting developed.

TO: If you think about our faculty members, there are a thousand different ways they come at things, using all different types of software. But we are saying, “This is how you make Microsoft Word accessible.” The last step beyond having a web design policy and a technology policy is the hardest step—a policy for what you use in the classroom. That’s the one we’re struggling with, and as we go to conferences, we find that that’s the one everyone’s struggling with. Because there are so many different ways to use technology in the classroom.

But there are some things we are taking a look at. Every faculty member should have an accessible syllabus. Every faculty member has to have a syllabus, right? It should be accessible. That may mean you have to have a Word document using a font of a particular size. We will come out with guidelines like that in a general form.

One thing that we really have going for us is that Blackboard is accessible, and almost everybody uses Blackboard, so that is a huge hurdle to get over.

SN: When you say Blackboard is accessible does that mean that there is an accessibility editor that you can build into all of your documents, or is it that a student who is visually- or hearing-impaired has a reader that will automatically make things accessible for them?

TO: A reader can navigate through Blackboard. Now the problem is when a faculty member puts a document, an old pdf file, for example, or a video on Blackboard, that may not be accessible. That would have to be made accessible.

SN: Can PDFs be made accessible?

PP: The newer versions of Adobe Acrobat Professional have an accessibility checker you can run on any PDF document.

TO: But the old version doesn’t. So that’s what we’re targeting in the new guidelines. You can use PDF, but it has to be this version or later. You can use MS-Word, but this version or later, using a certain font. That’s what we’re working on.

SN: What’s the timetable for that? All of this is important for faculty, but stuff in the classroom is where we live and affects us most directly. And it’s the most complicated. What sort of timeline are we looking at for these guidelines to be rolled out? And when will faculty be expected to step to them?

TO: Faculty will be expected to step to them once we roll out the guidelines. We have found out that this is the hardest part of what we’re doing. So we’re being very cautious about it; I don’t want to do it too soon. Maybe in the next year, Paul? I think that the awareness is key, and faculty are starting to get aware. I don’t think they should worry, that “Oh, my God. I don’t know how to do my course.” They should keep doing what they’re doing with this awareness until we come out with specific guidelines.

SN: Has there been much thought given to the practicalities of enforcement? Policies are announced all the time but are sometimes not adhered to. This one seems to be particularly important because, first of all, there are significant ethical issues involved. To not follow these guidelines really would significantly disadvantage a certain group of students. Then there are of course what has in part triggered this, which is the question of legal liability. Has much thought been given to how you’re going to monitor compliance? This is a huge university with hundreds of departments. Is it simply going to have to be a passive system, as in, “Look: This is the policy and we expect you to follow it.” Are you going to do spot-checks?

TO: I don’t think we’re going to do spot-checks. I don’t think we’re going to do audits. I want to say this: Our faculty have been fabulous on this. They want to do this, and they don’t know just how. We’re at the stage where we don’t know what to tell them. That’s what we’re figuring out. I don’t envision audits or anything like that. But I do think if a situation arises where it comes to our attention that there’s an issue or a problem, we’ll do what we need to do. We’ll intervene at that point in time. The beauty of this whole problem is everybody wants to do the right thing. I haven’t heard one
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characteristic of Temple.

TO: Right. In my time, I’ve dealt with some deans who wanted me to move people to their budget. My fear is that the deans are going to keep the budget and make me take over responsibility. I’m going to be very careful, let me tell you.

SN: This is a new day, and Deans are looking with a new keenness to cut expenses any way they can.

TO: First of all, I don’t think this is going to be a huge budget issue. I’ve spent $560K, but we’re getting real close to where we have all the major stuff done. The only other major thing out there is captioning, and personally I think that needs to be done by the School or College. I don’t think that needs to be an allocated cost. It’s the faculty member who decides whether you want a video in class. That’s not central; we don’t pay for anything else centrally for what you do in the class aside from Blackboard and the other central systems. It’s your decision whether to show that video or not. That’s fine. I don’t think we’re talking a lot of money here, I really don’t. I don’t think it needs to be built in.

I’ve spent $560K and I have some more money set aside to do the classrooms. We’re helping the colleges and schools. One decision that we made that saved us a lot of money. We went in to this saying we’re going to make every classroom accessible. And then we said, why do that? Why don’t we just make sure that every school and class has accessible lecture hall and one or two other classrooms that are accessible. If you go in on the first day and it’s not fully accessible and you have someone who needs accessibility, you can switch classrooms.

SN: It does occur to me that if someone is completely blind, that’s relatively easy to determine when he or she is in your class. With hearing impairment, it’s harder. I can think of visual impairments where it’s harder to detect. And there are other disabilities . . .

TO: That’s easy. It’s the student’s responsibility to make the determination. It’s not the faculty member’s responsibility to figure that out.

SN: So you’re not on the hook if someone doesn’t announce it.

TO: Right. The problem comes if someone comes in the first day needing accommodation, and you haven’t thought it through.

SN: Since we brought up the question of budgeting, this is not related to accessibility, but I thought I’d ask it. It used to be that schools and colleges got a disbursement from the technology fee.

TO: Yes, the schools and colleges directly get around 55% of the technology fee.

SN: Will that continue in Decentralized Budgeting?

TO: Yes. The Tech fee will be allocated in the same way.

SN: So in the various colleges, how was the hiring of the in-house IT people done? And will that change? For example, in Development, if I’m not mistaken, the costs for staff were split equally between the central Development office and the individual colleges and schools.

TO: It’s different for every college and school. There’s a twenty year history on that; I think that at one point in time, they were all under Computer Services. Then some colleges and schools wanted to run it themselves so they moved budget money there and the colleges have supplemented it. There are a few schools and colleges where there people are managed by them but are under our budget. And then there are some schools and colleges where we manage the whole thing.

