

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY  
**FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE**  
 Minutes

**Date:** Tuesday, 10/4/2016

**Time:** 1:00pm – 3:00pm

**Present:** Michael Sachs (Pres., CPH), Elvis Wagner (Vice Pres., COE), Tricia Jones (Past-Pres., SMC), Sue Dickey (Secy., CPH), William Cabin (SSW), Michael W. Jackson (STHM), James Korsh (CST), Sharyn O'Mara (ART), Cornelius Pratt (SMC) Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Ken Thurman (COE.), Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon (TFMA), Jeff Solow (BCMD), Jie Yang (KSoD), Cheryl Mack (Coord.), Paul LaFollette (*Faculty Herald*, CST), Melissa Ranieri (Pharm),

**WebEx:** Raghbir Athwal (LKSM), Teresa Gill Cirillo (FSBM), Kurosh Darvish (Engr)

**Absent:** Donald Hantula (CLA), Donald Harris (LAW), Heidi Ojha (CPH), Jie Yang (KSoD)

**Excused:** N/A

**Guests:** Jeremy Jordan, FAR (1:00 pm) & Cindy Leavitt, Vice-Provost, Chief Information Officer for Computer Services (2:00 pm)

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m.	Meeting called to order by Dr. Sachs. Agenda reordered so that guests could speak.	Meeting called to order at 1:00pm.
2. Guest: Dr. Jeremy Jordan, Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA (1:00 p.m.)	<p>Thanks for having me. This is Year 2 of my appointment to this role. We are fortunate to have a fairly transparent athletic mission: academics. Pres. Englert is very supportive of this role &amp; has allowed me to move forward with some of the projects we're working on. Here is my agenda for discussion with you:</p> <p>REVIEW OF THE CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process is under review (last one 8 – 9 years ago). We do this to avoid penalties for incorrect monitoring. That info is then forwarded to NCAA. Records are requested for 7 prior years. The Schools &amp; Colleges file their info in very different ways... laptops, paper files, computers. We need a more automated way. One person currently does this. We need to minimize the possibility for human error. We hope to have a new system in place by fall of 2017. Beta tested in the spring. Working with Justin Miller &amp; his group to create this.</li> </ul> <p>ACADEMIC INTEGRITY MONITORING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course clustering &amp; major clustering. Except for nursing students, there are minimal restrictions. Independent Study courses are monitored closely. Last year, UNC had a big scandal.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade changes monitored very closely for each student athlete. This is to make sure that there is no form of coercion for faculty to change the grades to passing. I will look at most cases individually; especially for extreme cases to make sure that there wasn't pressure.</li> <li>• Shared courses for student athletes &amp; team managers: There is a NO CUT rule for team managers. There are currently 53 team managers, with differing roles from team to team. Some travel with the team when they go on road; others do very little. Logistics of home &amp; travel. Towels; benches, operational position.</li> <li>• Academic Integrity Monitoring – we look for special treatment for our athletes that might count as impermissible academic benefits (IABs) such as 'extra credit' assignments. Unless those are offered to all students in the course, they would count as an IAB. Special test-taking circumstances that are not offered to others in the course. We speak to all our student athletes &amp; managers about this.</li> <li>• Justin Miller from the Resnick Center comes to speak to this group as well.</li> <li>• Non-compliance: Successful completion of course work toward the degree sought is expected by the end of each academic year. For sophomores = 40%, Juniors = 60% &amp; seniors = 80% of degree completion by the end of these years for permission to continue to be on the team.</li> <li>• Q: How is regulation done?