

Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
April 11, 2017

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><u>Call to Order</u></p> <p>The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00pm.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u></p> <p>President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly (FA) meeting of March 14, 2017.</p>	<p>Minutes were approved with a slight edit.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u></p> <p>No new items were identified.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u></p> <p>President Wilson reported that following the activities and actions from the last Faculty Assembly meetings there has been quite a bit of discussion about possible next steps. The final report of the long-termed Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Stream Faculty Issues was approved both by the Faculty Assembly and Senate Council, and Provost Beeson announced that she would be putting together a special committee, with Senate representation, to consider ways to implement its recommendations. More details are to come.</p> <p>At the last meeting, a report regarding the evaluation of faculty teaching, especially in the context of the appropriate use and misuse of OMET student satisfaction surveys, occurred. That process has already lead to greater awareness of the efforts of the University’s Teaching and Learning Center, and has opened the door for growing collaboration with them and other Pitt teaching resources moving forward.</p> <p>The big event regarding faculty evaluation, our annual Plenary, focused on the use of metrics for evaluating research productivity. Thanks to Robin Kear and all who contributed to that successful event. Both the pre-Plenary presentation by Berenika Webster and Andrea Ketchum about bibliometrics, and the Plenary itself featuring guest scholars, Diana Hicks and Cassidy Sugimoto, and the panel of Pitt experts, was informative, provocative, and stimulated new and ongoing discussions. It is a sign of success when the Plenary raises important issues that become the substantive focus of efforts to advance the University and practice.</p> <p>Taken together, a number of people have raised the question about the potential need for a new standing committee with a specific focus on an array of issues already identified, and additional ones that will grow from those. The Executive Committee (EC) believes that the idea of a new standing committee some have tentatively called “Faculty Affairs” is an important one to seriously explore. The EC therefore is beginning that process, with Immediate Past-President Michael Spring as the point person. From past experiences, this is not an undertaking that should be rushed but done thoroughly and efficiently, and will require consultation with existing Committees and their Chairs. It will involve deliberation, time, and work that will occur during the summer months and continue into the Fall term. Anyone interested in becoming</p>	<p>Discussion is described below.</p> <p>Anyone interested in becoming actively involved in the potential new Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate is encouraged to contact Michael Spring, Lori Molinaro, or any of the Senate officers.</p>

actively involved in this effort is encouraged to contact Michael, Lori Molinaro, or any of the Senate officers.

President Wilson then reported that the April 27th issue of the *University Times* will be the final one edited by Nancy Brown, who will then begin to enjoy her retirement. The Executive Committee wants to note the importance of Nancy's work over the years. Under her direction, the *Times* as the independent "faculty and staff newspaper" provided a source of objective reporting about issues, sometimes controversies, important to the entire Pitt community. This is not something that is typically found in higher education. We as Pitt should be proud of this, and are committed to helping maintain that tradition going forward. While styles may change, it is important that Faculty Assembly and faculty and staff as a whole maintain, and try to further, the standard of journalistic excellence that has defined the *Times*. The new editor, Ellie Graves, is welcomed and he pledged to work collaboratively with her and Vice Chancellor Susan Rogers to that end.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Fossil Fuel Investment will present their report at the May Faculty Assembly meeting. Based on a series of meetings that have taken place with administration and the Trustees and student groups, there may be an idea for process around this moving forward. The Committee must go over the emerging drafts prior to the report. The Special Senate Committee on Core Values now has a substantive working document. There have been a number of meetings and draft sections, and a full committee meeting will be scheduled. President Wilson is hoping for agreement on a statement and that will be distributed for Faculty Assembly input next month, and then the university at-large. A May meeting update also is planned.

Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate

N/A

Unfinished Business and/or New Business

Multifactor Authentication

Daniel Menicucci, CSSD Enterprise Architect, reported on the new multifactor authentication process from CSSD. Students will be folded into this process after the semester ends in April. He opened the floor for questions/discussion.

