

**Representative Faculty Senate Meeting  
Friday, February 26, 2016 – 1:45 PM  
Kiva Auditorium**

**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

Representative senators and officers: 23

Ex-officios: 0

Faculty, Administrators and guests: 17

WebEx: 14

1. Call to Order

President Jones called the meeting to order at 1:48 p.m.

2. Agenda approved unanimously.

3. Approval of January 25, 2016 Minutes

The minutes from January 25, 2016 were approved unanimously.

4. President's Report

President Neil Theobald will join us for our next Faculty Senate Meeting, March 23<sup>rd</sup>, (Wednesday), KIVA Auditorium to discuss stadium issues.

President Theobald is meeting with Collegial Assemblies as these can be scheduled throughout the semester to discuss stadium issues.

Council on Diverse Constituencies

Fall 2016/Spring 2017 Symposium

CSoW, FOC, LGBTQIA, Abilities, International Programs

eSFF Committee meeting – Numerous issues discussed:

Response rates (average of 61.5% response rate)

Multi-modal teaching evaluations/peer evaluations – so that eSFFs are not only evaluation tool being used

Administration processes for “unconventional courses” (e.g., 7 week courses)

Please let us know if you have concerns to be addressed by this committee.

Esteemed guests this semester to date:

Istvan Varkonyi, Director of General Education (Gen Ed and possible Summit)

SVP Peter R. Jones

Brooke Walker, Vice Dean of International Students, Division of Student Affairs

Bargaining Units Liaison Committee

Met this week

Discussions about Contract Process

Regular reporting to FSSC and via to Senate

Ongoing meetings with Temple Administration; Sharing Senate focus on giving voice to full-time faculty during this process

Faculty Senate Steering Committee has approved processes to provide full-time faculty voice

Discussion blog (on this and other issues) to be opened on Faculty Senate website

Q&A process (as in Fall 2015) to be continued with monthly summaries of information and questions distributed to all interested parties.

March meeting discussion

Private generation of questions

Invitation for responses from TAUP and Temple Administration

## 5. Vice-President's Report

The following appointments were made for senate committees. Thanks to all for their service.

Bargaining Unit Liaison Committee: Bernie Newman, Jim Korsh, and Trish Jones

Committee for International Programs: Daniel Berman, Elvis Wagner, Hiram Aldarondo, Xuebin Qin, and Wilbert J. Roget.

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color: Rafael Porrata-Doria and Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon

Committee on the Status of Women: Donna Snow

Library Committee: Robert Shuman and Donna Snow

Senate Budget Review Committee: Barry Berger and Kenneth Thurman

Student Award Selection Committee: Maia Cucchiara

March 7<sup>th</sup> deadline for nominations for Faculty Senate elected offices.

## 6. Discussion of the General Education “Technology” Course

Guest: Senior Vice Provost Peter R. Jones

Provided full context for Tech course. Two years ago there was an external review of GenEd. Generally positive feedback. Some comments. One point was too overly prescriptive, too many rules. Also, GenEd was 11 areas with no choices, other areas should be looked at (such as technology). Two areas were Technology area and Public Health area. Jones asked Istvan Varkonyi to get ball rolling. He got two faculty with varied backgrounds to develop course. These two faculty (one from CLA, one from CST) got funding for summer stipend, went to conferences and campuses to explore course options.

Came back with two options. Traditional course from one college. Second course (which Stanford and MIT would do now if could) would provide module structure from across disciplines. Coding one module for 4 weeks and 5 modules each for 2 weeks, with multiple choices within modules.

Provost expressed interest in traditional course as well as module interdisciplinary course (which Jones asked to be developed). Both are being developed and ideally will be available for fall 2016 and spring 2017 to test out. In old days courses came to GEEC then back to college. Last few years to college first and then to GEEC. It is important to add that the process for courses that cross colleges requires taking the course to GEEC then to EPPC and that the way this course is being handled is no different than other cross college courses that have been handled in the past.

Ideally course would be available for the fall to be ready for current registration period and available for fall, 2016.

Small offerings (one or two section options, not many students – perhaps 75 in one). Even with this, it would be 2½ years from comment to put idea into availability.

Course is multidisciplinary, so not ‘owned’ by any one college.

Would need a person to be in charge of overall course (for module course). Pedagogically unusual for us, but Jones wants the ideas and pedagogy to drive course, not organization of University.

Workload can be divided up by module and semester and is workable. Similarly, revenue can be divided up across colleges.

Innovative course is very appealing.

Discussions on how to adapt eSFFs for courses with many modules – this will be needed for the innovative course developed.

Mini-modules being developed for the course. CLA faculty explained different general categories to be included in the course (with mini-modules under the general categories). Two week micro-courses (mini-modules) within larger course structure.