</li> <li>• A: Self-monitoring. This requires people with high levels of integrity in these positions. Some thoughts about this include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There were new NCAA Academic Misconduct bylaws passed in August based on the UNC case. They adopted a sociogram flowchart entitled "Adopted Framework – Full Picture." (This was distributed to the members of the FSSC). It is an NCAA requirement &amp; the flowchart helps faculty decide whether or not the student participated in a reportable violation of some form of academic misconduct. It is a policy that allows for expedited review for everyone when needed for misconduct in any way. Some examples of misconduct might include social media violations, public inebriation &amp; so on. What happens is either a faculty member handles the infraction by himself or herself or a decision can be made to turn it over to Student Misconduct Committee. With a committee process, the student signs a form saying this is what happened; this is what we agreed to &amp; it goes away. Most faculty not aware of this form. There is no consistent archiving of these activities. Dr. Jordan encourages us to return to our Collegial Assemblies to tell faculty colleagues about the process of referral to this committee. If there is a suspected NCAA violation, follow the flow chart. If the incident goes into any of the 3 boxes, it is an NCAA violation &amp; a report goes to the NCAA. Was there impermissible academic assistance provided to the student? For EX: The student takes 4 class cuts when only 3 allowed that are not available to the general</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Impermissible academic benefits are reportable NCAA violations.</p> <p>We need to find out what the new rules &amp; regs are. Mike Sachs will check on this.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>student. That will change the outcome of your class performance. We are trying to educate faculty to understand that this could result in an NCAA violation so that the student can continue to perform in school.</p> <p>Q: How would this be detected?  A: We don't often know. Other students might point something out, such as "she got extra credit, but that option isn't available to me."</p> <p>Q: What should be done when students miss more than the allocated # of class periods?  A: Some of the schools &amp; colleges have very rigid "no missed class time policy." Maybe FSSC &amp; EPPC should have a conversation about this.</p> <p>Q: J.S. Commented. Policy just needs to be for Temple U. events, perhaps &amp; not general class cutting. Dress rehearsals are mandatory; choral ensemble rehearsals, etc.  A: How does the student make that choice? This makes me feel uncomfortable when students must make those choices when they've made commitments to their teams. Most students will choose academics. There is a level of strictness; different rules; different departments.</p> <p>Q: MS: Do we have exemplars?  A: We want to find a 'best practice' from other schools.</p> <p>Q: MJ: There are some disabled students with DRS plans that say that the student has anxiety. Don't be surprised if the student has to get up &amp; leave class. Athletes are pretty much the same &amp; require specialized services.  KT: Disabilities come under a Federal Law.  TJ: Not up to Faculty to comply when it's DRS.  KT: Documentation of the disability is required in order to implement DRS policies and a letter of accommodation should be signed by the faculty member.  TJ: You have to honor these DRS accommodations. (Or student may be moved to another class if there is one available. This is not the case in all majors.)</p> <p>Q: TJ: Do you have any read on the stadium?  A: My understanding is that all the studies are completed. My input is no longer required. More discussion among FSSC ensued.</p> <p>Dr. Jordan then reported that all current teams are now fully funded &amp; have had their infrastructure &amp; support updated.</p>	<p>Dr. Jordan may try to schedule talks during the remainder of this A.Y. with some of the more 'rigid' programs.</p>
--	--	---

