

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
October 29, 2013

Topic/Discussion	Action
<u>Call to Order.</u> President Spring called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.	The meeting commenced.
<u>Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 2013 Faculty Assembly Meeting.</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the October 1 Faculty Assembly meeting.	The minutes were approved as written.
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business.</u> President asked if there were any new items of business to be brought forward.</p> <p>Seth Weinberg: received an email from CSSD, about mailbox being full; why is there a cap on email, this policy may be antiquated, during this time; there should not be a cap on faculty email. Is this an issue for a subcommittee of the Senate?</p>	One item of new business was brought forward.
<p><u>Report of the President.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Barbara Shore passed away on October 23rd, she served as Senate President of the Senate from 1985-1987 and again in 1990-1991. Barbara was always at the forefront of issues of inclusion. Her long history of community and professional service are legendary. Just a few of her many awards include: Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania, Hand-in-Hand Martin Luther King Award, Richard S. Caliguri Award for Community Leadership, Willie Stargell Award for Outstanding Community Service, Pennsylvania Chapter of National Association of Social Workers Lifetime Achievement Award, Allegheny Department on Aging Recognition for Community Service, National Council of Christians and Jews Humanitarian Award, Woman of the Year by Pittsburgh Woman Magazine, Jefferson Award for Outstanding Community Service, Mon Valley Human Service Center Award for Outstanding Volunteer Service and Jewish Association on Aging Eight over Eighty Award. I ask you to join with me in a moment of silence for our colleague. ➤ Nominations for faculty to serve on the UCIS Director search committee are underway. We were asked by the Provost to convene Senate representatives for the search committee. While the policy on senior administrative searches is very specific when it comes to the Provost, Vice Chancellors and other positions, there are some questions about the nature of our responsibilities when it comes to Centers of the University. Working with the Provost's Office and UCIS we were able to come up with a list of the constituent faculty for UCIS. That list has been posted on the University Senate website and those faculty have been invited to nominate members for election to the search committee. As required by policy, I have appointed Cindy Tananis, Jerry McKinney and myself to serve as the Senate Nominating Committee. Our primary responsibility will be to certify those nominated and make any adjustments we feel are necessary for a balanced ballot. ➤ We received the following announcement from the Pitt Alumni Association and Governmental Relations. You are cordially invited to 	President's report was submitted.

attend: "THE FUTURE OF OUR REGION" with Guest Speakers the Honorable Rich Fitzgerald, Allegheny County Executive and the Honorable Bill Peduto, Pittsburgh City Councilman and Democratic Nominee for Mayor. The meeting will take place at the O'Hara Student Center Ballroom on Pitt's Oakland campus (4024 O'Hara Street) Tuesday, November 19, 2013, 6 - 7:30 p.m. Refreshments will be served.

- **Ad hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Stream Faculty.** The committee is involving more people and continues to develop in positive ways as it involves the Standing Committees and other constituencies.

- **Standing Committees**

- The **Expanded Executive Committee** met on October 14th to discuss the activities of the Committees over the past year and their plans for the coming year. While we were unable to cover our full agenda, we did introduce some issues which I will be following up on as time permits. These included: focusing this year's plenary on higher education in a digital world, an analysis of cross committee issues and committee coverage of research, discussion of public and executive session meetings.
- This past month, I attended two additional Senate Standing Committees – **Library** and **ADPC**.
- Professor Baker will bring you up-to-date on the **Senate BPC** activity including oversight of the planning process related to the suspension and termination of Graduate Programs in Arts and Sciences.
- Professors Claude Mauk and Ellen Ansell will bring you up-to-date on the Activities of the **Senate ADPC** along with a recommendation for a change in name. Professor Ansell has also agreed to represent the Senate on a panel for the Student Disabilities Conference being held at Pitt next week.
- I received a new Mission Statement from Susanna Leers & Pat Weiss, co-chairs of the Senate's **Plant Utilization and Planning Committee**: which was updated, reviewed, approved by PUP committee 10/24/13)

"The Plant Utilization and Planning Committee advises the University Senate on matters concerning the physical infrastructure and environs of the University. Its responsibilities include reviewing the capital budget and plans for new construction; monitoring the renovation and maintenance of existing facilities; advising on issues of safety and accessibility on campus; supporting safe, responsible means of transportation; investigating the utilization of space and energy; encouraging and monitoring prudent use of all physical resources; reviewing the design and renovation of classrooms and research facilities; and advising on projects that affect the quality of life of the University and associated communities. The Committee provides for faculty, student, and staff involvement in carrying out its mission and reports to, as required, the Faculty Assembly, the Senate Council, and the officers of the University Senate".

