

Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
February 10, 2015

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Michael Spring at 3:00 PM.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:01 PM.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of January 13, 2015.</p>	<p>The minutes were approved as written.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u> One item was introduced in the President's report.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Michael Spring (Feb 2015)</u> President Spring shared his monthly report. He noted that the report is brief this month due to the extensive number of committee reports and motions before us today.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the 2015 Senate Elections – While we have gotten a good response, please remember to consider the potential of running for an office or a Senate Standing Committee. Nominations, including self-nominations should be in by the end of February. I would like all of you to know that while I have learned a lot in the last year and a half, I have decided that I will not be a candidate for a third term. My students, funding agencies, and wife have indicated that they want a little more of my attention. 2. While the administration continues to work on regulatory and other matters facing us – at this time, we have heard nothing more related to the development of an initiative on Research Data Management, reporting of travel abroad, compliance with requirements to report sexual harassment events, development of joint library related issues with CMU, compliance with the PA child protection laws, or revision of the agreement documents pertaining to the optional two-year phase out retirement. As best we know, the rollover to a new management plan for TIAA-CREF and Vanguard continues to move smoothly. If you have any questions or concerns, please let President Spring know. 3. New Initiatives -- The Provost has indicated that she will be working on four new administrative initiatives. We sought input and suggested four senate representatives who the executive committee agreed had appropriate experience and expertise. I believe the Provost will be announcing these committees and their members over the next few weeks. <p>The executive committee, under the able leadership of Dr. Tom Smitherman continues to engage in discussions about realignment of existing standing committees and creation of new committees that might help us to better meet our responsibilities in shared governance. The University has changed dramatically over the last 60 years; the Senate Committees have not necessarily changed in step with this. This initiative will involve extensive discussions with Assembly and with the various standing committees to get input and suggestions. We will schedule this topic as an item of <i>new business today</i>, and while we might</p>	<p>No further questions.</p>

<p>not get too far, Tom has prepared a briefing paper (purple handout) which may be found in the back of the room. In addition, the document will be placed under new initiatives on the Senate website and Lori has created a new tab on the Senate website to gather your thoughts and comments on possible reorganization of the Senate Standing Committees. This will be a careful, planned change.</p> <p>4. Regarding Standing and Ad Hoc Committees – We have reports this month from the Ad Hoc committee on Non-tenure Stream Faculty as well as the Standing Committees on Educational Policies, Tenure and Academic Freedom, and Benefits and Welfare.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></p> <p><u>NTS Faculty Issues Ad Hoc Committee</u> <i>Professor Irene Frieze, Chair</i></p> <p>This is a follow-up report from last month, and was supplemented with a handout that was shared at the meeting (also posted on the Senate website). The NTS issues have been worked on for some time, in collaboration with Administration. We are much ahead of many other universities. Our Senate has been able to bring these issues forward. NTS faculty are a main part of our institution and work in many facets within the university. A show of hands at the meeting revealed numerous NTS faculty are FA members and/or current/past officers . Today’s focus is on full-time NTS faculty. In the course of our deliberations, review of bylaws, and looking at practices within our units, there is enormous variation between units. Each unit makes NTS decisions for items listed on the handout, for example, titles, contract length, duties, salary, etc. The Provost approves these; however, there is high flexibility on these issues. Our Ad Hoc Committee has five recommendations today:</p> <p>Ad hoc Committee Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly explained and accessible policies within the unit. The Provost’s Office requires that each school or unit have a clear policy and/or guidelines on NTS faculty appointment, review, and promotion. Each unit’s documents are reviewed regularly by the Provost’s Office for compliance and consistency with University bylaws, policies and procedures. These unit policies are reflected in content of the annual review of the faculty performance. We recommend that units make these documents readily accessible on their website to all faculty members in the unit, as well as to those considering a position in the unit. 2. Career tracks. Many schools provide one or more promotion tracks for NTS faculty. These tracks generally reflect different areas of emphasis, such as teaching, administration, or research. Each unit should have clearly defined tracks for promotion and career development for NTS faculty. These will vary for those with different duties within the unit and should reflect those duties. 3. Annual reviews. The Provost’s 1999 Memorandum on Annual Review of the Faculty (http://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-affairs/annual-review.html) indicates that annual letters should explain in clear and specific terms the expectations for the coming year and how these relate to earlier agreed-on job 	<p>The NTS report and recommendations passed</p>

duties. This is especially important for NTS faculty. Job duties and specific expectations for the coming year need to be clearly outlined in writing. Salary and promotion decisions should be based on meeting the stated expectations.