2. Merit Scholarship Review Process – Some discussion ensued about the process. There will be less money available to students via this process over the next several years than there were for the previous several years.
3. Mental Health Resources – struggling with how to get services to students. Tutelman Counseling Services are understaffed. For non-critical issues it can be up to a six week wait & for critical it can be up to a two-day wait. I am trying to help support our athletes in whatever way I can.
4. Academic Consortium – T.U. Faculty Involvement  
Faculty Mentor/Faculty Coach Programs: Underway. I am somewhat remiss about getting this initiative going. We want to bring people in, such as faculty members, to engage with student athletes.

Any questions? MS: Can we get a Senate block on the 50-yard line? 😊

EW to Dr. Jordan: I don't think you're bragging enough! Team GPAs setting new highs every year.  
The tutors, Justin Miller & his staff are stars. The coaches value academics & use them to recruit kids here.

Dr. Jordan: On Friday Oct 21<sup>st</sup>, all athletes with a 3.0 or > will get field recognition at that time in a ceremony.

Per MS: There is a meeting of the Athletics Committee next Tuesday @ 10 a.m. & then BOT @ 2:00 p.m. so maybe a conclusion then?

Jeremy will send form to Michael Sachs for

		distribution.
<p>3. Cindy Leavitt, VP, CIO for CS (2:00 pm)</p>	<p>Greetings &amp; brief self-introduction. I am new to TU since August 1<sup>st</sup> &amp; new to Philadelphia, as well. Report ensued: We:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Just upgraded Banner to stabilize the system.</li> <li>-Need to move to a new, easier learning system. Evaluating Bb Ultra &amp; the New Canvas. We are looking for teachers from all schools &amp; colleges to teach one single course in one of these two platforms in the spring. I saw a few frowns... is there a concern?</li> </ul> <p>Q: PL: What are your expectations?  A: Looking for people willing to do it &amp; provide feedback. Need names back by the 21<sup>st</sup> of October, 2016. We've sent a letter out to the Deans.</p> <p>MS: We can't guarantee that the Deans will do forward the letter to faculty. They may select their own people to pilot this initiative.</p> <p>There was other feedback for Dr. Leavitt given by the FSSC.  JK: Suggested that she go to the Faculty directly.</p> <p>Report continued: We are looking at where we should be investing as we move TU forward in technology. A steering committee is to sit down with Computer Services over next few months to brainstorm about where we should be investing energy for the future. We really need strong faculty input &amp; participation. There will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Banner upgrades will be happening over the course of the year. A lot of energy &amp; time.</li> <li>-Web projects that will be happening...</li> </ul> <p>C.S. We will be spending a lot of time in the next 2 years on that.</p> <p>Do you have any questions or feedback for me?</p> <p>TJ: A couple years ago, TU started the Office of Digital Ed (ODE). How is the Office of Digital Ed linked to other CS &amp; TU services? Is there a synergy?  A: The ODE is a stand-alone organization that covers its own costs. We work closely with Dan White, who works with individual colleges who are able to digitize portions of their colleges. They are NOT under Computer Services, however. Darin Kapanjie from Fox is a contact person.</p>	<p>Dr. Leavitt will send letter to MS, who will send it out to Cheryl for all faculty.</p> <p>MS We will help you to select. If you wish to share the names of those submitted by the deans, we can certainly help with that.</p>

Q: What are the thoughts about Blackboard v. other platforms for TU?  
A: CANVAS is the fastest growing LMS. A lot of people are moving to CANVAS from the open source world. More modern, modular, more APIs that go in & out that will just pop into your google calendar that make it more useful for the students & faculty. It's nicer, more intuitive. It doesn't need an instructional manual.

Q: Does it change every year?  
A: Do you folks have an awareness of what the difference between a SAS application is? With CANVAS... there are small changes that occur on a regular basis v. taking Bb down and rebooting the entire platform every couple of years.

Q: MJ: Can you make the reimbursement system (Concur) more user friendly? It's pretty tedious.  
A: Concur is not in my portfolio.

Q: PL – Nobody seems to be very concerned about the TU Web Presence content.  
A: Retiring old content is really something that needs to be managed. We need to look at it holistically. We need to look at all of web assets; not just marketing or what's on the portal. There is strong recognition by marketing & the Deans that we have appropriate content on these sites. You are not preaching to the choir!

Q: What are Computer Services' availability hours?  
A: I'm not sure. For the first 3 weeks of school.... We've been working on getting the new Bb up & running. There were very high abandonment rates for queued calls.

Q: Do we have wireless everywhere?  
A: Yes in public areas. In S's & C's, this is the purview of the individual Colleges to pay for this. It's not pervasive.

Q: MS. Why?  
A: Has to do with the funding model (RCM). Most funds come in via Tech Fee & can only be used for student areas. Wireless is considered part of the network.

Q: Can be very frustrating for faculty  
A: Model is shifting. Computers are changing. Less expectation to plug into the wall.... (10 – 15 X's faster to plug into a wired computer). We have to shift our whole model so that we take Wi-Fi & will figure out a different model to pay for this as a school or college.

Q: MR: In Pharm, we use Turning Technologies in large lecture halls to engage students. Clickers required, but they don't work very well.

A: Using phone. But is there enough Wi-Fi in the rooms to support it? Susan Hyer runs Academic Computing, so reach out to her. The new trend is moving away from the physical clickers. Moving to cellular phone networks & texting that don't require as much bandwidth & with which students are very facile. Also, phone APPS. Susan can give you a good idea for what people are using across the campuses.

Q: KWW: Has there been a general assessment across classroom buildings? There are whole floors where you can't get a cell signal & Wi-Fi. Sometimes, one's class location is where one's students are consistently disadvantaged due to lack of Wi-Fi. Limited cell signals & Wi-Fi in faculty offices. I sometimes must go into the ladies' room to obtain a cell phone signal.

A: Shared classrooms would be up to date. Classrooms held by a single college may make this uneven. Talk to your dean & copy Larry Brandolph ([larry.brandolph@temple.edu](mailto:larry.brandolph@temple.edu)) to let him know where there are consistent problems in that student space so we can partner with you to get these things up to speed. You have to have that kind of connectivity. However, the problems go back to the RCM funding model.

Q: You have to go into the bathroom in Tomlinson to get it! In the Theater, Film & Media Arts area, connectivity is fantastic!

A: Are the building paid for by the individual s's & c's? It's like water & other utilities. Is this just the cost of being in business. We need that conversation. We should mention it to Ken Kaiser that network is a kind of expected utility.

Q: What are your reporting lines?

A: I report to the Provost. I have 250 f.t. staff & 300 student-workers. My office is in 7<sup>th</sup> floor Conwell.

Q: KWW: The New Bb is very frustrating.

A: Vendors won't support old versions of Bb, so we struggle to help you adjust.

Q: TJ: There is an accessibility & faculty responsibility question. How can we help all the schools & colleges know what's going on?

A: Through the Computer Services Committee... new online training will be rolling out in November for ACCESSIBILITY. That will be the 1<sup>st</sup> step in knowing what expectations are. I will follow up on that! Thus concluded VP Leavitt's report.

<p>4. President Michael Sach's Report</p>	<p>FSSC Minutes of 9-20-16 approved with one small typo change in item 7.</p> <p>Mike deferred his report to Elvis; important business.</p>	
---	---	--



<p>5. Vice President's Report – Dr. Elvis Wagner</p>	<p>Vice-President's report for FSSC Oct. 4, 2016</p> <p><b>GEEC</b>—The administrative members of GEEC were pushing to move forward a document that was to be a “starting point for discussion” for Gen Ed's restructuring. I was approached by a faculty member of GEEC that had concerns about how this document was going to be presented to FS and FSSC. Based on this discussion and emails from other GEEC members, I decided to attend the last GEEC meeting on Sep. 29<sup>th</sup>. I stated my concerns with the process of how this particular document was selected as the one to move forward, and that there had been no committee vote on it. So the committee decided to not move this document forward, but to instead continue working on a proposal that would be officially voted on as the one to move forward to FS and FSSC in the future.</p> <p><b>The FSSC resumed discussion after C. Leavitt's presentation:</b> MS &amp; Elvis attended the GEEC meeting last Thursday. Peter Jones &amp; Istvan were not able to put the document forward. Members seemed to be a bit frustrated that they couldn't bring a document forward to move on it. No vote on the document yet. Not yet ready to move it forward to the Faculty Senate. It bothered me that they weren't able to move fwd. I don't know about any substantive changes. My concern was with the process. The real driving force was Provost Dai to revamp GENED. They don't feel that they're getting that push from above that they were getting before.</p> <p>KT: Do we know where Joanne stands on it?</p> <p>TJ: Peter said that there were a number of Deans that were really driving &amp; pushing were 4 – 5 very powerful deans. Definite dean pressure.</p> <p>PL: A number of schools &amp; departments that would like to run their intro courses as feeding into the major.</p> <p>Q: KWW: Do we know what the courses are?</p> <p>A: Reducing the # of GENED credits from 36 to 32. Five categories now from which they choose: getting rid of these. Inequity of waivers from one school to the next.</p> <p>JK: Would be stupid to go ahead with this until the RCM Model is reviewed.</p> <p>MS: It may be tweaked but it will not disappear.</p> <p>TJ: We are a 'Carnegie I' organization that has faculty in spaces in which they can't get basic</p>	<p>M. Sachs – We will bring this up (whether or not there are HR &amp;/or contract conflicts) in our joint meeting tomorrow of FS Officers' with Administrators: Kevin Delaney, Susan Smith &amp; Sharon Boyle.</p> <p>We wanted them to come to the FSSC to give them some feedback on the doc b4 it goes to the Senate.</p>
--	---	---

WIFI.