Budget and Expenditures for Accessibility

SN: I was going to save this topic for later, but since you brought it up, I have some questions to ask about budget. We’re talking about new equipment and new staff. Two big things are converging: one, Decentralized Budgeting and this very important effort to make Temple more accessible. The first part of the question has to do with the central part of it, which is your shop. It does raise a question: These services are goes to be requested on an ongoing basis by the various colleges and schools, so it wouldn’t be crazy to think that this is going to be part of the “allocated costs” paid by the academic units. The algorithm you’d be using to calculate that cost may need to be adjusted to acknowledge this.

TO: But let me tell you this: We are now doing presentations at conferences. We have moved from not knowing that this is an issue to the forefront. That’s really where we’re at with our awareness. We’re doing sessions at conferences now. I’m pleased about where we’ve gotten in a short amount of time.

SN: I’m thinking about my own class, a capstone on the Gothic. I’m going to show some film clips. How would I go about getting a clip from The Shining close-captioned? Where would I go to get that done?

TO: Close-captioning is a specific case. The Accessibility Technology Compliance Committee has taken the position that multimedia shown in the classroom do not have to be captioned unless a student requests it; if a request is made, the film, etc. must be captioned within a reasonable amount of time, typically 48 hours or 2 business days, whichever is longer. Of course, faculty could save themselves the possibilities of having to drop everything to get their media close-captioned should a request be made by having the captioning done beforehand.

SN: I know that’s not a cheap process.

TO: What is it, $150 per hour or something like that? It’s funny, in the past two weeks, this is exactly what we’ve been thinking about. We want to get a university-wide contract to get the cheapest price.

SN: Where would I go to get that done now?

PP: You could put in a TUhelp ticket or contact Viral Mehta in Computer Services, and he could assist with that. You could also contact Disability Resources and Services.

TO: Disability Resources or the ISC. We can get that done for you. Then who pays for it? That’s the bigger question. If it’s a school or college, you need to give us a FOAPAL. [Ed. Note: Stands for “Fund, Organization, Account, Program, Activity and Location,” the form used to explain and activate an expenditure.] Just to date, I’ve spent almost $560K updating the classrooms, and that doesn’t include the full year’s salary for Paul since I’ve had him on this for two years.
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TO: It’s one thing to cut expenses. It’s another to shift the expense to someone else without the funding. I’ll be very attuned to that.

SN: To get back to accessibility, a couple of thought experiments. Let’s imagine that I’m teaching a course in Art History and I’m trying to teach about a change in style in the Italian Renaissance and so I present pictures from different dates. How is it that one would accommodate someone who is visually impaired if the knowledge and competencies being inculcated require very close attention to the effect of say, the move to oil-based paints. Does that put us beyond the pale of reasonable accommodation? Or would the instructor have to make that accessible? One could ask similar things of the performing arts, music, and related fields.

TO: The answer is we don’t know. I use Tracy Cooper as an example. She’s in Art History, and we’ve built screens for her to display their work. Tracy made a statement where she said, “I could have 10 people describe the ‘Mona Lisa’ and get 10 totally different descriptions.” That’s what art is. I think we’re going to deal with that in the courtroom, maybe.

PP: What is supposed to happen when a student comes and says I need an accommodation is that the faculty member works with DRS to determine what a reasonable accommodation is. That’s their jurisdiction.

TO: It’s very interesting—we talk about the Dental school. By law, you can’t be blind and be a dentist. They take a physical before they start Dental school.

SN: Then there are biology labs, even if it’s online dissection.

TO: That’s when you’re getting to reasonable accommodations. I can envision a time where somebody comes into a classroom, wants an accommodation, and we need to get Legal Counsel involved to review it and make that determination. That’s what this committee is for. A lot of it when you get into that level of detail is common sense; and it’s a matter of risk. Can I say that everything we do can be made totally accessible? No. That’s not going to happen. I don’t know how you make a class about the subtle differences that come with using different paints available to a blind person.

Remember that we’re talking about technology here. What’s the difference between an image in a book or on a screen?

I would be very concerned if a faculty member made a statement to a student, “You can’t take this course because you’re blind.” Then we have a problem. I don’t think that should ever be said to a student. We need to get the ADA people, the Disability Resources people, legal counsel involved before a statement like that gets made. Don’t ever make that statement. In some schools, those statements have been made, and you can easily imagine lawyers getting involved. I don’t think that it’s ever been made here. I think we’re going to deal with that in the courtroom, maybe. I don’t know how you make a class about the subtle differences that come with using different paints available to a blind person.

Remember that we’re talking about technology here. What’s the difference between an image in a book or on a screen?

I would be very concerned if a faculty member made a statement to a student, “You can’t take this course because you’re blind.” Then we have a problem. I don’t think that should ever be said to a student. We need to get the ADA people, the Disability Resources people, legal counsel involved before a statement like that gets made. Don’t ever make that statement. In some schools, those statements have been made, and you can easily imagine lawyers getting involved. I don’t think that it’s ever been made here. I think it’s important that our faculty are aware of the issue. When an accommodation is requested and don’t feel they can make it, get Disability Resources, get Paul, get the ISCS, we’ll bring legal counsel in, and we’ll have those discussions. I think those decisions will have to happen on an ad hoc basis.

The Make-Up of the ATCC and Accessibility Working Groups

SN: I wanted to discuss the committee you mentioned. It has four faculty members on it, although I think we can say in the case of Betsy Leebron Tutelman, while she’s certainly a faculty member, her responsibilities are primarily administrative. You have Darin Kapanjie and Catherine Schifer, whom I’ve spoken with frequently and who recently published an article on standards for Online Learning. They have lots of experience in the way technology and pedagogy shape each other.

TO: Yes; I’d add that Prof. Kapanjie is in charge of Fox’s online programs.

SN: Then you have Jeremy Schipper from CLA, who is a scholar in disability studies. It sounds like a great group of people. It does raise a question for me: While the resources on the committee are fantastic, what resources might be out there that are not on the committee? How is the Institute on Disabilities involved? It doesn’t appear that any of its members are on the ATCC.

TO: The Institute on Disabilities is engaged in the project, and we do have Disability Resources on the committee. We’re looking at how to do this in the best possible way, knowing that there is no clear black-and-white solutions. We know that it’s a committee that we deal with limited budgets. We know that this could get really expensive with some non-practical solutions. We went to the Deans; we went to the Provost; we went to the Faculty Senate when this all started; we didn’t turn anybody away. We were looking for practicality; we are not talking about theory now, we were talking about how to put things to practice. There is a difference in some cases between what theoretically should be done and what practically can be done.

PP: The Institute on Disabilities is engaged in the project, just not at the ATCC level. They’re involved in the Instructional Materials and Captioning workgroup, and we’ve just finished an RFP for captioning pre-recorded materials. They had a representative there. They had representatives when they chose the software for auditing websites for content.

SN: I’m imagining two types of courses—Writing Intensive courses and Gen Ed, though there’s some overlap. I’m wondering if you’ve been in touch with Istvan Varkonyi and the other people in Gen Ed or Lori Salem, since one of the ways you could get these guidelines promulgated efficiently is to say, well, along with the other things you have to check for when you put up a proposal for a new course or have to get it re-certified as Writing-Intensive or Gen Ed is accessibility.

TO: Paul, why don’t you go through the other committees involved?

PP: I don’t know if I can hit all of them off the top of my head. [For a list of Working Groups, see here] Procurement: That’s where we decide how to make accommodations through software. There’s the library; Jonathan Le Breton has been spearheading that committee, and he’s also on the ATCC. They’ve been doing a huge amount of work contacting the vendors that they use for databases to make sure they’re accessible. Instructional Materials and Captioning, headed by Lori Bailey. Rather than developing a policy or set of guidelines, they took a different approach, doing checklists. Then, Training and the Website, run by Pamela Barnett and Gail Gallo, who took the checklists from the Instructional Materials group and created training materials from them. Lori Bailey helped with the website content as well. For the website, Margo Scavone who has since left and then Ron Vitale to make sure that the web is accessible, setting the guidelines and standards. Online Learning is Dominique Kliger. Steve Hazzard is responsible for the Administrative Systems, and Andrea Caporale for assistive technology used in classrooms and computer labs.

TO: But I don’t think we’ve specifically dealt with Gen Ed.

PP: But we have spoken with Istvan since that’s where the largest number of classes are. We spoke with Istvan and other GenEd folks a couple of months ago about making their syllabi accessible. But that’s a chicken-and-egg question, since syllabi need to be accessible, but we need guidelines for how to make them accessible. So we’ve held off having a deep conversation with
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them until we finalize the appropriate checklists.

TO: But we have a liaison with each school and college, and it’s up to them to determine how best to translate these guidelines into practice.

SN: I’m on the Writing Intensive Course Committee, and accessibility could be factored into the discussions around those courses.

TO: We now have Turnitin, and that’s accessible; we also found out that we have purchased iThenticate, and that’s not accessible. That’s more for graduate theses, and that’s not accessible. So we’re trying to figure out before we roll that out how we would accommodate someone on that. But Turnitin is now accessible.

Cyber-security

SN: I wonder if you could talk about some of the challenges you’re facing about IT security. What challenges are coming down the pike?

TO: This is a whole new article for you, first of all. IT Security has always been very important and will only be more so. You saw what happened with Target, right? And they’re now saying that there are many vendors hit by the same thing who don’t even know it yet. There’s now commerce involved with hacking. Hackers are going out and doing this for profit. Before, it was a bunch of teenagers seeing if they can break in to somebody’s system and cause havoc. Now there’s a profit motive.

It’s my number one concern, security. When I started in this job 12 years ago, I had one person in charge of security. Today, I have seven. We review it constantly.

As many times as we’ve told people not to give out their IDs and passwords. The last time we had a big phishing event here three weeks ago; in a day, we had 40 people who disclosed their IDs and passwords. It’s like physical safety; in some cases, people are very concerned, but others think nothing will happen to them. You have lots of young students who don’t think this would ever happen to them.

I spend a great deal of money, millions of dollars a year to protect our IT infrastructure. But I’ll never say that it will never happen to us. It’s scary, what’s going on out there.

SN: As universities get increasingly interested in technology transfer and patents...

TO: We’re big targets; we’re big targets from people here and in other countries looking to steal data and research. More and more, we’ve gotten faculty to move their IT from the server underneath their desk to our Data Center where we can protect it better and back it up.

But I’ve had faculty argue about the price. They can go out and buy a server for a thousand dollars, and I charge them fifteen hundred dollars and they don’t want to pay it. These are tenured faculty, and you can’t force them to do some things. But I think we’re getting there. But it’s scary, Steve, it’s scary.

SN: Do you see lots of DNS attacks?

TO: Daily! I have some statistics for you. DNS attacks, we get them constantly. Within a 24 hour period, our firewall rejects 33 million unauthorized attempts. The numbers are staggering. Within a 24 hour period, our antivirus blocked more than 28,000 pieces of malware. The things that I’m doing cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Our firewalls are $500K a piece, and I have four of them. People always ask me why I have such a big budget, a lot of it goes into security.

At one point in time—I don’t know how old you are—to get money out of a bank, I had to stand in a line and show my ID to a teller to get money. Today, it’s your ID and password, and you get whatever you want. So how important is your ID and password?

