

## **Shared Governance and Transparency: Not Only Good Ideas, but Ethical & Moral**

By Dr. James P. Byrnes  
*Professor, Psychological Studies in Education*

As someone who has served as both a professor and administrator across a 35-year career in academia, I have come to truly understand the value of both shared governance and transparency in budgeting. Shared governance lies somewhere between the two extremes of (a) all strategic decisions being made democratically by the faculty (that administrators just rubber stamp) and (b) an autocratic form of leadership in which all decisions are made in a top-down manner by administrators with no faculty input. The central tenet of shared governance is the idea that planning and decision-making should be distribut-

ed throughout an organization in order to take full advantage of the expertise and relative authority of people at various levels. When all levels of an organization collaborate and communicate effectively (while acceding authority where appropriate), important institutional goals are more likely to obtain.

Not surprisingly, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) strongly endorses shared governance for this very reason (<https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/shared-governance>). Wise and effective leaders recognize the value of seeking input from key con-

*[continued on page 2]*

## **TUTTLEMAN COUNSELING SERVICES & CARE TEAM**

By Dr. Daniel Dengel  
*Interim Director / Associate Director for Training, Tuttleman*

The current environment underscores the importance of assessing, supporting, and advocating for the mental health needs of university students. At Temple, and across the nation, students are managing anxiety, grief, sadness, confusion, loneliness, and other difficulties in the midst of navigating a global health pandemic, financial hardships, social disconnection, and continued racial injustice and unrest. At Tut-

*[continued on page 4]*

Social media: @TUFacultyHerald ([Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#))

Email the editor: [Herald@temple.edu](mailto:Herald@temple.edu)

## **THE CENTER FOR ANTI-RACISM RESEARCH**

### **A Temple Initiative Against Racism**

By Dr. Molefi Kete Asante  
*Professor, Africology and African American Studies*

The public murder of George Floyd on May 25, 2020, and the subsequent Black Lives Matter Movement marches, re-activated the most chilling centuries-old outrage of African Americans and others of goodwill. Responses to the arrogant, ignorant, and brutal killing of Floyd by a police officer Derek Chauvin in Minneapolis were immediate as ordinary citizens and CEOs, preachers and politicians, lawyers and athletes, authors and

*[continued on page 3]*

## **Textbook Affordability: Reporting on Faculty & Student Surveys**

By Dr. Stephen Bell  
*Associate University Librarian for Research & Instructional Services, Charles Library*

In the prior issue of the *Faculty Herald* I wrote about current initiatives at Temple University aimed at achieving textbook affordability for our students. That piece, “Textbook Affordability: Helping Our Students to Have a More Affordable Education”, identified the University’s Textbook Task Force as a Provost’s committee charged to identify and implement measures to advance affordable course materials. One of the committee charges relates to learning about

existing faculty efforts to adopt affordable learning materials. To that end the Task Force conducted a survey in the fall of 2020 to collect information on faculty adoption of open educational resources (OER). In addition to a faculty survey, the Task Force worked with the Temple Student Government (TSG) to conduct a student survey on textbook purchasing and use behavior. This article highlights findings from both of these surveys.

*[continued on page 4]*

## Shared Governance and Transparency, continued

situencies (budget experts, faculty experts, etc.) because strategies and plans are more likely to be successful. They not only seek advice but also heed it when it is well-founded. But effective leaders also have to make tough and unpopular decisions sometimes that are in the best interest of the institution. Even in such cases, these leaders still take into full consideration the points of view of multiple constituencies. In essence, then, shared governance is far better than the other two options at the extremes. Autocrats do not seek input or heed it from experts at different levels, so their plans tend to be less effective than those of leaders who function within shared governance models. But the plans adopted by rubber stampers in bottom-up democracies would be comparably problematic, especially in tough economic times in which faculty in programs would compete with each other to survive. The ship would be rudderless, so to speak. You need someone at the helm who has the vision to see where you should be going with the help and support of the crew.