**Search Committee for School of Law Dean**-- Professor Rafael Porrata-Doria of the Law School is a CATA member. Is it appropriate for him to participate in the selection of the faculty candidates to serve on the Law School Dean Search Committee? I understand that the Law School will be forwarding its candidates to the Provost separately. Rafael is indifferent as to which way we go.

Q: Elvis: Should he recuse himself?

A: TJ: He's just faculty, so it's probably not a conflict of interest.

Cheryl: Looking @ 9 applicants & meeting on 10-616

**CATA**—Harold Klein is the Chair of CATA. He wants us to reconsider the idea of having a "pool" of possible candidates for the Presidential Search (or any other search, for that matter). We had a long discussion regarding the motion that was passed in FSSC and was to go to CATA. Harold forwarded me an email that he'd sent to Deborah Howe (how many years ago?) in relation to an almost identical case:

Once the FS Exec. Comm. is informed of the need for faculty candidates for potential service on selection/advisory committees for positions considered important "administrative and/or trustee appointments," the CATA chair is contacted (see Mark and/or Trish in this regard).

We jointly decide on how to go forward, whether we need extra time, when and how the call will go out, etc. The CATA serves on behalf of the FS if and when it is called to do so.

We considered the idea of a ready pool of faculty candidates for potential committee appointments -- and decided finally not to pursue this course. When we have a surfeit of candidates after any one call and selection decision, we need to write thanks-but-no-thanks letters to all others. It is rarely the case, but it's happened once or twice, that unchosen faculty don't quite understand why they were not selected, especially where they are sure that they fit the bill. These situations require additional care (we've handled these successfully).

Do we let faculty in the pool know that they have not been proposed or wait for them to ask?

A standing pool of potential candidates likely would increase the aggregate number from which to select appropriate faculty to put forward for consideration. However, there is no guarantee that among the pool there is a sufficient number of individuals with the particular qualifications called for (e.g., must be a tenured full professor in the School of Dentistry) and/or that any one individual has the inclination or availability to serve at the moment of the call. In such situations, we would need to issue a general call to the entire faculty -- which precludes the value of a candidate pool in the first place.

Additionally, it is not clear whether the Faculty Senate can (or should) preclude any faculty not in a preexisting pool from putting themselves forward for consideration. Can or should the FS not announce that a selection will take place? And what if CATA finds that the assumed candidate pool doesn't have appropriate candidates to put forward - and then goes

forward with a university-wide call? How many pool members might feel slighted (after all, they actually volunteered, indicating their willingness to serve)? The pool would be more trouble than it is worth.

MS: Pool may be a misnomer. It's a list, really.

TJ: There's not a disadvantage that if there are people who are willing to submit their names (for selection to CATA or not) this is not a problem.

EW: Will we have other calls?

MS: Check the list to make sure that these are still available. Not unmanageable. They wouldn't necessarily get selected automatically.

PL: If they ask for 4, you could still send a list with 8 names.

JK: Trying to have people in place should they be needed immediately.

KT: I hate to sound hierarchical, but I am. Does the committee have a right to turn around & say that they wouldn't do that?

EW: The main issue is that IF there is a short turn-around time, we will have people in place when CATA puts out an official call.

MS: We can say that we believe that Chairman O'Connor can't tell us not to do it. If they say that they're not looking for anyone until next year, we'll just wait. If we do a call now & come up with a list, we're ready. Let's defer until Chair O'C comes on Nov. 8<sup>th</sup>.

EW: The International Programs Committee wants to make a change to its "charge". In the document I've provided, the changes are highlighted:

**International Programs Committee**--The International Programs Committee has developed an update to our committee charge; these changes are deemed necessary to reflect the work the committee has done and is currently focused upon. The committee voted on this change in Spring of 2016 and it was approved; we would like these changes to be reviewed and accepted by Faculty Senate. Please advise if you require further information or details.