Discussion:

Stoner: When Peoplesoft times out, I have to sign-in again. Is there any way to not require this for on-campus IT addresses?

Menicucci: This was considered, but Pitt Net has a variety of access points, and some machines are public and we are not sure who is on them. The attacks that have been seen prompt us to treat all computers as untrusted.

Constantino: How long is the time-out?

Menicucci: It should be 12 hours. You should have to provide your credential only one time in 12 hours if you leave your browser open.

Tanais: We should not do this (leave browsers open). We are trying to be more secure with MFA. Does increasing security occur by closing your browser? Is this encouraging people to leave their browser open?

Menicucci: If you are away from your computer, you should lock your computer. If your browser is open, they can pull your domain resources. I would lock your computer.

Spring: Can you explain for everyone how the MFA works?

Menicucci: MFA is based on the principle that passwords are a weak way to identify yourself in a system. You can reuse same password on every system, use sticky notes, or do not change your password. We are constantly incurring phishing attacks. It is one of the biggest problems we face, with just this past year, there were 930 accounts where folks lost their passwords. MFA is a something you know (e.g. your password) with something you have (e.g. your phone). If someone has your username and password, but does not have your phone, they cannot log in. The cellphone provides the additional factor of authentication.

A concern was then raised from several faculty that they had to make a list in the computer of all of their passwords because it is so many accesses now. UPMC uses trigger questions, which is much easier. It may be too late, but this is a perennial problem that the security industry solves with an action.

Menicucci: We did not go into this lightly. We did testing with phishing emails and when we send these out, more than 30% of respondents click on the email, so there is cause from concern. The final straw for us in CSSD was over Christmas break, a phishing campaign went out. There were 22 faculty and staff members that logged into Prism and changed their bank account password. If we had not caught it, these employees would have lost their December paychecks. The “bad guy” behavior is escalating and we needed to do something.

Spring: Dan and Jinx spent a long time with Computer Usage about this, and we talked of sending an open letter to the faculty about this. He noted that he asked for numbers about how many faculty have not yet mobilized this and what are the implications of this (travel, grading) . We need the feedback on this. We also suggested a more positive wording if the account needs to be shut down. It was a herculean effort to do this. Password locker will keep your passwords safe and is available for \$11 per month. Banks are offering this same MFA for protection. The amount of criminal activity out there is incredible. These things are true: the banks and Targets of the world have tightened up due to big losses, so has industry. Hospitals and educational institutions are where personal information can be used and hackers can find information to steal your identity. The Senate asked for optional MFA for faculty that wanted it for their enterprise single-sign-on. The attacks now have escalated to such a high point that we need to do this across the board. Half of network traffic is now malicious.

More!: I can access my email from my cellphone without the MFA. Is that a problem?

Menicucci: There is not a magic checkbox for prompting the second factor. We started with the computers, websites and VPNs. This is not the end. Faculty and staff will be able to add on in May. For websites available outside of campus, we will be using MFA in some manner. It is in our roadmap. A VPN provides the ability, if you are working outside Pitt’s network, to access files as if you were in the network. Your communications are encrypted. Cellphone is encrypted, but MFA is not yet supported.

Rohrer: Since hackers can circumvent any system, what confidence do we have that the MFA is going to protect us, for how long?

Menicucci: I am not quite sure how to answer that. Security is not a one-technology fix. There are multiple security controls we are putting in place- this will take us a big step forward from where we are now. Once we see accounts being used in two continents with the same MFA, that will be noticed.

Spring: I wrote an issue article for the FBI on securing information. One goal is to use 3 factors: what you know, what you have, and what you are (fingerprint). Any of you that have the newest Apple, you have a fingerprint on it. You will see within 5 years, and on

the intelligent devices in their home, and laptops, and phones, all three factors needed, and an alert will come to you verify it. If your house burns down, you can replace it. They are going now after personal information now, and we cannot replace that. What the Senate officers hear frequently, is that things happen without explanation, to people who need lengthy careful information. We need information. Meninucci: (It was asked if CSSD can you stop making faculty change their passwords every 6 months if MFA is better.) Until we get to where all accesses require MFA, we cannot stop the need for changing passwords every six months, as you can be compromised. As we close these other holes, that is something we can look at.

A faculty member noted that CSSD has a Mini-Kee pass, where you can put all of your passcodes. Can we pull out of the dual factor MFA, some of the easier things, like library access or Blackboard, and use the secret question? A lower threshold could be used.

Olanyk: We just had a library access violation, so it is not a lower priority or threshold item. It happens a lot and the accounts are phished from that access point.

Menicucci: It is the same as password-sharing. With MFA, these cases have surfaced as it is much harder to share. This is good. People are still going to try to work around the system.

Labrinidis: In the case, you have someone purposely trying to circumvent the system. We cannot bypass that. No technology will stop that. This MFA technology is trying to put in more barriers so we do not have more repercussions. There are other ways beside cellphone for MFA. Can you explain?

Menicucci: We pushed most people to use the cellphone MFA. It is not the only way. You can register any cell phone or any landline (generates a call). Another way is a key fob you can get from the bookstore (free) that will generate a random code. A final way, if you registered a phone but lost it, is to call the Help Desk for a 24-hour bypass number.

Tananis: You can register any device, and multiple devices. I have registered every mobile thing I own.

Loughlin: Thank you for explaining this to us. A thing to consider for future: the timing on this could have been better. The MFA came out right before Spring Break, and the timing was poor. At our School, they explained the fob and it was easy. Also, the change to the new email resulted in no email for 2 days, and that was not optimal.

Menicucci: We planned to onboard everyone at once, but realized 65,000 persons could not be done at once. We also even saw MFA phishing schemes based on our announcements. Spring Break actually helped with the slower faculty usage so we could gradually do this.

Spring: I know Jinx tried to come today. There have been two instances that came too fast and without enough education: the (360) email change and the MFA change. Two strong messages: people did not like it but understood it, and people did not like the way it happened. The need to move fast needs to be balanced with the cooperation of the faculty. We have been without explanation and empathy. I hope Computer Usage will report back to Assembly about who really is at risk now. We don't want to make faculty or staff miserable.

Menicucci: We do realize we have been asking a lot lately. We do appreciate everyone's cooperation.

Frieze: Have you sent this up for Emeritus faculty?

Menicucci: Emeritus faculty, students, and student employees are next to be converted.

Sukits: On a different but related subject, this email change has had a lot of complaints.

It is slower, and you get locked out. Are there any solutions to these problems?

Menicucci: Solutions exist to what you are talking about. Slowness can be solved. We can work with your School to do it.

Mulvaney: If we are teaching in the summer, will students convert in the summer?

Menicucci: May 14th is the force date for students.

There were no further questions or comments. Please contact Dan Menicucci at CSSD if you need more information.

Pittsburgh March For Science

Lance Davidson, Swanson School of Engineering

Lance Davidson, a co-organizer of the event, talked about the March for Science Pittsburgh event that is scheduled for April 22nd. There are over 400 local marches on April 22nd, and Pittsburgh is hosting one of them. He reported that his purpose today is to alert Faculty Assembly about the March, and also to ask for endorsement of the Faculty Assembly for the event. He distributed two different event flyers to Faculty Assembly members. The March for Science shares the philosophy of the national march and reflects the grass-roots nature of the March. The professional science societies are on-board with sponsorship. Lance noted that he joined organizers in February, and he was embarrassed as the only faculty member at the Pittsburgh planning meeting. The event is intended to be non-political and to support science, technology, and industry. We are selecting speakers and teams for demos. Bigelow will be blocked off between Forbes and Fifth Avenues, with speeches, experts, scientists, and public discussion and interaction. We will have a march around the Cathedral of Learning to signify the importance of science in Pittsburgh. I am asking for Faculty Assembly support. The organizers have contacted the President of CMU and the Chancellor of Pitt, and they are tacitly supporting this, but they do not have a standard or letter of open support from the faculty.

Questions/Discussion:

Marra: Is this the only march that day? (or is there another down town)

Davidson: This is the only march that day in Pittsburgh. Buses from WV and Ohio will be arriving.

Hartman: You may already know -- I wanted to make you aware. This is CMU carnival weekend, so parking may be challenging.

Davison: Soldiers and Sailors is offering event parking as well as public transportation.

Landsittel: Who are the organizers? I was a little surprised by some of the sponsors (e.g. Sierra Club)

Davison: These are the early supporters (listed on the flyer). It is not so much as to whether these groups have a foundation in the science and technology industry, but it is that Pittsburgh has a rich history in science (examples provided) and what we want to do is be science boosters in science and math across the board. I direct you to the mission statement on the flyer. We are coming together "in support of science that serves the common good, diversity and inclusion in STEM, funding for scientific research and its applications, cutting-edge science education, evidence-based policy and regulations, and open, honest science and inclusive public outreach."

<https://www.facebook.com/MarchForSciencePGH/> I ask, who is really against that?

Loughlin: Did you say that the Chancellor passively supported this or did he dance around it?

March For Science Pittsburgh Event:

Vote for Faculty Assembly to acknowledge receipt of the information and encourage faculty to decide if they wish to participate: (see full motion and link to more information in Discussion section)

Abstentions = 1

No = 0

All remaining attendees were in favor

Davidson: The support that the Chancellor's Office provided is access that any student group would have. There are student groups that are co-sponsoring, and applications for access to university resources are through that. There is no explicit statement of for the March for Science from Chancellor's office.

Wilson: Does anyone want to make a motion to support this? A motion occurred [Landsittel] with a second to the motion [Stoner].

Rohrer: I'm sorry for being late to getting this in. I am not clear exactly what we are endorsing: are we endorsing the intent of the March? What are you looking for?

Davidson: I am looking for an endorsement that stands side-by-side with the goals of the March: support for science that serves the common good. It is the mission statement of the local March for Science Pittsburgh and the national March for Science website.

Morel: There are a number of busses going from Pitt to the national March.

Loughlin: You say it is non-partisan. There is a question about the "who." I notice that the Young Republicans are on the "who." There are statements about the "why," that come from the March for Science vision statement about how threats to dismantle government agencies harm us all. This statement says it is non-partisan. In looking at it, I don't know if it is so non-partisan. What makes it non-partisan?

Davidson: No politicians are speaking. All representatives from Pittsburgh and the surrounding area have been invited to participate to march in the March. I don't know if there is any opposition to science and technology here in Pittsburgh. This is really about the support that we have for science and inquiry-based methods.

Loughlin: I totally support that, but there are statements in here that we are standing up for "what we believe and what we know to be right." (in the "why")

Davidson: There are two documents. I underestimated the size of the faculty assembly.

Tananis: What are you looking at that we cannot see? There are two different documents we have.

Davidson: One sheet is an event flyer, the other is going to the media as a press package.

Tananis: Can we swap? We are voting on something we all have not seen.

Sukits: We can't all see these. Can someone just read it?

Kear: (Reads the "why" statement from the flyer aloud)

"Science, scientists, and evidence-based policy making is currently under attack by those who feel threatened by the truth. The scientific community is banding together to stand up for what we believe and know is right. We are marching for truth to uphold the values of the scientific community for Pittsburgh's continued future as a scientific epicenter. Budget cuts, censorship of researchers, disappearing data sets, and threats to dismantle government agencies harm us all, putting our health, food, air, water, climate, and jobs at risk."

Tananis: That is definitely a stronger statement than what we had in front of us.

Kear: (Reads the "what" statement aloud)

"As March for Science, Pittsburgh is part of a global movement to defend the vital role science plays in our health, safety, economies, and governments. We are advocating for evidence-based policy making, cutting-edge science education, funding for research and its applications, and inclusive and accessible science for all. We have united as a diverse, non-partisan group to call for science that upholds these values, and for political leaders and policy makers to enact evidence-based policies in the public's interest. March for Science Pittsburgh is an official satellite march of the March for Science that will take place in Washington, DC."

Rohrer: I can't speak for the whole group, but I for one would be comfortable endorsing that statement ("what"). I am less comfortable with endorsing the whole

March. It is likely that there will be mixed agendas and mixed issues with the various groups in the march. I am not opposed to them, but there is lack of clarity there. That particular statement (“what”) is pretty clear about the principles. I can endorse the principles. I am less comfortable endorsing the March overall as it is a work in progress and we are not sure who all is going to be involved. I am just expressing my own opinion.

Wilson: We need to figure out which motion to vote on.

Bircher: There are three options: Vote on the simplified page; vote separately on press release; or treat them as one single document. What is intent of motion originally?

Davidson: I had it to endorse the “what” – the principles.

Bircher: The principles as stated on the flyer. All you are doing is endorsing the general principles of the march.

Costantino: The biggest problem is that this is a work in progress and we really don’t know what it stands for, and what it means, or what it really is going to turn out to be. We don’t know who the speakers are going to be. Even though those words on the papers sound great, it could turn out to be something that is very controversial and there could be a variety of things going on and different agendas going on as we have seen at several meetings. If we had one or two marches and we had some history about this, I would much be more comfortable. To come to us two weeks before it is going to happen and give us nothing about it except for some words on a piece of paper, that is not what we are going to be associated with if things pre-riot down there. I am not comfortable voting in favor of it.

Spring: We have seen over the last couple of months a lot of questioning of scientific method and scientific research, and we are all concerned about it to different levels. Bringing this here and that it will be reported on in the *University Times*, gives it some publicity. Whether it is for any march: Faculty Assembly welcomes the information and Faculty Assembly would encourage all of our colleagues to look at what the event is about and decide whether they wish to participate and share their voices. There is a Facebook site that has the information about this event to find more about it. (I would be willing to articulate a motion that says) We, Faculty Assembly, recognize the event and we recognize the rationale for such an event, and we encourage the faculty to see if this is something in which they want to participate.

Tananis: We already have a motion on the table on the floor that needs to be dealt with.

Bircher: In my opinion, we are debating friendly amendments to what is asked.

Spring: That is your choice - I view it as a friendly amendment.

Stoner: I seconded something that was based not on a commonly shared document. I assumed we all had the same document. Doug had the other version of the document. Is that flawed in constitutional terms?

Bircher: In the course of this discussion, the Assembly has the opportunity to examine the second document independent of what we looked at. We are okay on this evidence issue.

Loughlin: I wanted to clarify as I did not know we were not looking at the same document. I agree with the “what,” but on the other document, when I read it, it said non-partisan. I could see some people saying it is. I thought I misheard – when you commented that the Chancellor gave tacit approval for this, I was struck by that. He was at a recent Senate Council meeting where he explained why he is not taking positions on some issues like this, and it is because he has to represent the entire University to the state of Pennsylvania, and there are potential repercussions to the University as a whole for taking sanctioned positions on things that some in Harrisburg might feel otherwise about. When I was reading the document on this side of the table

coupled with your comments that he did not come out and support this, that is why I brought it up. When the “what principles” were highlighted, absolutely I endorse these 100%.

Landsittel: That is what I meant and was thinking, it was the principles. I did not mean we were endorsing the actual event; I agree with what Joe was saying – in terms of not knowing exactly enough about the event. We are endorsing the principles that were stated.