- **Video Taping of Faculty Assembly**, nothing has yet been scheduled.
- **Reflecting on Senate involvement in Research Policy**, We are planning on having Vice Provost Mark Redfern speak to the next faculty assembly along with Senate appointees to the research committees who

<p>are available at that time. One of the items of new business for today's meetings will be a question or issues you would like to see addressed.</p> <p>➤ Reflecting on public versus executive session meetings, I would like to continue our discussion of how the meetings of Assembly and the Standing Committees are conducted. In particular, I would like to ask for your thoughts on the implications of holding meetings in Executive Session. As a reminder, the bylaws state that this meeting, as well as the meetings of the Standing Committees are generally open to the full community, but may be held in Executive session. There are two primary reasons this occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The matters discussed in the committee are of a sensitive nature and it is deemed best to hold those discussions confidential. ○ The administration indicates that they do not feel comfortable exposing plans and thoughts for which Senate advice is sought in a public forum. ○ The decision to meet in executive session carries with it questions of reporting of decision made. And raises questions of ongoing confidentiality of what is communicated to whom. 	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate...</u></p> <p>Anti discriminatory Policy Committee: Claude Mauk, Co-Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee to report on 3 things, handout is available: http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/sites/default/files/Strategic%20Vision%20v4.pdf. • When the committee meetings began last year there was no specific issue; we realized that the committee in the past was largely reactive to issues; plans are now to be more proactive <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change to the committee name: current name was “anticipating negativity.... change in name would reflect more positivity 2. Equity, Inclusion and Anti-discrimination Advocacy Committee <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mirrors university office of Equity and Inclusion 3. Reviewed our mission statement; <p><u>Revised Mission Statement:</u> <i>“ The equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination advocacy committee identifies, reviews, and monitors issues relating to equity, inclusion, and respect for all members of the diverse University community. The committee advocates for equity and inclusion in university practices, policies, and programs. The committee offers recommendations for maintaining, developing and promoting anti-discriminatory policies and initiatives. The committee serves to hear about, investigate, and make recommendations on practices and policies relating to eliminating inequity, exclusion, and discrimination. The committee establishes its own areas and topics of inquiry, and encourages communications from the university community, including students, on all manners of access, civil rights, and equal opportunity”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We do not see this as a major shift in our work ➤ Needed an infrastructure to accomplish the work ➤ Review schematic in the handout <p>The process for the committee includes:</p>	

1. Gathering data from the community
2. Reviewing data and decide if there are issues to be addressed
3. Recommend initiatives that may mediate
4. Pass along recommendations to the appropriate body within the university
5. Review the outcomes of the intervention

Creation of working groups of the Standing Committee

1. Gather information about specific issues
2. Working groups report to the standing committee
3. Full standing committee would make decision with regard to specific recommendations and further actions.

Spring: Standing committees can review/revise their mission statements; changing the name of a standing committee - is it an editorial change or a change of the bylaws?

Bircher: according to the bylaws, standing committees can be terminated or install a committee; there is not a need for a separate amendment to the bylaws; committees define their mission independent of the bylaws and change of name is editorial

Smitherman: congratulations to the committee for their work; I have had contact with this group and their's has been exceptional work.

Spring: there are mechanisms to address issues for University wide concerns; move to the next stage of equity and non-discrimination. Accept this; take as formal change;

Bircher: take a formal vote

Spring: judgment of the bylaws, changing the name was editorial

Frank: does this set a precedent for the future name changes of committees

Bircher: it is a procedural precedent

Editorial change to bylaws: a name change to the Committee name could be made on that basis

Mission statements are not part of the bylaws, can be changed each year by the committee

Smitherman: recommended that it would be good to vote on it and also reviewed and voted on by the Senate Council

Baker: mission statements are reported out to the larger Senate

Smitherman; I move we indorse the motion posed by the Antidiscrimination Policy Committee

Budget Policies Committee: John J. Baker, Chair

The SBPC Mission Statement is attached to the end of this report. The major activities of the SBPC for the last year are discussed below.