Will run two versions – the one with five two-week modules and one four-week module as well as a more traditional, more science oriented course with one four-week and three three-week modules will also be offered.

Actual content in mini-modules remains to be finalized (in response to a question from Art Hochner (FSBM). Hopeful this could be a model of sorts for future courses.

Steve Newman (CLA) – compliments to designers. Perhaps in both Science and Technology and Human Behavior areas within Gen Ed. In fall 2016 will probably have only 2-3 modules within each general category – could add more modules later. Students follow individual path through course, choosing modules of interest. Perhaps modules will be hybrid/on-line. Need to bring faculty together to make sure in sync on Gen Ed goals, etc.

Jeffrey Solow (BCMD) – how grade each module which then goes into final grade? How credit people who teach it? These assessment questions are still being discussed. Bring faculty together to discuss/decide this. Credit might be 1/7<sup>th</sup> for a two-week module and/or 7 times during the semester for a full course load.

Gregory Irwin (CLA) – concerned that PowerPoint of table of course structure not available. Concern with empty seats in Kiva. A toothless body that cannot provide feedback. President Jones noted that the chart provided is simply a visual to indicate basic module structure and the language labels inserted are simply filler (reinforcing Peter Jones statement). She indicated that it was her decision to ask Peter Jones to present this visual and since it did not contain substantive content for discussion and decision, it was not important to provide it prior to the meeting. Concern about approval process of courses. This course may have taken a different route reflecting complexities of such a course. This is something we need to consider in terms of approval processes. Love to have room filled, but do so by having substantive issues/decisions. WebEx does provide additional opportunities for participation.

Peter Jones noted difficulties of having innovative courses within current framework. Going down a new path means engaging different constituencies in new ways. Trying to be sure faculty are involved in development of such a course. Challenges of doing this in an RCM environment!

Maria Lorenz (CST) – from students' point of view – where in Gen Ed requirement. Option in one of the Science and Technology of Human Behavior areas.

Question – What can we do to accelerate the process of developing/approving such a course – technology is moving along so quickly. Peter Jones noted that developing such a course gives a roadmap for future innovative courses. Wish could do it faster but there are constraints within college/Gen Ed model.

President Jones - FSSC will propose a task force on course innovation. What options do we have for expediting process as well as facilitating innovative course development? President Jones noted intensely that Administration has sought/honored faculty input at every level for this course.

Istvan Varkonyi (Director of Gen Ed) summed up progress of course within Gen Ed review committee. Initially no content, so content was requested. Now committee has six mini-modules to review for course content to be reviewed after Spring Break.

## 7. Discussion about General Process Questions on Adjunct Faculty Contract Negotiation

Questions about process (not arguments) for TAUP/Administration. Index cards distributed efficiently by Vice President Davey for provision of questions.

Art Hochner offered opportunity to answer questions for TAUP. Brief report TAUP offered at Liaison Committee. One, amending TAUP bylaws. Not sure when changes

will be placed for a vote. Process will involve individuals and small groups – all 700 TAUP members. Getting interaction, get questions. Two, not sure when negotiations will begin. Survey being conducted on issues for adjuncts as well as other college adjunct contracts. Hopefully (no promises) constitution/bylaw changes for vote by end of semester as well as sit with management and start negotiating on contract issues by end of semester. No negotiating team yet – adjuncts, as well as tenure track and non-tenure track members on team.

TAUP (Steve Newman) will not take a vote during the summer.

President Jones – Faculty Senate represents all faculty and interested in sharing questions from all faculty with TAUP and Administration.

Art Hochner reinforced TAUP Constitution only provides for voting during fall/spring academic year. No stealth changes taking place.

Suggestion that town hall meetings preferable to one to one conversations – open forum to express points and share discussion.

#### 8. Old Business

No old business presented.

#### 9. New Business

Steve Newman (CLA) – question about how faculty and students are being protected with students going through difficult times. Some concerns expressed by students and faculty. President Jones said will bring this back up to FSSC.

Michael Jackson (STHM) – noted e-mail from James Creedon on Cleery Report and request for information. Keep eyes open – we are biggest preventers of crime.

Gregory Irwin – does FSSC keep minutes. Answer - posted on web site. Those minutes are public information. Could also send out via listserv if desirable. Does President Jones think she violated resolution by allowing Peter Jones PowerPoint without prior distribution? President Jones felt she did not violate the resolution (note earlier information that this PowerPoint slide was simply a visual aid not a document with substantive content). Senate has done a pretty good job getting PPs out before meetings.

#### 10. Call to Adjourn - 3:12. Unanimously approved.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is Wednesday, March 23<sup>rd</sup>, in Kiva Auditorium.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Sachs, Secretary