That said, a little reflection shows that shared governance models cannot be optimally effective if budgeting is not transparent. It would make little sense to seek input on plans or decisions if individuals who play roles at lower levels of an institution were operating in the dark. Imagine, for example, if Temple's administration sought votes from faculty on whether to open a new campus in France but did not inform the faculty that doing so would mean closing campuses in Italy or Japan for budgetary reasons.

If it seems self-evident to the reader that effective organizations em-

brace both shared governance and transparency in budgeting, my next point may not be so self-evident: it is also moral and ethical to embrace these two organizational policies. There are many ways to demonstrate this point from the realms of ethics and morality (and I hope ethicists and moral philosophers on campus weigh in), but I will choose an angle that may surprise you but is nevertheless quite apt. As anyone required to obtain IRB approval to conduct research knows, there is the respect for persons principle of the famous Belmont Report that contains two components: (a) people should be treated as autonomous persons and (b) individuals who have diminished autonomy should be protected. The first component is described as such in the Belmont Report:

*“To respect autonomy is to give weight to autonomous persons’ considered opinions and choices while refraining from obstructing their actions unless they are clearly detrimental to others. To show lack of respect for an autonomous agent is to repudiate that person’s considered judgments, to deny an individual the freedom to act on those considered judgments, or to withhold information necessary to make a considered judgment, when there are no compelling reasons to do so.” (Belmont Report, p. 4)*

When administrators are autocrats and do not cede some authority to faculty to let them have a say in how they are governed or restrict their ability to make decisions, they are showing them lack of respect according to the ethicists who drafted the Belmont Report. Those ethicists were asked to weigh in on the idea of how to treat research participants ethically after various scandalous experiments were conducted (e.g., the Tuskegee and Milgram experi-

ments). It is against human nature to take away the freedoms of autonomous agents and doing so places a psychological toll on individuals working in autocratic institutions. This is why psychologists ranging from Erik Erikson to Ed Deci & Richard Ryan argue for the centrality of autonomy, as did the authors of Vatican II documents such as *Gaudium et Spes* who linked autonomy to respect for persons.

The authors of the Belmont Report argued further that the principle of respect for persons directly leads to the application of this principle known as informed consent. When shared governance lies at the core of institutional decision-making, it is often the case that faculty are asked to vote on matters as a form of quality control, such as which job applicant should be given an offer, whether a program should be eliminated, and whether to grant promotion and tenure to a candidate. When administrators do not give faculty complete and accurate information before asking them to make an important decision, they are not giving the faculty informed consent. They are not giving them the way out expressed by “if I have known that, I would not have voted (yes or no)” which is precisely the same sentiment that one tries to avoid in research participants. Therefore, it follows that being non-transparent about the budget is also unethical.

In sum, then, shared governance is not only an indicator of institutional effectiveness, it is also an indicator of the extent to which administrators adhere to the respect for persons principle and recognizing the right of faculty to have some au-

*[continued on page 3]*

## **Shared Governance and Transparency, continued**

tonomy and being fully informed. In other words, embracing shared governance and transparency is also ethically and morally responsible. Why should an institution hold a double standard in which researchers must abide by the respect for persons principle, but this principle is not required in other kinds of in-

stitutional decisions? We have to ask ourselves, to what extent does Temple as a whole and individual colleges embrace shared governance? To what extent is there real transparency in budgeting? Why, for example, is information about the official operating budgets of units on campus published in a

single copy of a book in the library that cannot be photocopied by the faculty? How much information is provided to budget committees in colleges and what actual input do they have in college strategies and plans? Could we be doing better from an effectiveness and ethical standpoint? Surely.

## **The Center for Anti-Racism Research, continued**

first responders reacted with practical actions. Words were not just spoken, deeds were done.