4. **Incentive structure.** For NTS faculty, it is critical that clear incentives be tied to their promotion. Increased contract length, increased salary, opportunities for paid leave, and improved office space are some examples of the incentives now offered in some units. We therefore urge all schools/units to develop a clear incentive policy related to NTS faculty promotion.
5. **Review of current status of decision-making solely within the unit.** We recommend that a systematic review be done to determine if some of the NTS decisions now delegated to the school or unit should be made at a higher level of the administration so there is more consistency across units.

Discussion:

Labrinidis: Is this school or department?

Frieze: It could be either, depending on the School

Munro: Could you define NTS versus adjunct?

Frieze: An adjunct professor has a primary job elsewhere and teaches in select courses. The NTS we are speaking of are full-time faculty. Although hard to define, the main difference is no opportunity for tenure.

Munro: Are these administrators?

Frieze: They could be. There could be overlap. In some units, the NTS faculty function the same as tenured faculty. Titles across schools are not standardized between schools.

Spring: NTS faculty are hired on one or more year contracts, and are hired as faculty.

Balaban: The bylaws and procedures have a definition of NTS faculty.

Richard: I agree with this for NTS who are teaching and advising. I am sorry to say in Arts and Sciences there is no flexibility and the NTS involvement is not well-recognized. There is a title of Senior Lecturer that needs to be changed. Decisions are centrally administered and criteria are not defined.

Frieze: University bylaws are not being following in many ways. The practice is different today than the bylaws.

Richard: There is no teaching career for NTS.

Kovacs: Based on previous reports, there is no uniform guidance from above, and every school acts like individual. The solution to this is to ask the Provost's office to exercise responsibility in enforcing the bylaws as they exist.

Frieze: This is our last recommendation—to review status of decision-making that is solely within the unit.

Kovacs: This should be the first recommendation. The lack of uniformity and transparency is the problem. We should appeal directly to the Chancellor on this.

Frieze: We are not ready to go to the Chancellor yet, as there is not uniform agreement if unit-wide or university, and our comments received echoed this.

Sukits: It is important that flexibility is not taken out of the hands of the units and Deans, who need to do things at their school that are not needed at the university level.

Smitherman: The committee has seven months left on its contract. I hope this committee will continue for the next seven months and come back.

Spring: In light of timing, I would like to suggest a procedure. The third page of your handout describes assignments to standing committees. The 4th page is further action for the remainder of the committee's work. As Tom has suggested, the Ad hoc Committee has more work to do. The substance for today is five recommendations that will go

forward to the Senate Council as a statement to move further. I would like to suggest that we ask if there are questions about each motion and vote on them separately.

Frieze: This is fine.

Recommendation #1:

Spring: Questions related to recommendation #1? (none) Seconded? Yes. All in favor. No opposed; no abstentions.

Recommendation #2:

Frieze: Career tracks

Munro: Are NTS positions renewable and ongoing?

Frieze: Not always. They could be, but not always are.

Munro: There is a problem then. The role of a given person is flexible, and item #2 takes flexibility out of the hands of the school.

Tananis: Many NTS positions started that were one year contracts, and they are now 20 years. This item calls for the unit to define the expectations at the outset; it does not remove flexibility in the dept.

Spring: The university is much different now; it is >60% NTS.

Poloyac: We recently redid our guidelines in the School of Pharmacy and decided to not have tracks. We did consider it. We have faculty who are a blend of all three tracks so we moved away tracks to a global system of accomplishment.

Weinberg: Our school (Dental) went the opposite and created tracks. It may make sense to not have tracks. Each NTS should fit into a track or path for promotion in some way.

Frieze: We consider this a friendly amendment and it fits into item 2

Smitherman: In the SOM, teaching and research are part of all of the tracks. Having tracks established early in their career helps increase flexibility at the school.

Labrinidis: Could the tracks be blended and flexible?

Cauley: Could we add language about flexibility?

Spring: It is all over this document (flexibility).

Tananis: Our job was made difficult by having so much diversity, and we worked hard to wordsmith recommendations for ultimate flexibility. I would hesitate the urge to read your school into this language.

Stoner: The two key parts of this are less about language, and more protection for NTS faculty. I do not see that people are forced into tracks. Tenure is not a shield for these NTS faculty. These faculty should have hope 20 years down the line for advancement.

Balaban: The language is career progression, not tracks.

Spring: Let us vote on this as written. All in favor except for 3 abstentions. None opposed.

