

Representative Faculty Senate Meeting
Meeting Minutes
March 22 2013

Attendance:

Representative Senators and Officers: 32
Ex-officio: 0
Faculty, administrators and guests: 13
Total attendance: 45

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:48pm

2. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the Representative Faculty Senate meeting of February 19, 2013 were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

3. President's Report:

Faculty Senate President Joan Shapiro welcomed the senators and asked Steve Newman, chair of the Nominating Committee, to present the formal slate of nominations for Faculty Senate Officer positions. Steve presented the slate:

- Mark Rahdert, School of Law – President
- Tricia Jones, College of Education – Vice-President
- Paul LaFollette, College of Science and Technology – Secretary

Joan Shapiro also asked senators to attend to the materials attached to the agenda for the meeting, specifically, the letters to President Theobald concerning faculty budget committees and the Guidelines for Collegial Assemblies. She summarized the discussions that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee had had and their sense of the importance of these issues.

Joan announced that President Theobald will be visiting the FSSC on April 2nd. In preparation for that discussion the FSSC is gathering data about how collegial assemblies are functioning now in schools and colleges.

Art Hochner (FSBM) – asked whether Tony Wagner, CFO, can come to a Representative Faculty Senate meeting to talk about decentralized budgeting? He came to TAUP Executive Committee and they spent an hour with him. One of the key principles in decentralized budgeting is shared governance. But Art reported that he heard today (and needs to verify it) that his Dean has started to appoint a budget committee. The concern is there are Deans who don't want to involve faculty in a faculty-selected budget committee.

Joan Shapiro responded that Doug Priest (a DBM expert from Indiana University) will be joining Tony Wagner and Raphael Porrata-Doria, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee, on the May 8th panel devoted to discussion of the DBM topic at the University Senate Meeting.

Joan also reported that on April 11th, our next Representative Faculty Senate meeting, there will be a forum on general education. Julie Phillips and Pamela Barnett met with FSSC yesterday to discuss these important possibilities and refine ideas for the nature of that forum.

4. Vice-President's Report:

Vice-President of Faculty Senate, Mark Rahdert, announced that the nomination period for elected committees is closing. We have at least one election that will be contested, but we have some committees with insufficient nominees. Faculty need to come up with a process to handle appointment to those vacancies.

Mark also reminded senators that this is the season for committee reports. Committee chairs need to get these reports in so they can go into Faculty Herald.

Mark directed senators to the materials received and, specifically, the last page of those materials contains two motions to amend the faculty by-laws. Both motions have been presented to and adopted by FSSC. Thus they can come here and be presented for action – no seconding or second action is needed. He clarified that these are motions of a technical nature.

Motion #1: Mark reviewed the first motion which comes to the Representative Faculty Senate already moved and seconded from the FSSC:

Article IV, Section 2, presently provides:

2. Members of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee must be tenured full professors. Members of the Senate Personnel Committee must be tenured faculty. Any University Senator may serve on any committee other than these two.

Motion:

Before “Any” in the third sentence, insert: “Unless otherwise designated in these by-laws or in the charge for the relevant committee,”

Explanation:

There are actually several committees that place restrictions on membership in order to achieve wider representation or because of the specific nature of the work of the committee, so the by-law statement is inaccurate. Some of the limitations are in the bylaws in later sections (Art. IV, sec. 7) Others are not (e.g., Sabbatical – set by TAUP contract; Library).

The motion passed with a vote of 26 in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstaining. This vote surpassed the 2/3rds vote required for a by-laws change.

Motion #2: Mark reviewed the second motion which comes to the Representative Faculty Senate already moved and seconded from the FSSC. Mark noted that the FSSC believes this motion is fully consistent with the language of the TAUP contract. This amendment clarifies that in the event an election fails to fill all vacancies the FSSC would be empowered to fill the vacancies:

Article IV, Section 12, presently provides:

12. In the event that any specified elected position on any committee be vacant, the Steering Committee may select a qualified Faculty Senator to fill that position until the end of the term of the vacant position.

Motion:

Add a sentence at the end: “In the event that there are fewer candidates for election than the number of vacancies on any elected committee, the Steering Committee may select a qualified Faculty Senator to fill that vacancy for a period of up to one academic year, at which point the remainder of that committee member’s term will be filled by election.”

Explanation:

This amendment allows the FSSC to fully staff committees that fail to attract sufficient candidates for election. The one academic year limit prevents the position from being effectively converted to an

appointed position. (Presumably, the person(s) selected by the FSSC could choose to be a candidate in the next election for the remainder of the term.)

The motion passed with a vote of 29 in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstaining. This vote surpassed the 2/3rds vote required for a by-laws change.