The Department of Africology's students were agitated then distraught, talkative and energized, as were faculty members in America's first doctoral program in African American Studies. After conversations with the faculty and students I wrote a letter to the president of the university on June 20, 2020 expressing the combined and pent-up rage I have often felt at Temple for its lack of active antiracism in departments and colleges. In my letter I addressed five issues specifically related to what Temple could do. One of those issues was stated simply as asking the University to "Promote Temple's leadership role in Africology and African American Studies and set up a Center for Antiracist Research much like the ones at American University and Boston University that have been directed by our former student." I was referring to Ibram X. Kendi who wrote *How to be an Antiracist*. Dr. Kendi started the antiracism center at American University and then was lured away to Boston University where he was able to attract millions of dollars for a first-rate center for antiracism.

President Richard Englert's posi-

tive response to my modest proposal meant that our faculty could begin to discuss the nature of such a center at our urban university located in the heart of North Philadelphia. I requested ideas from faculty and doctoral students about the shape of such a center. As the author of *Eras-ing Racism: The Survival of the American Nation*, I had some thoughts about themes that might be covered in Temple's Center for Antiracism Research as proposed in my June 2020 letter. However, the Center would have several important characteristics impacting the entire campus. First, it would be, as other centers at Temple, open to campus-wide participation while being in a constant search for new synergies and research formations investigating various aspects of racism. Secondly, the center would be directed by a tenure-track professor with a commitment to racial equity, justice, and the elimination of the racial ladder. Thirdly, the center's director, while a member of the department of Africology, will report to the Office of the President. It is expected that the director with the support of an advisory committee composed of faculty members from Africology and other departments will create formations around the study of topics such as white supremacy, anti-Af-

rican police actions, economic discrimination, early interventions in racial curation, structural racism, resistance to dysconscious racism, cultural domination, elimination of violence against racialized bodies, racial politics, astral-blackness and afro-futurism, racial discontents in the 21st century, racial stereotypes in visual media, homelessness and racism, intersections of patriarchy and hierarchy, and epistemological racism. The Center will invite all faculty members to participate and join in the antiracism work. Our intention is to stand the center up as soon as we can select a director.

### **QUESTIONS? COMMENTS?**

You can take our quick survey at this link: <https://t.co/19G-9zA9gKR?amp=1>

### **WOULD YOU LIKE TO WRITE FOR THE HERALD?**

Please feel free to write the Editor at any time by sending an email to [herald@temple.edu](mailto:herald@temple.edu). All pitches, ideas, or essays will be read and responded to.

Ideally, the *Herald* will represent the widest possible range of voices on campus. Your voice could be one of them.

## Tuttleman Counseling Services and CARE team, cont.

tleman Counseling Services (TCS), we are more committed than ever to providing accessible, high-quality care in a variety of formats.

We are pleased that as of March 2020, we were able to successfully transition all clinical services to a remote format. Now, nearly one year later, we remain virtual and continue to build and refine our services based on important feedback from both staff and students alike. In our recent review of service utilization since transitioning to telehealth, we have seen both an increase in our individual appointments and a decrease in our no-show rate.

A student interested in accessing services can register online during the operation of our Walk-in Clinic (Monday through Friday, 10am to 1:30pm). Once paperwork is complete, a clinician reaches out same-day to schedule an Initial Assessment interview. In the Initial Assessment, the clinician clarifies student concerns and determines what services are most appropriate. These diverse

services may include the Resiliency Resource Center (RRC), drop-in support groups, skill-based therapy groups, interpersonal process groups, individual therapy, psychiatry, referral, and consultation. It is important to note that while out-of-state students are ineligible for ongoing care due to licensure restrictions, we will gladly assist in locating providers in their community. In addition, a staff member is always available to provide crisis intervention and consultation during regular business hours.

If you are looking to consult, please also keep in mind the Temple University CARE Team. The CARE Team is a multi-disciplinary body of stakeholders from across the University which receives referrals pertaining to students of concern, collects additional information, and then identifies and enacts appropriate strategies for addressing the situation. If you see physical, emotional, or academic signs that can threaten the safety or the well-

being of the university community, the behavior is considered a CARE referral. If you are unsure whether a behavior should be referred, please contact the CARE Team to discuss the circumstances.

As we continue adjusting in these uncertain times, know that we will remain dedicated to caring for, supporting, and serving the Temple community through virtual services and resources.