Recommendation #3: Annual reviews (reviewed language)

Kovacs: This is an existing policy? It is a practice of the Provost area.

Balaban: In all areas, it is an annual requirement (policy).

Kovacs: It is a policy and it is not being followed.

Frieze: We want to emphasize that all pay attention to this, and the duties of the NTS faculty be outlined.

Kovacs: We have a policy not being followed, and we are passing a document that says we should follow it.

Spring: The Provost's office does require an annual review. NTS faculty are appointed on an annual basis. There was an observation that there was a discrepancy between the appointment letter and annual review. This motion ties these together and reinforces the informal policy of a letter from the Provost to the Deans. The Provost is responsible for it. This motion ties, for NTS faculty, the annual review to the appointment letter.

Frieze: This also should specify the duties for the upcoming year.

Spring: There was a disjoint, and this reinforces the practice. It will raise up to Senate Council and will go to a higher level.

Frieze: Vote on this? All approved except for 1 abstention. None opposed.

Recommendation #4: incentive structure (reviewed language)

Frieze: NTS faculty want benefit from promotion, and this is a recommendation to the units.

Monroe: This is vague, which is good. What is expected?

Frieze: We give examples of incentives in some schools in the report (paid leave, etc).

Spring: There is a sacred cow on this. NTS faculty will never see a sabbatical. This should be verified. A paid leave could be approved. It depends on the institution. If the majority of the work is done outside of the tenure stream, it not clear why there is not incentive or reward for those individuals.

Cauley: Will these raises or incentives be paid from unit or school budget?

Frieze: It would come out of unit's budget.

Weinberg: One unit is building it into their budget now.

Balaban: Three ranks were established with increased contract length in one of our NTS units. There is an example.

Savinov: I spent a lot of time on this. One thing the ad hoc committee did not do is address the most important issue. We are trying to protect NTS faculty- a good thing to do. This is good. We are helping this university to change the structure of how departments operate, but also helping administration decrease the number of tenured faculty. We are hiring more people who are not protected and are thought of sometimes as second-class citizens. The root of the problem is not being addressed.

Frieze: That is a different problem. We have these NTS people now. We want to make their lives as good as possible. You are raising a good issue. We are trying to protect the people who are already here.

Weinberg: An example is that Chairs and Deans may be NTS faculty – in some units they are not 2nd class citizens.

Spring: The question is good – what is the optimal blend – have we overshot it? That is the key question.

Bircher: Another interpretation of Seth's data is that the rules of tenure have been interpreted in a tight fashion. We are expanding tenure track positions as well.

Spring: Vote? All approved except for 2 abstentions. None opposed.

Recommendation #5: Decision-making within the unit (reviewed language)

Frieze: Our committee or another, talk about if these items should be done a university level or within unit.

Spring: This has been controversial. It is on the last page as ongoing work. Are there some things that should be dictated university wide? This is not an easy discussion, but an important one.

Bircher: I would strongly urge voting in favor of this part of the motion. If the primary objective is to protect NTS, the school's sovereign approach is destroying protection for the NTS.

Munro: The phrasing of these five points is different on main verb. Are these all the same flavor?

Frieze: Yes.

Baker: I would like to second what Nick said. There is a difference between uniform criteria and then letting the Deans do what they want. We should have a standard for all schools to meet and also allow flexibility. We should vote for this.

Frieze: We could set up an area on the Senate website for more comments. They are welcome.

Shafiq: A point raised a few months ago by Baker was that Pitt has one of the largest gaps between TS and NTS faculty related to salary. Where does that come in? Is that incentive?

Frieze: Salary is determined by the unit.

Shafiq: You are not specific though.

Frieze: No, we are listing everything that should be considered.

Wilson: I have not seen data that distinguishes TS and NTS faculty salary gap. We are making a recommendation to the Standing Committee to identify these differences. I have looked at the data and they are not there.

Baker: Tenured salaries are Professor and Assistant Professor. Tenure stream is 7 years. We are trying to get a report on part-time salaries. Information is available in Snyder report. There are enormous numbers of part-time faculty. That information is available. Only 10-15% of the faculty is tenured. These issues are very important and should get worked out.

Sukits: We discussed this in the Committee. There are not data separating NTS and TS by salary according to rank. We have NTS full professors; salary is not different. I think the issue raised is part-time faculty regarding salary.

Spring: Vote: Unanimous approval; opposed 0; abstained 0

Frieze: Thank you all. Further comments can come to the website. Page 3 tells recommendations for Senate Committee work; chairs are encouraged to read and consider these recommendations. We have recommendations for Budget Policies for example related to salary review. Committee Chairs also are welcome to talk to us about it. The final page is recommendations for the future, and we will continue to do this.