Frank: In looking at this document that says it is non-partisan, on the bottom it says budget cuts, censorship, disappearing data sets, efforts to dismantle government. I do not find these non-partisan. I would support what Professor Spring proposed that it is up to individual faculty to decide if they want to participate in it. I would not be comfortable to have Faculty Senate endorse it.

Tananis: I do not know what I am voting on. Am I voting on the friendly amendment?

Wilson: Originally, we had a motion and a second. You clarified what your motion was. There was a separate motion that comes after this.

Bircher: If you treat the first motion as separate from Michael’s motion, we have to deal with the first motion. If Michael’s motion is acceptable to the member who moved the resolution initially, then we vote on Michael’s motion.

Wilson: Are you good with that Doug and John?

Landsittel and Stoner: Yes.

Spring: Can Sue read it aloud?

(Skledar reading): *“Faculty Assembly welcomes the information and Faculty Assembly would encourage all of our colleagues to look at what the event is about and decide whether they wish to participate and share their voices. A Facebook site has the information about this event to find more about it:*

<https://www.facebook.com/MarchForSciencePGH/> *We, Faculty Assembly, recognize the event and we recognize the rationale for such an event, and we encourage the faculty to see if this is something in which they want to participate.”*

Davidson: I want a statement endorsing the “what’s” outlined in both documents. The six bullet points in gold on one of the documents, and the “what” statement in the other document.

Bircher: Just to put labels on the strategies: Michael’s strategy is that we acknowledge receipt of this document and endorse faculty decision or not to participate. That is different in my opinion than endorsement of two separate documents. I am understanding we are acknowledging receipt of the information.

Wilson: Right now we have Michael’s motion on the floor.

Spring: By us having this discussion, this raises awareness of the event much more than it otherwise would have been because it happened in this deliberative thought. This allows us to unanimously encourage our colleagues to look at it and make a decision. This is a strong statement to get faculty to look at it and think about it. I fear if we get too specific in endorsing it, it may send the wrong message and some are going to pick a piece and it will end up a negative vote. The more people are aware, the more people are likely to go.

Wilson: Can we take a vote on this? Skledar was asked to reiterate the motion again [see above]. Results of the vote: Abstentions: 1; No 0; All remaining attendees were in favor.

<p><u>Announcements</u></p> <p><u>Marra</u>: This Thursday afternoon April 13th, the Year of Diversity end- of-year poster session from 12n-5p in lower lounge. A Title IX activity on the lawn is also scheduled. This was sponsored by the Senate and EIADAC. Please attend.</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: Elections for Senate officers and Senate Standing Committees are underway. Voting closes April 19th. Please vote.</p>	
<p><u>Adjournment</u></p> <p>The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.</p>	<p>Adjournment at 4:22pm.</p>

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Skledar, RPh, MPH, FASHP

Senate Secretary

Professor, School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy and Therapeutics

Members attending:

Becker, Betru, Bircher, Borovetz, Cassaro, Cole, Costantino, Danford, Dewar, Fort, Frank, Guterman, Hartman, Henker, Horne, Jacob, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kear, Kiselyov, Labrinidis, Landrigan, Landsittel, Leers, Loughlin, Marra, Morel, Mulvaney, Olanyk, Phillippi, Rohrer, Skledar, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Taboas, Tananis, Van Nostrand, Wilson, Withers,

Members not attending:

Adams, Bilodeau, Bonneau, Bratman, Clark, Cohen, Deitrick, Donihi, Gleason, Gold, Goldberg, Harries, Helbig, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthak, Kelly, McLaughlin, Muenzer, Mulcahy, Munro, Nardone, Schmidhofer, Scott, Smolinski, Swanson, Thorpe, Velankar, Vieira, Weikle-Mills

***Excused attendance:**

Beck, Czerwinski, Dahm, De Vallejo, Flynn, Gaddy, Kovacs, Molinaro, Nelson, Rigotti, Triulzi, Yarger

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Davidson, Frieze, Kirsch, Livingston, Menicucci, Sbragia

*Notified Senate Office