1. Budget Recommendation for FY 2013-2014.

The SBPC makes an annual budget recommendation to the Chancellor for each coming fiscal year. For 2013-2014, SBPC endorsed the UPBC's budget recommendations with the added provision that should additional funds for salaries become available, they should be applied to the maintenance component of the salary

Motion passed unanimously by the Faculty Assembly

pool. Additional funds did become available and the chancellor applied them to the maintenance component. The final breakdown of the 2.5% salary pool increase for FY 2013-2014 was 1.5% for satisfactory performance and 1.0% for merit/market/equity.

2. The Revenue and Cost Attribution Study.

In spring, 2009, Pitt's administration stopped producing the Revenue and Cost Attribution Study. This internal Study was compiled annually for the University Planning and Budget Committee. It attributed revenues and costs for each of the University's responsibility centers to the extent reasonable possible. It was not 100% accurate by accounting standards, but gave a good estimate of the financial health of each of the University's major responsibility centers.

The administration agreed in 2010 to resume production of the Revenue and Cost Attribution Study in the 2011-2012 academic year. The initial run was delayed to correct some technical issues. A new Study was completed in spring, 2013, but has not yet been presented to the UPBC or SBPC.

3. Annual Public Reports Related to Faculty Salaries.

The SBPC receives three annual reports related to faculty salaries which are released publically and reported in the *University Times*. The name of these reports and their last release dates are listed below.

- Mean and Median Salaries of Full-Time Employees. The most recent annual report on mean and median salaries was for the 2011-2012 academic year (FY 2012). It was discussed at the April 19, 2013 Senate Budget Policies meeting; the results were published in the May 2, 2013, *University Times*.
- Analysis of Salary Increases for Full-Time Continuing Faculty. The most recent annual report on salary increases was for FY 2012 to FY 2013. It was discussed at the May 17, 2013 Senate Budget Policies meeting; the results were published in the May 30, 2013, *University Times*.
- Average Salaries of Faculty and Librarians: A Peer Group Analysis. The annual report on peer group average salaries for 2012-2013 (FY 2013) was discussed at the October 18, 2013, SBPC meeting; the results were published in the Oct. 24, 2013, *University Times*. The faculty salary information for this peer report is taken from the annual AAUP faculty salary survey which is published every year in the March-April issue of *Academe*. This year's report had three important changes:
 - Unlike previous years, Medical School basic science faculty were not included.
 - The salaries of instructors and lecturers were included for the first time.
 - The number of faculty at each rank was included for the first time.

4. Dietrich School of A&S Proposals to Suspend/Terminate Three Graduate Programs.

The SBPC has monitored whether the university's *Guidelines for the Review of Academic Planning Proposals* (1995) and the Planning and Budget System have been followed in the case of the Dietrich

School of Arts and Sciences' proposals to suspend the graduate programs in Classics and German and terminate the graduate program in Religious Studies. A report containing the SBPC's conclusions was approved for public release at the SBPC's October 18, 2013, meeting by a 7 to 2 vote. Portions of the Report were reported in an October 24, 2013, University Times article on the graduate program suspensions. Copies of the full report are on the back table; it is also posted on the Senate's Budget Policies web page www.univsenate.pitt.edu/committees/budget-policies.

The Report examines process and procedural requirements only. It does not consider the merit of the proposed graduate program suspensions or termination.

A key conclusion in the Report (second paragraph) is the Dietrich School Deans did not violate the University's Guidelines for the Review of Academic Planning Proposals (1995) when they suspended admissions to the three graduate programs on April 5, 2012, because a temporary suspension of admissions is not the same as termination or substantial modification of a program.

Rational:

- A temporary suspension of admissions is not a substantial modification or fundamental change in an academic program because it does not change the description of the program, nor the admission and degree requirements. The only thing that has changed is students are not being admitted. This would also be true if the program did not have any applicants in a given year or none of the applicants met the program requirements.
- Suspending admissions obviously impacts a program. The UCGS website under its Guidelines and Frequently Asked Questions tabs states that UCGS reviews anything having a direct impact on a degree granting program. However, the words "direct impact" are not used in Planning and Budget System documents.]

Another key issue in the Report (second paragraph) is the Dietrich School Deans suspended admissions to these three graduate programs without any prior consultation with the chairs of the affected departments, and without discussion or approval of the suspension of these three specific programs by the Dietrich School's relevant shared governance committees. The SBPC concluded that the "lack of prior consultation was counter to the spirit of the Planning and Budget System." This conclusion may disappoint those who wanted a stronger statement regarding lack of shared governance, but there are two sides to this issue and both have merit; it is not possible to distinguish which is right.

Rational:

- The PBS requires "the active participation of administrators, faculty, staff, and students within the shared governance structure of the University," and that "all constituencies involved are provided adequate opportunities to participate in the process and to be informed of its outcomes." University

Policy 02-04-01: *Role of Faculty in School and Regional Campus Governance* and the PBS document both state that “the faculty of each school or campus have primary responsibility in the areas of curriculum design, degree requirements, program content, methods of instruction, academic advising, and the conduct of research and public service.”

- In regard to the suspensions of the three graduate programs in the Dietrich School, the Deans made the decision to suspend the graduate programs and they did so without consultation with the chairs of the affected departments, and without approval by the School's relevant shared governance committees. On its face, this appears to be a violation of university governance policy and the PBS, which give primary responsibility for curriculum decisions to faculty.
- However, in the case of financial exigency, the Dietrich School Deans can legitimately make curriculum decisions normally reserved for faculty. At the time (April 5, 2012), Governor Corbett had proposed a 30% cut in state funding for Pitt. The Deans cited this as the reason the graduate program suspensions were necessary. At the same time, the Dietrich School's new Five Year Strategic Plan (which was dated March 30, 2012, and not yet approved by the Provost and UCGS) stated the School was planning to take TAs away from low performing departments and reallocate them to departments ranked by *US News* in the hopes of moving more of the latter into *US News*'s top quartile of graduate programs. The Dietrich School Deans have continued to pursue the suspension/termination of these graduate programs even though the expected funding cuts from the state never occurred.
- It is not possible for the SBPC to say with certainty that financial exigency played no role in the Deans decision to suspend the graduate programs, so it concluded what was certain: The lack of prior consultation with the Department Chairs and governance bodies was counter to the spirit of the Planning and Budget System.
- Even if one assumes the April 5, 2012, decision by the Dietrich School Deans to suspend the three graduate programs were a violation of the PBS, the Deans have subsequently complied with PBS requirements.]

The last paragraph in the Report is a summary that states the processes used by the Dietrich School met the procedural requirements of the School's Bylaws and the review carried out by the UCGS adhered to acceptable shared governance standards. This conclusion may disappoint those who were expecting the Dietrich School to be criticized for not adhering to the best shared governance practices, but the School only had to meet the procedural requirements of its Bylaws and the PBS.

Rational:

- The Dietrich School uses Robert's Rules as its parliamentary guide. Robert's Rules state: “When a committee is to make substantive recommendations or decisions on an important

matter, it *should* give members of the society an opportunity to appear before it and present their views on the subject at a time scheduled by the committee. Such a meeting is usually called a *hearing*. During actual deliberations of the committee, only committee members have a right to be present.”

- None of the three relevant Dietrich School shared governance committees (the Graduate Council, School Council and PBC) consulted with the Chairs of the affected departments or held a hearing before making a recommendation on the graduate program suspensions. The UCGS did this. Thus, the Report credited the UCGS review with adhering to acceptable shared governance standards, and the Dietrich School's review merely with meeting the School's Bylaws requirements.]

5. Part-Time Faculty Issues.

SBPC is interested in several issues regarding part time faculty and would like to develop an annual report on the mean and median salaries of part-time faculty in each of Pitt's financial responsibility centers similar to the one currently done for full time faculty. This is in a preliminary development stage, so nothing has been decided.

Senate Budget Policies Committee Mission Statement

The primary concerns of the Budget Policies Committee are the fiscal health of the University, the economic welfare of its faculty and staff, and the appropriateness and sufficiency of funds provided for the academic programs of the University. The Committee therefore makes recommendations on such matters as tuition levels, compensation policies, and issues like the creation, merger and termination of academic programs, when budgetary considerations are involved.

In order to acquire factual knowledge necessary for informed advice, the Committee has initiated or participated in various studies on such matters as budget and compensation history, personnel levels, and revenues and expenditures of cost centers. Much of this information has been compiled by the Office of Budget and Administration and the Office of Institutional Research.

Under the University's Planning and Budgeting System (PBS) (available at <http://www.pitt.edu/~jdl1/PBSdoc.htm>), the Senate and its committees, including SBPC, are recognized as providing advice to the Chancellor and administrative officers "on all aspects of University planning and budgeting, including long-range planning and budgeting, program plans, operational plans and budgets, gift and endowment spending policies, compensation policies, and design and modification of the PBS" and "may initiate recommendations with respect to broad University policies (such as gift and endowment spending policies, and compensation policies) and with respect to information collection and dissemination, such as the Revenue and Cost Attribution Study.”