Spring: Thank you to Irene and the committee for a herculean effort. Your vote today moved this forward as an exceptionally high priority for the Provost's office. Shared governance means we speak on matters of university concern and have the administration hear our concerns. The unanimous nature of the vote speaks to our position on this. This university is already in a good position on this, and your vote here today ensures that we will continue to work on that. The comments made are all good.

Educational Policies

Professors Bonnie Falcione and Zsuzsa Horvath, Co-Chairs

Our committee would like to thank for the feedback we received on our recommendation presented during the last Faculty Assembly meeting and also via the Senate webpage.

The background for the resolution we are presenting is as follows:

- Prompted by student request, the Educational Policies Committee concluded that students should have access to up-to-date and more meaningful information prior to registration.
- The resolution aims to address the issue that course descriptions and other information available to students prior to registration is sometimes not sufficient and not always up to date.

The feedback from faculty addressed the topics related to our original recommendation. Several possible challenges were cited, for example, a uniform implementation across schools would be difficult; the teaching assignments for adjunct faculty and teaching assistant are often made shortly before the semester starts. Along similar lines this recommendation may pose a challenge for new faculty or any faculty teaching a course for the first time, or courses that are offered as special topics or are being revised. There were concerns raised that such a policy would impede instructional innovation and revisions to courses. On the other hand, it was brought to our attention that up-to-date

and more meaningful information prior to registration would be helpful not only at the undergraduate level, but at the graduate/professional level as well. Suggestions were made that making syllabi available rather than course descriptions may work better for some units. Our committee reviewed the feedback received on the proposal, and received further input from the Provost liaisons, from Vice-Provosts Manfredi and Sbragia, with feasibility of the implementation at the Provost level in mind.

The SEPC revised the resolution to recognize the problem, asking the provost to work with individual units to address it, and acknowledge the challenges that may arise during implementation. Our committee would like to thank all for the feedback we received after last FA and the senate webpage.

To summarize our resolution presented today at 2/10/15 FA (available on Senate website), students wanted access to more meaningful information prior to registration. Our resolution summarizes that the information available is not always up-to-date. Challenges were cited across schools. We are aware that teaching assignments are made shortly before the semester starts, and new faculty or first-time course teachers may not be always able to provide this information. It was brought to our attention that there are some challenges with this and some benefits to this. Making syllabi available may help; there is not a university requirement to have a syllabus for every course. We received additional feedback from our Provost office representatives. The sheet distributed summarizes our resolution. We are asking the Provost to work with individual units to address this issue.

Goodhart: This work is appreciated. Specific to the resolution: it may be a matter of wording, the updated and meaningful course information reads as if all of this is required. Should it be an “or”? Can the information after the parenthesis be removed? If left in, use such as, or for instance, as a cleaner way to address the feedback.

Spring: Is this a friendly amendment?

Horvath/Falcione: Yes, we will change this to “such as”

Goodhart: The original student request for more information for instructor effectiveness was decided by the committee not to be necessary, although more information was decided that is needed. Could more information be shared as to why the committee did not feel this was necessary? Students can get this from ratemyprofessor.com. Should OMET be revised? I am concerned with the statement that students should not have access to instructor information.

Nelson: OMET are student opinion surveys; they are not in any way meant to evaluate effectiveness of instructors. They are not a structured evaluation by a qualified individual. They are opinions. This is why they should not be made available to students. If provided in an unfiltered format, this is not valuable.

Spring: This is a good debate we should have. SEPC provided its report last month, and we tabled their motion as it was complex and there were questions. We wanted to focus on whether we were in favor of students having more information than in the registrar’s course description. We need to move this ahead. I want to get this motion to Senate Council and the Provost if it is appropriate to do so.

Labrinidis: One of the problems I have is that in October we prepare the syllabus for fall semester. If we get student input and the changes cannot be incorporated into the most recent document in time. If this can be updated to allow more flexibility within the unit, as per the unit, that would be good.

Horvath: This is flexible and can be decided to the unit and Provost office. Our intention was to leave this open enough for that flexibility. Our committee will offer help to the Provost office via examples.

Tananis: Our attempt was not to dictate cycles or requirements, but to suggest by systematically putting procedures in place that we would have more accurate information available to students. Again, no standards apply across the university on some of these issues. We want to help students make more choices wisely.