***Proposed change to Charge (changes highlighted)***

*To advise Education Abroad and Overseas Campuses, International Student and Scholar Services, International Student Affairs, and the university community on matters of consequence to Temple students studying abroad, international students studying at Temple*

	<p><i>campuses, and American students from other universities who wish to study at Temple University campuses abroad.</i></p> <p><i>To explore opportunities for Temple programs, faculty, staff, and students to engage in multidisciplinary and scholarly pursuits, which develop and support cross-cultural and international perspectives.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the committee will support efforts to infuse an international perspective across the TU curricula through courses, experiences, and learning communities. The committee has advisory, consultative and interpretive roles in serving all the colleges and campuses of Temple University.</i></p> <p>TJ: Why is “staff” included here? This may have implications for H.R. New international committee was set up under previous provost. I think we should send it back to the committee to explain.</p> <p>?: How can this committee advise overseas campuses? This doesn’t seem possible.</p> <p>EW: This is referring to the “Office” of Education Abroad and Overseas Campuses”, and the “Office of International Student and Scholar Services” and the “Office of International Student Affairs”. I will send it back to Mary Conran, Chair of the committee, asking for clarification for the reason for including “Staff”, and also to add “Office” to the charge where appropriate, to make it clearer.</p>	
<p>6. Old Business</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>7. New Business</p>	<p>Per M. Sachs:</p> <p>Next Monday at the Fac Senate meeting, the Accessible Technology Compliance Committee will be coming (Betsy Leebron Tutelman &amp; Associates).</p> <p>MS: Do you have any other issues? We could have a shorter meeting.</p> <p>Q: KWW: We are concerned about an intellectual property issue. An anecdote was shared regarding an adjunct faculty member who was asked to design a new course and was told by the local administrator that the University would own all that was created. We would like to talk to someone from U. Counsel about this. This affects people in the arts especially.</p> <p>A: TJ: We still don’t have an intellectual property policy. This targets adjuncts &amp; others who are least able to protect someone.</p>	<p>-President Sachs will check with U. counsel.</p> <p>-President Sachs will ask John DiMino to come talk with us.</p>

	<p>Q: JK: Is the default policy (in absence of a policy) that the IP belongs to the faculty?  A: TJ: IP is not a union mandate. It is not a term &amp; condition of employment.  JS: If it IS a part of the contract, it would be very easy for administration to attempt to say that all creations done &amp; shared with students belong to the University.</p> <p>A: TJ: It shouldn't be in contract b/c it such terms can't be changed until the next contract.</p> <p>Q: SO: There is a lack of adequate counseling services for students. Bigger &amp; bigger problem this early in semester.  Q: MJ: This is spilling into the neighborhoods.  A: MS: There is the outstanding stadium issue. Would we like to move forward with whether or not we support the stadium or not?  Q: TJ: Without additional info, does it make more sense to wait since they're doing their feasibility study? We have Dick &amp; Joanne who actually seem to care about what faculty think.  A: MS: The longer we wait, the more it will be a done deal.</p> <p>Q: KT: Are we talking about the opinion of the entire faculty or just the Faculty Senate?  A: MS: We haven't decided.  Q: KT: Does everyone know enough to make an informed consent?  Q: PL: It's my understanding that the faculty are saying that we ought to put this on hold until we have a president.</p> <p>Q: MJ: We changed the name of our college. We will be changing our Collegial Assembly bylaws (which currently were posted back in 1969) to reflect this. Is there a Collegial Assembly bylaws template? I cannot find one online.  A: JK: Past U. President Adamany made a template. It's just hard to find.</p> <p>Q: MJ: What are the required standing committees &amp; can we add new ones at this point?  A: PL: I did send out some concerns via the <i>Faculty Herald</i> that I would like to get into FSSC eventually. Would also like to see that EPPC is doing something this semester.</p> <p>Q: TJ: Is planning for the Diversity Symposium moving forward?  A: KWW: I believe it is. To my knowledge they are still waiting to be approved as a committee. Very few people filled out the doodle call to meeting.</p>	
8. Adjournment		Adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, <i>Sue Dickey</i> Sue Dickey, PhD, RN, Associate Professor & Faculty Senate Secretary, 2016-17		
---	--	--

Next meeting: Representative Faculty Senate, Monday, October 10, 2016  
FSSC, Tuesday, October 17; 2016

SBD/sbd 10-13-16