Links:

- Accessing services remotely during COVID-19: <https://counseling.temple.edu/access-services>
- Resiliency Resource Center (RRC) online: <https://counseling.temple.edu/resiliency-resource-center-online-during-covid-19>
- CARE Team: <https://care-team.temple.edu/>

## TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY, CONTINUED

Rather than surveying faculty about their general selection and use of textbooks, the Task Force survey was targeted to learn about OER adoption in particular. It is difficult to know the exact extent to which Temple faculty have already adopted an open textbook. The committee designed its initial faculty survey to provide insight into OER use across the institution. The survey was distributed to all full- and part-time instructors. For faculty respondents not yet adopting OER, the brief survey was over

with a quick “no” or “does not apply to me” response to the question “Do you use OER?”. Of the total 335 responses, 90 faculty responded “yes”, 225 faculty responded “no” and 21 responded “does not apply to me”. Of those faculty who responded that they were using OER, many indicated that they were using a textbook from OpenStax, a popular publisher of high-quality, peer-reviewed, openly licensed college textbooks based at Rice University. In addition, the survey revealed that certain departments

were actively using open textbooks in their introductory classes, including Chemistry, Political Science, Earth and Environmental Sciences, and Psychology.

Faculty respondents could also request additional information about OER, and 156 did. In response, members of the Temple University Libraries’ subject specialist research team directly contacted each of these faculty members to both offer links to information about OER and assistance with

*[continued on following page]*

**HERALD EDITOR: Anna Peak ADVISORY BOARD: Teresa Gill Cirillo (chair), Cheri Cutler, John Dern, Jeffrey Doshna, Lisa Ferretti, David Mislin, Karen Turner, Rebecca Vernon**

## TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY, CONTINUED

identifying and locating OER for their course.

Those faculty who responded in the affirmative were asked to provide basic information about the course in which OER was being used along with some identifying details about the specific open resources provided to students. A few of the 90 faculty who indicated they were already using OER were among those who requested additional information.

One of our Task Force members, Bavesh Bambrohlia, University Registrar, conducted an analysis of the survey data. The most salient data, according to a breakdown of the courses taught by both OER users and non-users, is the potential cost savings to our students. The faculty who responded that they used OER (n=68 after de-duplication) potentially saved their students \$760,839.00 in textbook costs, whereas the faculty (n=170 where course information was available) who did not use OER potentially cost their students \$1,372,574.00, assuming no zero-cost material was used in the course. These savings/costs are based on the average price of a textbook in the college store for the fall 2019 semester and the total number of students enrolled in each course taught, as identified by the faculty members in their response to the survey. Undergraduate, graduate and professional school courses were included in the analysis.

While it was rewarding to discover that quite a few faculty at Temple are already using OER to the great benefit of their students, another discovery was the apparent confusion among our faculty about what OER is. This is certainly not a phenomenon limited to Temple University. It is well recognized

that instructors tend to conflate free learning materials with open learning materials. While both are free to faculty and their students, OER content provides unique permissions that allow faculty to not only use it freely, but to edit, modify or repurpose the content. Many videos and books provided freely on the internet, are still copyrighted in traditional ways that prevents any adaptation. When faculty responded that they were using OER but identified traditionally copyrighted contents such as e-books licensed by the library or a freely available web-based video, they were conflating free content with open content. This points to the need for more faculty awareness about what is and is not OER, and what permissions are granted by true OER.

On October 22, 2020, the Temple Student Government (TSG) sent a textbook purchasing and use survey to 12,500 randomly selected undergraduate and graduate students. The 31-question survey was a combination of 13 questions developed by the TSG and 18 questions from a national textbook survey conducted by the U.S. Student Public Interest Research Group. There were 633 responses. For those who responded, textbook costs are clearly a costly burden that can impede rather than support learning. In response to the question "Indicate how course materials have affected you this (fall) semester", 41% replied that they worked extra hours at their job to afford course materials, 24% said they chose classes and sections based on the cost of the learning materials and 28% had to prioritize the purchase of access code content over other learning materials, reflecting the expense

and mandatory nature of access code material. In their comments, students mentioned skipping meals, not paying a bill and even dropping a class because they could not afford the course materials. However, 35% of the respondents indicated that they were not affected by the cost of their course materials.

Given the impact of textbook costs, what are our students doing to save money on them? The top three cost saving strategies are renting, opting for the cheapest used copy and not buying at all. This student's strategy reflects the work some go to in order to save on textbooks: "Always double check on library first. If nothing there, then local public library. If nothing there, download/pirate. If nothing there, buy from a friend/Temple student used or online used." For many students, Temple University Libraries is a go-to resource for learning materials. They report using the Libraries reserve collections and accessing library resources embedded in their Canvas courses; 31% reported using the reserve collection at the Libraries, another 31% used library resources through a Canvas course and 30% obtained their course materials through an interlibrary loan. The impact of COVID-19 has accelerated students' reluctance to purchase textbooks as 30% reported a member of their household losing a job, 27% reported losing their own job and 35% worked extra hours to make ends meet. When asked how they spent on textbooks for the fall 2020 semester, 10% spent more than \$500, 11% spent \$400-\$499, 16% spent \$300-\$399, 23% spent \$200-\$299, 22% spent \$100-\$199 and 18% spent less than \$100

*[continued on following page]*

## TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY, CONTINUED

(N=624).

Comments shared by students reveal some of their dissatisfaction with the ways in which assigned textbooks present challenges beyond the struggle to afford them:

- “During the course of my grad program the cost of books has been a struggle for me and I appreciate that some professors get material from online sources or provide photocopies from the textbook that help reduce costs.”
- “Professors should be honest when telling students if the textbook is essential to their success in the course. They should use the myriad of free reading instead of expensive textbooks.”
- “I understand the cost of some of the textbooks but access codes for things like business courses and Tophat should not come out of the student’s pocket.”
- “We’re basically forced to purchase through the bookstore as the access codes bought straight from the company’s website cost more than the

textbook and access code bundle alone from the bookstore.”

- “I don’t think it is terrible. The problem is with the educational system as a whole. The only time I felt I was spending more than I should was in a class where I spent a little over \$100 to buy an access code that included an etext my professor said was unnecessary.”
- “I have friends and roommates in STEM majors who consistently take out greater loans to pay for their textbooks.”

These two surveys provide a good starting point for generating more awareness at Temple University about the impact of textbook costs on students and the ways in which faculty, when possible, can adopt OER, zero-cost learning materials or other low-cost options. Doing so can keep our students from going deeper into educational debt, while creating a level learning platform for all students regardless of their financial status. As the pandemic continues into 2021, the economic crisis will take its toll on many Temple students and their families. In the shift to remote learning, all-digital learning content has become

the standard. As most OER and zero-cost learning materials are born digital, but most with the capacity for printing on demand, it is an opportune time for all educators to consider choosing them over commercially published textbooks.

As the Textbook Task Force’s faculty OER survey shows, Temple faculty are successfully making this transition. You can hear their stories here. The Textbook Task Force will continue to share information about affordable course learning material, as well as partner with Temple Student Government to discover how our students are impacted, educationally and financially, by the cost of course materials. As Temple University looks ahead to its 150th anniversary in 2034, now is the time to imagine a future institution that excels at educating its students and is recognized globally for its use of course content that is transformative while adding little or nothing to the cost of that education. For more information about achieving textbook affordability at Temple University, contact Steven Bell, Co-Chair of the Textbook Task Force.

### EDITORIAL

By Dr. Anna Peak

Associate Professor of Instruction, Intellectual Heritage Program

#### “An Absolute Crisis Point”

One response to the survey I sent out last semester pleaded, “Please talk about real issues affecting faculty. We are at absolute crisis point with the low morale among faculty.” I am doing my best to publish issues of the *Herald* that do just that -- talk about real issues. I feel rather like the Little Red Hen, however; who will join me? Not I, says one person

after another. They wish me well, but they can’t write anything for the *Herald* right now. And they certainly can’t write about anything real.

Of course, it is very true that faculty, and librarians, and many administrators, are wildly overworked right now, and -- especially with no Spring Break -- simply don’t have much time. And of course there are very real job constraints that genuinely prevent many from being able

to speak up.

#### Why the Secrecy?

This points to a larger issue. Why the secrecy? As James Byrnes points out in his piece for this issue, why is Temple’s full budget so hard to access? Why are the faculty on the Presidential Search Committee

*[continued on following page]*

## EDITORIAL, CONTINUED

unable to speak about the process of choosing a new President for the University because they have to sign a non-disclosure agreement? Why are the members of the various budget committees likewise unable to speak because they, too, have to sign non-disclosure agreements?

### **A Right to Know**

The faculty of a University have a right to know what is going on because only then can they give constructive input, and only then can they make serious, thoughtful decisions. Administrators sometimes treat faculty as if they were precocious children or pets, whose job it is to do “easy,” “fun” stuff like teach while they shoulder the adult burdens of *real* work for us. And it must be said that some faculty seem to go out of their way to behave in as emotionally immature a way as possible. Yet infantilizing people is a self-fulfilling prophecy, and a University run by businesspeople who hoard knowledge of the University’s inner workings from a scattered and fragmented faculty only exacerbates the problem of faculty ignorance and prevents this, and any, University from benefitting from a thoughtful faculty perspective on education -- the true business of a University.

### **What is the Budget?**

Universities tend towards the dour these days. Budget cuts may happen, probably, likely; that is what we are told. Do they need to happen? Yes, universities have lost revenue as students opt to wait until COVID-19 is over to enroll in college. Loss of revenue certainly does equal budget cuts -- but need it come at the

expense of faculty or core educational goals (or what should be core educational goals)? That is entirely another question, and when either administrators or faculty jobs are on the line, and only administrators have knowledge about the budget, a clearly unfair situation has been created. This was true long before the pandemic, and at colleges and universities across the country; but the pandemic has accelerated a trend toward “streamlining” the academic side of academic institutions, facilitated by administrators keeping faculty in the dark. At Marquette University, for instance, faculty have been told 300 layoffs will be necessary, then told that 39 layoffs will do the trick. Probably. As [Spanish professor Julia Paulk points out](#), “Not only are we not getting information, we’re getting different narratives about what’s happening. And it’s very frustrating because faculty wants a strong university. You know, we want Marquette to survive and do well. But it feels like we’re sort of flying blind.”

### **Non-Disclosure Agreements: Not Just for Budgets and Search Committees!**

Once a precedent is set, it becomes difficult to dislodge, and the use of NDAs at universities has become more popular in multiple countries as new uses discover themselves. Widespread use of NDAs in the UK, for instance, has prompted criticism from the group Universities UK. Faculty who report sexual harassment or bullying and whose allegations are, let us say, substantiable, are given an NDA to sign and money to make the problem “go away,” meaning for the

faculty member to shut up about it. The [BBC reported in 2019](#) that UK universities had spent £87 million on payouts to faculty asked to sign NDAs -- in a mere two-year period. Such payouts do nothing to create better conditions for future faculty and graduate students, and thus hinder academic achievement and accomplishment. A culture of silence, legally imposed or not, is detrimental to the life of the mind in multiple ways.

### **“Whites Only”**

Speaking of which, Elon University [recently instituted a whites-only caucus](#) to talk about race. Participants are, of course, required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Only a culture of legal control over speech makes such a thing possible at a University, and only a commitment to freer speech than academic institutions currently enjoy can prevent such abuses.

### **Academic Freedom**

The University requires faculty to include a statement about academic freedom in every syllabus. Student learning, we are told, is inseparable from academic freedom. But academic freedom also requires that faculty be free to speak, and from a place of knowledge -- free to speak about the criteria and process of searching for a new President of the University; free to speak about the new Strategic Plan; free to speak about budgets; free to speak about how the University is set up and run in general, with knowledge, and with an eye to whether decisions about the running of an academic institution keep in mind academics.