In addition, the PBS document specifically states that SBPC "is responsible for reviewing whether the PBS processes are followed and whether all constituencies involved are provided adequate opportunities to participate in the process and to be informed of its outcomes. Accordingly, the SBPC may

communicate or meet with PBCs as necessary. The SBPC will regularly inform all unit heads and all members of PBCs of its role in reviewing the integrity of the planning and budgeting process."

Spring: congratulation to Dr. Baker for his work on this issue.

John Lyon (member of Faculty Assembly and Chair of the German Department) made the following remarks:

German Department Response to the SBPC Report on the Suspension/Termination of 3 A&S Graduate Programs:

The German Department is grateful for the work of the SBPC and for the role of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate in assuring proper faculty governance. Nonetheless, it has some serious concerns with the SBPC report.

The SBPC report correctly concludes that the Dean's "lack of prior consultation [with departments] was counter to the spirit of the Planning and Budget System," but it does not consider the real effects on decision-making processes that the violation of the spirit of university regulations and procedures can have. In addition, its conclusion that the letter of those regulations and procedures was not violated is incorrect.

The German Department would therefore like to note for the record one violation of Dietrich School Bylaws and two violations of University regulations:

Violation of Dietrich School Bylaws

According to the report, the procedure used to suspend/terminate the three graduate programs "met the procedural requirements of the Dietrich School's Bylaws." This is not so. Even though the specific proposals had not yet been voted on by the Dietrich School Council, the suspensions took effect on April 5, 2012, eighteen months before the Council decision was gazetted (October 8, 2013). The action therefore was in clear violation of Dietrich School bylaws, which state that "Council actions shall take effect 30 days (excluding regularly scheduled vacations) after gazetting as prescribed in paragraph 13...." By ignoring this procedural violation, the SBPC report implicitly condones future actions of this kind, which undermine the power of the bylaws to ensure timely faculty participation in school governance.

Violation of University Regulations: Academic Planning Proposals

The report excuses the failure to follow procedure in the suspension of admissions by claiming that "a temporary suspension of admissions is not the same as termination or substantial modification of a program." But this mischaracterizes the nature of these suspensions—there is documented evidence from the earliest stages of planning that the Dietrich School considered these actions as

permanent closures, not temporary suspensions. As closures, therefore, they were in fact subject to the University's *Guidelines for the Review of Academic Planning Proposals* (1995). Specifically, the preliminary draft of "Focusing for the Future," shared with the chairs of the three departments on April 2, 2012, does not speak about suspensions, but about program closures. And, nowhere in subsequent editions, correspondence with the affected departments, or proposals submitted to various committees and councils are these suspensions described as temporary. Instead, they are characterized as "indefinite" or "for the immediate and foreseeable future." The change from "closures" into "suspensions" for the final draft of "Focusing for the Future," just a few days before implementation, was in our view disingenuous. It leaves the impression that the Dietrich School was trying to do an end run around its own bylaws and University regulations. The SBPC report should acknowledge that the Dean's plans were not for temporary suspensions and thus should have been subject to the University's *Guidelines for the Review of Academic Planning Proposals* (1995).

Violation of University Regulations in the Name of Financial Exigency

As reported by the SBPC to the Faculty Assembly, University procedures allow deans to make curriculum decisions normally reserved for faculty "in the case of financial exigency." However, in the case of the suspensions in question, the SBPC did not address the issue of financial exigency. By the best calculations available, the estimated savings from the suspensions would come to less than 0.5% of the total Dietrich School Budget, which is hardly a detectable response to a financial crisis. Additionally, whatever the savings might be, "Focusing for the Future" states that funds were to be reallocated to other programs and not used to reduce overall Dietrich School expenditures. Finally, if these suspensions were only responses to a threatened budget rescission, why were the suspensions not lifted when that rescission did not materialize? This leaves the impression that the Dietrich School used "financial exigency" as a pretense to avoid following its own bylaws and University procedures, which would violate University regulations. In light of these concerns, we suggest that the SBPC consider the lack of University-specific guidelines on what constitutes "financial exigency" and how to respond to it. A first step might be to consult the AAUP guidelines on this matter (<http://www.aaup.org/report/role-faculty-conditions-financial-exigency>). Had there been greater clarity about "financial exigency" during initial discussions about the fate of the three graduate programs, a better result might have occurred, not only for the departments in question, but also for the university community as a whole.