I still take grief for having people changing their passwords every six months. You don’t know how many people yell at me for that. The number one problem we have at the Help Desk is people forgetting their passwords because they have to change it. We have worked hard to make everything accessible through TU Portal with one ID and Password. That’s a nice convenience, but it’s also a security concern. If someone gets your ID and password, they have the keys to everything. I can’t see your password, but research shows that the number one password is “password.”

SN: Well, I’ve kept you long enough. This discussion has been very useful, I think.

TO: The faculty have been terrific. I was very worried when we first started the ADA project, but they’ve been terrific, very understanding. I haven’t had any major issues or arguments with them. We’re trying to be as practical as we can. Again, we’ve gone from not having any awareness of this to being a leader. Schools are calling us up now. I initially was going to put Paul on this 25% of the time, but he is on it full-time. And he’s become very passionate about it. He’s a pain, frankly, raising questions whenever I buy software, for instance. But that’s a good thing. We need to be aware of this.

The Way-Back Machine: A Bid for the “Ground Hog Day Bowl?”

By Steve Newman, Editor

The reason I chose this issue for The Wayback Machine [link] may be obvious in the context of the controversy over our cutting seven sports teams—the front page assurance from a Temple administrator in 1992 that “Temple Football Can Succeed.” And then there’s the meta-Wayback moment, as the editor reprints a column from 1982 raising the same questions about the viability of Temple Football. Groundhog Day, anyone?

(For those who don’t know, that’s the movie starring Bill Murray in which an arrogant weatherman is doomed to relive Groundhog Day until he finally mends his ways.)

This is not to say that there’s no hope of escaping this sad treadmill of bright promises that quickly evaporate—dazzling visions of national prominence, rising tides of revenue from licensing and TV, and knock-on effects like increased alumni donations and applications. Perhaps our current President, Athletic Director, and Coach will find a way to reverse our fortunes on the gridiron. I have had the pleasure of meeting all three as well as other athletic administrators and coaches and have been impressed by their clear-eyed assessment of Temple’s situation and by their commitment to new ways of doing things and to academic as well as athletic excellence. It’s been both eye-opening and reassuring to serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee to our athletic academic support center, directed by the able and forthright Justin Miller.

But it’s hard to be too optimistic, especially given the hand we’ve been dealt, as the rich paydays promised by rejoining the Big East have disappeared with the implosion of that conference. That’s an outcome I can’t help but think we and UConn helped to precipitate by emphasizing football over basketball, the sport favored by the seven Catholic schools who have literally taken their ball and gone home, taking the Big East name with them. We
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02/24/2014

Dear Editor,

In response to Dean of Students Stephanie Ives’ recent contribution to The Faculty Herald, I am pleased that we are in at least partial agreement. Despite some apparently inaccurate information to the contrary, Dr. Ives now notes that faculty can indeed ask a student to leave a classroom; security issues do necessitate the involvement of campus police; and that faculty hold primary responsibility for classroom coordination. Granted, Dean Ives does recommend that asking a student to leave may elicit negative reactions. Of course, allowing a student to remain when she or he is disrupting the learning experiences of others may well result in the same. As such, and although I fully recognize and appreciate Dean Ives’ suggestion, faculty have the right to accept or decline her recommendation. As she has established, faculty are the primary directors of the classroom.

Still, however, there are two areas that deserve additional consideration. First, as evidenced by the lengthy reading list in Dr. Ives’ response, there is an assumption that disruptions are typically the effect of faculty members’ ignorance of how to properly manage their classrooms. For the myriad faculty who have been teaching for decades, several having earned awards for their efforts, the contention that disruptions result from a lack of training is rather presumptuous. It also assumes a dearth of faculty learning as opposed to tangible student hostility. Surely, several faculty members recall the sage advice of our graduate school advisors who noted that we should read another book as we continued in our path toward degree completion. At that stage of our educational development, that advice was very well warranted. To suggest, however, that a faculty member should just become more equipped with classroom tactics or to imply that faculty should consult another text in response is that a judicial board must be called in order to prove whether or not a student was indeed hostile or disruptive. But what exactly does being disruptive or hostile mean? If a student used overtly hateful speech and does so to attack a student or faculty member, is that disruptive enough? If a student backs a faculty member literally into a corner of his or her office while complaining about a grade does that action meet the standard of hostility? Regrettably, there is not one word in the current Student Code of Conduct that specifically defines student disruption or hostility. Even more, a faculty member must prove conclusions about such perceptions before a judicial board—a review board that is, of course, not privy to the occurrences of a classroom that a faculty member will see throughout the semester and cannot use a behavioral code as a reference to guide its assessments.

If Temple University is genuinely concerned about classroom disruptions and trusts the faculty to oversee classes, a code that deals clearly and strongly with student behaviors and faculty rights should be crafted. Currently, such a code does not exist. The Temple Student Code of Conduct leaves so much room for interpretation that it is not an effective deterrent or guide.

I would hope that the Student Affairs Office will remedy these glaring problems in Temple’s Code by not only consulting with faculty but inviting us to co-write this missing material. After all, it is we, the faculty, not administrators, who are more directly affected by disruptive students. I look forward to making this positive outcome a reality through discussions with Dean Ives and members of her office.

Sincerely,

Scott Gratson
Associate Professor of Instruction, Department of Strategic Communication
School of Media and Communication

Letters to the Editor

01/14/2014

Dear Editor,

In response to concerns raised in the recent edition of the Faculty Herald about disruptive and dangerous student behavior, I would like to offer additional information for clarification. It is important to recognize that the presiding faculty in the classroom is expected to respond as well as manage the situations posed by disrespectful students, distressed students, disruptive students, or dangerous students. Responding to student disruptions in the classroom can be challenging and requires the employment of strategies specific to the uniqueness of each situation. It takes tremendous thought and preparation, but the type of response applicable to different situations will vary.