5. Guest: Tim O'Rourke (VP for Computer and Financial Services; and Chief Information Officer):

Tim O'Rourke came to share with the Representative Faculty Senate issues about technology accessibility. He had sent a set of PowerPoint slides that were posted two weeks prior to the meeting on the Faculty Senate website for review by senators. Please refer to the PowerPoint for information about this presentation.

A brief summary of his comments are:

There have been a series of cases that have made it clear Higher Education Institutions need to focus on making all learning environments more technologically accessible to people with special needs. One case that has generated particular concern is Penn State v. National Federation for the Blind because the case judgment provided a list of actions that Penn State was ordered to take to be in compliance.

When faculty has a need to accommodate a special needs student, they have usually referred students to the Disability Student Resource Office. That is not enough anymore. The Department of Justice has indicated that ad hoc remediation is NOT enough (look at PPT). In response, Temple University has been talking with vendors. Blackboard is fully accessible. BUT not all the content we put on Blackboard are fully accessible. There is nothing about administrative systems like Banner in the case law, and no system (including Banner) is fully accessible right now. AMX (touch panels) used Temple to develop a way to make touch panels accessible to blind persons operating them independently. Some clicker systems are accessible and those are being recommended.

We have adopted a university-wide policy. The person responsible for putting the technology or information out there is responsible for making it accessible. If it cannot be made accessible it must be removed. This means that faculty need to be more involved in issues of accessibility and we need to raise awareness levels.

Temple has created the Accessible Technology Compliance Committee. This committee oversees this general effort, including the provision to grant exceptions. There will always have to be some exceptions (e.g., blind persons cannot become dentists).

Tim O'Rourke's office sent a group to a conference on accessibility. At this conference they saw several legal presentation that suggested government is looking to make sure that HEIs are aware, have policies, have plans, and ways to get to required levels of accessibility. Not everything has to be done right now, but it is critical that all faculty and programs are thinking about how to become accessible as quickly as possible. They have set a committee of school and college liaisons and ISC staff are learning more each day about how to insure compliance. One important realization for faculty is that if something is required in a course it must be compliant.

-Jennifer Cromley (COE): Is statistical analysis software technology? What do we do if we know or suspect that it is not accessible?

-Tim O'Rourke indicated that it is important for faculty to begin to ask these questions. And, he suggested that there may be situations of exception or faculty may be required to look for different "technologies" to use that would be compliant.

-Gregory Urwin (CLA): Does this issue of accessibility affect PowerPoints (gave examples of using PPT, songs, maps, visuals, etc.)? Is it fair to impact the learners who do not need accessibility by restricting content and format to meet the needs of a few students?

-Response – the intent of ADA is different. The argument that we can't deny 109 students because of the 110th is not an argument that we can make.

-Joel Sheffield (CST): He discussed using class capture and the benefits of that, including having recorded lectures available. Others than the special needs students can benefit from these improvements.

-Tricia Jones (COE): Thanks to your office. Your efforts have put us ahead of the curve. Faculty Senate needs to devote effort to preparing faculty for these issues. And under an RCM process is there a need for more information about costs of these accessibility changes and how these will be factored in – against programs or commonwealth funding.

Tim O'Rourke continued by indicating that there are several points of contact in his office. (e.g., Paul Paire and Roz White).

7. Guest: Peter Jones (Senior Vice-Provost of Undergraduate Studies):

Peter attended in place of Provost Dai to present a recommendation from the Provost that the students be given access to data from SFFs. He reported that Temple Student Government made a proposal that they recommend students be given access to quantitative data from 10 SFF items through secure portals. And students would obtain full access if they complete all forms. The SFF Faculty Senate subcommittee made a recommendation to allow access to specific items (4 items) from SFFs.

Time is of the issue – registration is coming forward. The Provost is recommending that we listen to these two bodies and concur. Some details on mechanics are done (e.g., on line, intranet, prior two year window of results available).

-Steve Newman (CLA, Faculty Senate Herald): In my work on this issue and in related discussions, I have heard deep misgivings from some faculty members. There are concerns about real security and reliability, validity of the SFFs. There are questions like “When would the data start getting released?”

Peter went on to indicate that the SFF subcommittee also addressed another set of issues: How does one assess teaching more effectively? He mentioned that the subcommittee is interested in the possible use of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness

Tricia Jones (COE): I applaud the SFF subcommittee for suggesting multiple measure feedback. She recommends that we work toward allowing faculty to have multiple measures of effectiveness made available with SFF data next fall when it goes live. We should help mentor and prepare faculty in defining these relevant multiple measures, gathering the data, and making the data available with SFFs.

8. Adjournment:

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:09pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary