

**Faculty Senate Nov. 7, 2013
Minutes**

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.

Marina 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 to 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 AuthentiKit. 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 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.
Secretary