A faculty member is the primary authority of his/her classroom. When offending behavior by a student seriously undermines that authority and control, the faculty member may ask the student to leave the classroom until the matter is appropriately addressed (for example, through a meeting, an apology from the student, or a referral to Student Conduct). Removing a student from class for conduct that is disruptive, however, can be challenging. In some cases, asking a student to leave a classroom may escalate a situation rather than defuse it. For this reason, we discourage the idea of removing a student from a class unless other options have been tried and failed. We encourage the use of prevention and intervention techniques of engagement and boundary-setting to avoid disruption or to escalate exist-
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- The Teaching and Learning Center provides resources for developing skills to deal with challenging in-class situations. Upcoming are two programs that may be of particular interest:
  
  (1) What would you do? Dealing with Challenging Situations and Students, Feb. 17 and 24th (10:30-12:00, TECH 111); and
  
  (2) the Teaching in Higher Education curriculum for graduate students.

- If you believe a situation should be referred to the Office of Student Conduct or question whether a Conduct proceeding is appropriate, you should call Senior Associate Dean of Students Andrea Caporale Seiss at 1-7188.

- In a situation you perceive to be threatening, you should always call Campus Safety Services at 1-1234.

- Director of the Tuttleman Counseling Services Dr. John DiMino is always available for consultation at 1-7276.

- As the Dean of Students, I am always available for consultation and discussion about student behavior for which you have particular concerns. You can reach me at 1-7188.

The prevention of disruption in the classroom can be best established by setting firm expectations and clear behavioral standards. If students step outside those expectations and standards, or if they behave in any manner which is threatening or dangerous, then communication with one or more of the individuals or offices listed above is key.

Stephanie Ives, Ed.D.
Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Temple University

01/02/2014

Dear Editor,

I feel that I must respond to the issues raised by Dean Ives in her response to the Faculty Herald article concerning student behavior. I have known Stephanie for years and respect her as a colleague. In the area of student behavior and faculty responses to it, however, I believe that she is mistaken.

As a faculty member, I am expected to have control over my classroom. I make decisions about that environment on a daily basis. I must consider all of the students in my classroom and my own safety when I do so. When a student poses a direct threat to me or to my students, I would expect that the university would back my decision as a faculty member to ask that student to leave the classroom until she or he can behave in an appropriate fashion. I would suspect that if I phone Campus Security when a student poses a direct physical threat to others in my classroom, the student could and should be removed from that setting. A recent presentation to my School’s Campus Safety even noted as much. Indeed, to use the visiting captain’s own words, it is ‘common sense’ that security would do so.

Unfortunately, that is not the position of Dean Ives and her office. I and a series of faculty members have been told how to teach students about civility, how to reference the Conduct Code, how to explain that inappropriate behavior is not, indeed, appropriate. I have learned a great deal on how I can teach a student over the course of a term to act like an adult. At no point, however, have I been told exactly how to ensure that my own safety or the safety of my students is upheld.

I have, however, heard plenty about how to make sure that a disruptive student’s due process is noted, how to contact the CARE team under the apparently common notion that all disruptive students need mental counsel-

ing, and how to set up a Conduct hearing for the future. Not a single one of these suggestions empowers me to act in the immediate setting in the case of a safety concern or in the case of student being violently disruptive in a classroom. In fact, I was told that if I opted to act otherwise by asking a disruptive, harassing, threatening, or violent student to leave my classroom, I may run legal risks for preventing that student from having access to her or his class.

It is charming what the University Code suggests in terms of faculty concerns and well-being. Under its current means of implementation, however, it does not allow for a faculty member to make immediate decisions concerning the administration of her or his own classroom. Instead, we must rely on classroom management by a panel from Student Affairs, our own safety be damned.

Best,
Scott Gratson
Associate Professor in Strategic Communications, School of Media and Communication

12/16/2013

Dear Steve,

I read with interest the Faculty Herald editorial (vol. 44, no. 2) about faculty safety. Allow me to provide a correction to the following statement from the editorial. “While the student Code of Conduct mentions the sanctions for student-on-student aggression, we on the FSSC have found nothing dedicated to protecting faculty.”

The Student Conduct Code does not limit what would be considered a violation of the Code to student-on-student aggression. Code violations #2 and #3 speak most specifically to a classroom disruption or an act of aggression by a student:

Violation 2 - Disruption or obstruction of teaching, research, administration, disciplinary proceedings, other university activities, including its public service functions on or off campus, or of other authorized non-university activities when the conduct occurs on university premises.

Violation 3 - Any act or threat of intimidation or physical violence toward another person including actual or threatened assault or battery.

The language of each violation is broad and would apply to student behaviors regardless of whether the subject of the aggression or disruption is a faculty or another student. In other words, if a student has disrupted a classroom, acted in an intimidating manner, threatened violence, or acted in a violent manner, the student can be charged with Code violations. I encourage all faculty to not hesitate when a concern about a student’s behavior arises. In a college community, it is our collective responsibility to hold students accountable.

Stephanie Ives, Ed.D.
Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Temple University

---

Thanks to Associate Vice President Ives for pointing out my mistake; I apologize for not having been more careful in my reading of the Code. Instead, I should have focused on the concerns raised by the FSSC last year—that many faculty have had situations with disruptive students that have made them feel as if they were afforded little or no protection by university policy. For instance, a faculty member was told that she could not prevent a student who had been disruptive in a class the prior semester from enrolling in her class. (See the Herald article on this topic from last year.) We look forward to continuing our work with the administration to ensure that faculty feel -- and are -safe. – The Editor
Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:47 PM

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes from the October 7th meeting were approved as distributed.

President's Report:
Professor Angel proposed a change in the September 2013 Minutes. She pointed to the sentence in which it was stated that acting CFO Kaiser said “there have been many times when the Dean of the Medical School and the CEO were the same person.” What he in fact said was that Doctor Malmud had been both Dean and CEO. The secretary confirmed that he had listened again to the recording of that meeting and agreed with Professor Angel. She moved to strike “historically there have been many times in which” and add “Dr. Malmud, many years ago, was Dean of the Medical School and CEO of the Hospital,” and strike “were the same person.”

Rahdert said that we would need a 2/3 majority to act on this during this meeting. The motion carried.

Angel then requested that if any action items are coming from the FSSC that they be sent out to the Senate several days prior to the meeting. Rahdert agreed.

Angel also suggested that the minutes of the FSSC should be sent to the Representative Senate on a weekly basis. Rahdert will take this up with the FSSC.

Rahdert thanked all who participated in the in President Theobald’s inauguration.

The FSSC held a retreat with all of the deans and representatives from the Provost’s office. The Provost moderated the retreat. We discussed the evolving implementation of the RCM process, the participation of the faculty in the new Academic Programs Review Committee, the need for collegial budget committees chosen by the various collegial assemblies to advise deans about budgetary matters, the development of new masters and non-credit programs, and about academic integrity and the possibility of developing a Temple University honor code.

FSSC also met with President Theobald. We discussed faculty involvement in the budget process at the level of the schools and colleges. He has agreed to encourage the deans to make sure that this occurs. We discussed the review of deans. He told us that the process is being finalized and that it will begin with some deans this spring. We talked about T&P procedures, raising some of the same issues that had been raised in the Senate about actions over the summer. We had a frank discussion, but the President feels that this matter, if it needs further addressing, should be taken up with the Provost. The President informed us that the portion of the campus plan dealing with main campus is nearing completion. The other campuses will take longer to put together plans for. We brought up the issue of diversity. The Committee on Faculty of Color has long sought information about diversity. The President indicated that the Provost has commissioned a study and that this study will be shared with us when it is completed.

We subsequently met with Diane Maleson, Zeb Kendrick, and Tilghman Moyer. We have several other guests scheduled.

We have on the agenda today, three proposed actions. One involves distance learning standards. The second is about the composition of the Academic Program Committee. Rahdert would like to ask us to put that motion on hold. The third addresses the standards and authority of the committee, and the amount of time we will have to review proposals to the committee.

Vice President’s Report:
We have had a tremendous response this fall requests for serving on various committees. We are 2/3 of the way into the fall semester. Over 50 faculty have volunteered for new service. These come from nearly all schools and colleges. This adds to the more than 200 faculty members already serving. That means 250 faculty out of 1500 full time faculty. This does not count those who are serving at the college and department levels. However, we need more. We need to improve the networks operating between senate committees. We need to find better ways to use technology to communicate between our various committees and also between those committees and other interested parties at the university. Finally, we are trying to create more connections between the senate and the administration and staff. We will be soliciting your ideas.

There are still a few committees that need members. In particular we are looking for members for the Committee on Faculty of Color, and the Committee on the Status of Women.

Presentation by Peter Jones:
Jones first discussed the eSFF process. Student Government is anxious to be able to see some of the material from the eSFF’s. This material is now available to all newly matriculated students, and to other students who filled out SFF’s for all of their other courses in the previous semester. The site will be up permanently and will roll over the information each semester. Jones demonstrated the various pages and information that the students see when they use the system.

He next discussed the question of academic integrity. The tool available on Blackboard for detecting plagiarism, SafeAssign, is not as good as a competing tool named TurnItIn. Faculty have requested that we make TurnItIn available. Doing some research, they discovered that it is cost effective to buy it as part of a package which includes a product for detecting plagiarism in research called AuthenticKit. The decision was to buy the package. It will be available on Blackboard soon. That process led us into a discussion by the Council of Deans about educating faculty and students about academic honesty. HR is working with Teaching and Learning Center to address plagiarism from both faculty and student perspectives. Students are anxious to hear clear definitions of plagiarism in the context of group work. One of the possibilities on the table is the development of a student honor code. There have also been discussions about whether we need courses in GenEd and in our major courses about ethics.

Finally he gave us some details about Semester Online. We were offered the chance to be an affiliate member, and we decided that we would go ahead with it. But we were not going to put up any of the Semester Online courses if they replicate Temple courses. EPPC would be the body which decides whether we want to add any Semester Online courses after consultation with the applicable department.

Questions:
Professor Hochner (FSBM) commented that TAUP representatives, and representatives of the administration met last week to discuss the implications that release of eSFF information to students may have upon the union contract.

Professor Miller (FSBM): Is Semester Online the same organization mentioned at last month’s Senate meeting?
Answer: Yes

Brief Return to President’s Report:
Professor Hochner, FSBM, pointed out that it is not enough to have a faculty derived budget committee in each college to make recommendations about RCM. In FSBM the dean has announced that he has his own committee of faculty advisors, but the faculty do not know who they are. This is not a proper way to involve faculty in governance.

Rahdert is in entire agreement with that. The Senate needs to keep putting pressure on by reporting constantly back to the Provost and President as we find places where proper faculty engagement is falling short. It is also important that this happen at the college level. Rahdert encourages colleges to
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get in touch with him if your college is having problems.

Hochner reminded us of the situation in which all changes to bylaws have to be approved by the dean, which in some cases means that no changes will ever happen.

Resolution on Online and Distance Learning:
Professor Schifter, COE presented the resolution brought forth from the FSSC.

The motion was:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the university officially adopt the guidelines put forth by the Distance Learning Standards/Guidelines Committee. These guidelines can be found at http://www.temple.edu/provost/resources/distance-learning-guidelines.html

After reading the motion, Schifter reviewed the process by which the guidelines were developed and what they covered.

Professor Newman, CLA congratulated the committee for putting together such a fine report. This was a model of shared governance. We need to make sure that the colleges know about these guidelines.

The motion was passed.

Resolution concerning the Academic Program Advisory Committee:
Professor Newman, CLA, presented the following motion, brought forth from the FSSC:

While the Faculty Senate supports the formation of a committee charged with “encouraging innovation and promoting transparency while avoiding redundancy and inefficiency in the new budgeting model”, we also have some concerns about how this committee will operate in the scope of its charge. They include the following:

- While we understand the desire for efficiency, we believe the proposed ten day comment period on course and program proposals will not give academic units impacted by proposals enough time to respond in an effective way.
- As the University implements decentralized budgeting, it is likely to create incentives for schools and colleges to generate more credit hours at the potential expense of academic quality even if this is short sighted and ultimately self defeating. Ensuring academic quality does not seem to be part of the charge of this committee. While some proposals will be subject to review by the EPPC and the Graduate Board, it is our understanding that a proposal for an undergraduate course or program that will operate within a single school or college is not likely to be viewed by either body. While we believe curricular committees in the colleges and schools will faithfully discharge their duties, we think it is crucial to have a faculty based body at the university level that will review the academic integrity as well as the efficiency and lack of redundancy for proposed programs.
- We are also concerned about the possibility in cases where a new program and an existing program overlap with one another that those authorized to make the decision will favor the new program over the old, and take steps to phase the existing program out. While this may or may not be in the best interest of the University, we seek clarification as to whether APAC will possess such authority and, if so, what procedures are contemplated for involving the school or college responsible for the existing program in making this sort of decision.

For these reasons, the Faculty Senate therefore urges the Provost

1. Lengthen the commenting period to at least three weeks, and to task either the proposer of the program or the committee itself to actively engage in discussions with other schools or colleges whose existing programs may be affected.
2. Make maintaining academic quality a specific part of the committee’s charge, and
3. Clarify the committee’s policies and procedures with respect to the phasing out of existing programs deemed to be either inferior or less efficient than new proposals.

The motion carried.

Old Business:
None

New Business:
Professor Hochner, FSBM, asked for the rationale for not acting today on the second resolution. Rahdert responded that his conversations with the Provost indicated that the Provost will afford us some opportunity to discuss with us again the composition of the committee later on in this year. Rahdert thinks it is appropriate under these circumstances to hold the other resolution and wait to see how things develop before presenting it to the Senate.

Hochner responded that the resolution urges the provost to reconsider the faculty composition of APAC.

Rahdert responded that it is permissible for a motion to be made to overrule the chair and bring the other resolution to a vote.

Professor Conrad, FSBM, agreed that the motion should be discussed and voted on today. This is a core issue.

Hochner moved to overrule the chair. The motion was seconded, and carried.

The following resolution was presented by Professor Newman as brought forth from the FSSC:

Recently the Provost asked the FSSC to provide names for the Academic Program Advisory Committee. According to the administration, this committee will be charged with encouraging innovation and promoting transparency while avoiding redundancy and inefficiency in the new budgetary model. The current proposal calls for five faculty members on a committee of nine, with perhaps a sixth faculty member if member from the School of Medicine is not among the original five. Three of those faculty are to be selected by the Provost from a list furnished by the FSSC. The other two are to be directly selected by the Provost. When this committee structure was presented to the FSSC, its members requested that more faculty be included, and a greater proportion of those faculty be directly supplied by the Faculty Senate possibly by appointment but preferably by election. Additional faculty at the October Faculty Senate meeting expressed similar views. However, it is our understanding that the current proposal for the composition of the committee remains unchanged. The Faculty Senate believes that a stronger and more representative faculty voice is needed on this committee. The Senate therefore urges the Provost to reconsider the makeup of APAC to allow for more faculty representation and a greater role in the process of selection by the Faculty Senate and the FSSC.

After lively discussion, the motion carried.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 PM

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.
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Attendance: 52
Representative Senators and Officers: 36
Ex-officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 15

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:50 PM

Approval of Minutes:
(November 7, 2013 minutes to be presented at the February 18, 2014 meeting.)

President’s Report
President Rahdert welcomed us to the first meeting of the semester. The Vice President’s report will be incorporated into his report. It consists of the three words “elections, elections, elections.”

We are already in the process to begin to structure the Senate elections in late March. We need to create a timeline and create a nominating committee. Rahdert asks all of us to consider what elected committees or officer positions we might want encourage our colleagues to run for. The Senate could use some new blood. We need to create a culture of university engagement among our colleagues.

The process for performance review of deans is underway. The first deans to be reviewed will be those from the Law School, the School of Dentistry, and TUJ. The committees are being formed. CATA submitted recommendations for faculty members of those committees.

Several items are up for engagement this semester:
- International education
- FSSC will be meeting with officers of Student Government
- Seeking ways of better coordination between the FSSC and the Board of Trustees. We have invited the chairman of the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee, Judge McKee, to meet with the FSSC later this term.
- We are about to start a campaign to improve attendance at the Representative Senate meetings.
- We expect further discussions of GenEd and undergraduate programs.
- We will pursue the question of the faculty’s role in institutional advancement.
- We need to think about the relative roles played by TT, NTT, and Adjunct faculty.
- Shared governance and the roles of the Senate and collegial assemblies will be reviewed.

Dialogue with Dai

The Provost began by announcing that we are currently conducting many searches for TT faculty. One faculty member feared that the majority of these searches would be in the sciences. The President asked Provost Dai to let us know that, excluding the School of Medicine, we are doing 90 searches. Of those, the science lines account for 28. The rest are non-science areas.