Mark Possanza (Chair of the Classics Department) remarked:

I want to thank the Senate Budget Policies Committee for reviewing and reporting on the issue of compliance with the *Guidelines for the Review of Academic Planning Proposals* in the matter of the indefinite suspensions of the graduate programs in Classics and German and the termination of the graduate program in Religious Studies. This is a matter of great concern to all members of the University Community.

I also want to congratulate the members of the SBPC for publicly stating for the first time the decision-makers who were responsible for the memorandum of April 5, 2012, which suspended admissions, “immediately and for the foreseeable future,” to the graduate programs in Classics, German and Religious Studies. The SBPC report clearly states: “On April 5, 2012, a decision was made by the Deans of the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences to suspend admissions to the graduate programs in Classics, German and Religious Studies.” The memorandum itself does not identify the decision-makers but distributes responsibility among a large group of unnamed individuals.

This public statement that the Deans of the Dietrich School made the decision has serious consequences. Now the issue of compliance with procedure includes the issue of conflict of interest. Simply put, the Deans of Arts and Sciences, who decided on the suspension of admissions announced on April 5, 2012, as stated in the SBPC report, were also an influential presence on the Dietrich School Councils or Committees that supported suspension in the case of Classics and German, and termination in the case of Religious Studies; they are the Dietrich School Graduate Council, the Dietrich School Council and the Dietrich School Planning and Budget Committee. The review of proposals for suspension/termination by governing bodies whose membership includes the very persons who are influential supporters of the proposals under review is not the best procedure for obtaining a fair verdict.

Persons in positions of power and with a vested interest in the approval of the proposals are not impartial judges of the fates of the three graduate programs. It is not surprising in this situation that a council from outside Arts and Sciences, a council whose membership is gathered from the whole University, the University Council on Graduate Study, chaired by Vice Provost Alberta Sbragia, reversed the trend of approval for the proposals by voting on September 17th against the indefinite suspension of German and against the termination of Religious Studies. Clearly members of the UCGS saw unresolved issues and unanswered questions in moving forward with suspension/termination that escaped the notice of the members of the Dietrich School’s Councils and Committee. Conflict of interest as a factor in forming a judgment about a controversial matter creates only more controversy.

Thank you for your attention.

Smitherman: Mentioned the petition created by Marianne Novy in University Times on Thursday.

Spring: consider a motion that the minutes of the assembly meeting should be brought to the attention of the Provost.

Baker: The issue needs to be decided on its merit

<p>Spring: I will carry this information to the Provost next week Mark and John submit written comments that will be forwarded to the provost.</p> <p>Cindy Tananis: I am not a member of Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences, I have read the documents and listened to comments related to this issue. I am left with sense of deep concern as a member of the university community. This has been a series of sad and unfortunate events that, while technically correct seems deeply flawed in intention. We've spent a good deal of this meeting mired in the details of procedure and rules of order. Clearly these things are important but they don't represent the spirit of the community that creates a university. When the dust clears over this issue I hope we don't lose sight of the spirit of engagement that has been impacted here. There is a serious issue about intent, form and style that tends to get lost in these detailed discussions. I find this very sad and I hope the Provost sees it as well.</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u> Make a query on the mail quotas.</p>	
<p><u>Adjournment.</u> The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.</p>	Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Rose Frank, PhD, MSN, ACRN, FAAN
Senate Secretary
Associate Professor of Public Health, Medicine, & Nursing
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

Members attending:

Alarcon, Baker, Beck, Bircher, Burkoff, Clark, Cohen, Costantino, Daley, de Montmollin, Erickson, Flynn, Fort, Frank, Frieze, Fusco, Gleason, Goodhart, Groark, Hravnak, Hughes, Jackson Foster, Lyon, Mauk, McKinney, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Neft, Poloyac, Savun, Shafiq, Skledar, Slimick, Smith, Smitherman, Song, Spring, Tananis, Weinberg, Withers, Withiam

Members not attending:

Alexander, Buchanich, Caldwell, Chiarulli, Clermont, Gibson, Gold, Irrgang, Jones, Karp, Labrinidis, Leers, Lewicka, Lin, Majumdar, McLaughlin, Mohammed, Mulcahy, Munro, Nisnevich, Riccelli, Savinov, Smolinski, Sukits, Vieira, White

*Excused attendance:

Ansell, Butterworth, Cauley, Chase, Gaddy, Kear, Kelly, Kovacs, Lunsford, Novy, Ramsey, Tisherman, Weiss, Wilson

Others attending:

Balaban, Barlow, Fedele, Possanza

*Notified Senate Office