The Provost outlined the Fly in Four program. This initiative is a response to the President’s first commitment from his inauguration. The goal is to increase our four year graduation rate and thus decrease student debt at graduation. The program is well described at

http://admissions.temple.edu/cost-and-aid/fly-in-four?

utm_source=web&utm_medium=link&utm_content=newsrelease&utm_campaign=fly-in-four

Questions:
Q: What mechanism will be used to resolve disputes about who is at fault if a student requires more than four years to graduate?
A: The design is that we will catch these mistakes early and find ways to resolve it. In order to make this work faculty have to support this initiative and make our delivery of courses more efficient. We will need to simplify pre-requisites. In particular he wants to get rid of courses which demand more than a C- in prerequisite courses. Also we need to pay more attention to the matrix. Experience at other universities is that it is very rare to have to pay for a student’s tuition for a fifth year.

Q: STEM majors faced complexity in their first few semester required math and science courses. Typically, the first one of these courses that a student fails will make four year graduation impossible. We need to think about sequencing and offering courses more frequently even if this is discouraged by RCM. There is also a problem with the math department’s math placement exam. The SAT math test is a better predictor and should be used.
A: We will take these issues very seriously as we enter into this program.

Q: Agrees with difficulties identified in the biology major. What happens if a student chooses to switch majors?
A: If a student can still be on track to graduate in four years after a change of major, then a new plan for four year graduation will be worked out for them and they can continue to participate. It is generally easier to change major from STEM to liberal arts and stay on track than it is to go the other direction.

Q: Is there a way to use the summer to keep people on track?
A: Yes, summer does not enter into the initial pathway developed, but can be used to give time for repeating courses if necessary.

Q: Do we have statistics on what percentage of students take more than 4 years and students who failed a course in STEM and then changed majors? Also, is renewal of grant aid dependant on making appropriate progress to graduation each year? And will this new grant aid be at the expense of other existing grant programs?
A: Students will be monitored for appropriate progress, and no existing grants will be affected.

Q: Will we need more advisors to make this plan work?
A: We have been increasing the number of advisors over the past few years, but yes we will need more.

President Rahdert next announced that the university has created a new procedure for schools, colleges, and non-academic units to create their budgets. This used to be an informal process. In light of the move to RCM, the CFO has decided to change this to a process in which each budget unit will make a presentation to a budget committee. This will be a larger committee which will include people from the Provost’s office, the budget unit’s office, and a faculty member. There will be many of these committees. One of the jobs of the committee will be to act on requests for discretionary funds from the central fund by evaluating that proposal. We will need faculty for this purpose. Please ask your colleagues to consider volunteering for this.

Presentation by the Athletics Department

Eleanor Myers, LAW, thanked President Rahdert for continuing the tradition of inviting the Athletics Department to address the Senate. Various members of the Athletics Department then gave a presentation about what has been happening with our student athletes. These presentations are well summarized in the PowerPoint handouts provided.

Following the presentations, Professor Turner, SMC, asked that our guests talk about the process by which the decisions to cut certain athletic programs were made and then communicated to the students and other stakeholders. This began a dialog between the representatives from the Athletics Department and various members of the Senate about how the balance for the need for confidentiality, the need for transparency in decision making, the need to include faculty advice when the university is making important decisions about matters that impact the academic mission of the university, and the need to take proper care of our students. No real consensus was reached.

Old Business:
None
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now face the much-less-lucrative contracts that come with the American Athletic Conference, along with its punishing and expensive travel times to such far-flung spots as Tampa and Dallas. This may be a part of the story behind the cutting of crew, etc. that has not been widely told. If we had been able to stay in the Big East, perhaps we could have funded those teams at an acceptable level and invested in new facilities.

However, that same possibility points to the larger issue at stake—sharing information with the faculty, in this case, about athletic finances. We have been told repeatedly that football is the engine that drives college sports, that its potential financial payoff dwarfs even basketball and that we cannot afford to be an also-ran. Indeed, President Theobald has informed us that football was not the reason for the cuts insofar as any savings from cutting football would be more than outweighed by the loss in revenue from broadcasting and licensing. Then, as a colleague at the Faculty Senate pointed out, there would be the devastating effect cutting football would have on the marching band (though a drop to a less-competitive division would not necessarily mean an end to the band). But the administration and the Board would probably gain more support for its position if it was more forthcoming about the athletics budget, the kind of transparency we see in the report from the Board of Trustees reprinted in our Wayback Issue—which, to underscore our Groundhog Day theme, refers liberally to the benefits that will certainly come with membership in The BIG EAST. This is the sort of transparency Michael Sachs rightly calls for in his column [link] as a first step in making proper use of the faculty in decision-making, the sort of transparency that is supposed to come with our new decentralized budgeting system.

But the Wayback Issue has more to recommend it than this prophetic material about football (including its mischievous “Temple Football Garland,” which makes me wonder if The Herald could use a bit more levity). I would also point to the report about new tenure procedures, formulated with significant faculty input, as was the case with the revision under President Hart and has not been the case with more recent changes. Also of interest is the call for applicants for Dean of Boyer, a refreshing if quaint approach in our era of outside consultants and secretive search committees. See, too, the announcement of the Temple-School District of Philadelphia partnership initiated by Provost Jim England, referred to in the prior issue of The Herald, as well as the discussion of our then-Director of Libraries about the familiar challenges of space and keeping pace with technological changes.

All of these issues continue to play a key role in the life of Temple. I would like to think that we’ll avoid the cautionary tale of Groundhog Day in athletics as well as other areas. But as the movie suggests that is really is up to us to shed the dispiriting sense that we’re stuck in bad patterns of opacity, sugar-plum delusions, and contempt for shared governance.