Spring: If we do not pass this, no enforcement. If we do pass it, the strength of your voice has an influence on administrative activity. If this passes unanimously, the Provost's office will ask the Deans for a better plan for how we provide information for students. SEPC will continue to monitor it and come back with next action if needed.

Tananis: In a nutshell, what we wanted to do was to provide more course information to students, not more instructor information. Students asked for more course information.

Baker: Every faculty member should have a course syllabus for protection. If you get a complaint and your policy is spelled out, you are protected. This is a good idea and there needs to be flexibility.

Spring: Can we call the question (with friendly amendment)? Voting: all in favor except for 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee

Professors Barry Gold and Maria Kovacs, Co-Chairs

T AFC reported an interim recommendation on academic freedom. This was distributed at the meeting and is available on the Senate website. In summary, the university policies as they are written do not need to be revised.

Novy: I second the academic freedom motion. University policies are strong and acceptable. This was presented as an interim report two months ago.

Spring: Call to question? Voting: all in favor except four abstentions. No opposed votes.

A brief report of T AFC activities was presented and copies distributed.

ITEM 1: Provost's report of number of faculty transferred from the tenure stream to non-tenure stream status. Type A refers to temporary transfers; Type B refers to permanent transfers [see attachments]. The former is designed to give faculty more time to build up their credentials for tenure. The latter is for people who are not going to succeed at getting tenure and are seeking an alternative. The transfers are in line with Faculty Policies, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (p. 31 in the PDF version of the Handbook). Type A transfers can be for no more than 24 months; Type B transfers have to abide by the stated steps. As the Attachment shows, these transfers have been gradually increasing since 2003 but leveled off since 2010, with about 33-36 faculty affected per year, and the vast majority of cases in SOM.

Bircher: How far back are you looking at data?

Kovacs: I do not know. The Provost's office is sending the report and will collate the data. This will be investigated.

ITEM 2: T AFC activity affecting all University faculty. During the past year, T AFC addressed issues of considerable importance to all faculty by initiating several resolutions that were passed by the University Assembly, as well as by direct overture to the Provost's office to review certain policies as follows:

- a) Transfer of Intellectual Property Rights to the University (see resolution):
Reflecting faculty concerns, the resolution requested formation of an Ad Hoc

Committee of the Faculty Assembly, which was approved. In response to arguments put forth by the resultant Committee, the Provost's office mostly resolved key issues by making available alternate signature templates. However, given still unresolved questions about the University's IPR policies, the Provost has stated her intent to form a Committee to look further into this matter.

- b) Academic Freedom and the Electronic Media (see resolution): As per the resolution, a Subcommittee of TAFC was formed to investigate this issue, which was put forth by faculty. Its Final Report was approved on February 5, 2015 by TAFC and is to be presented to the Faculty Assembly (see end of TAFC report*). In addition to the Report, which found that the related University policies were adequate, the Subcommittee has been working on a digitally available version of "best practices;" it also suggested the possibility of an informational webinar, and recommended that the Chancellor reaffirm that intellectual freedom extends to electronic media.
- c) Review the Guidelines for Evaluating Tenured Faculty and Associated Salary Decisions (see former resolution). This resolution requested the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Assembly to address the practice of *salary reduction of tenured faculty* as a consequence of unsatisfactory job performance evaluations. Co-Chairs of the resultant Ad Hoc Committee met with the Provost on January 22, 2015. The Provost expressed her support of the Committee's goal and pledged to facilitate the data-gathering phase of the task. The next step is to initiate that task. We seek to complete the work of this Committee before the Summer of 2015. (this is still in process)
- d) Questions about the Content and Language of the Contract that faculty have to sign if they opt for Phased Retirement. Phased retirement involves faculty (eligible for retirement) opting for a transitional period of typically 1-2 years of ½ time appointment which terminates in full retirement. Two faculty members (later supported by others) filed a grievance with TAFC on behalf of all faculty, questioning the need for the constraints imbedded in the contract associated with this option, and objecting to the language and content of the contract, which they perceived as coercive, intimidating, and needlessly unfriendly. A subcommittee of TAFC had met with Vice-Provost Balaban on January 12, 2015 to review this issue and to request that a revised contract be prepared that has faculty input. The timeline for resolution is by the end of the Spring, 2015. (this is still in process)

ITEM 3: Usual Activities. In addition to the above major tasks, TAFC had continued to counsel and assist individual faculty (of any rank or job status) with job-related grievances and problems. The topics have been wide ranging and faculty complaints have included charges of unjust termination, nepotism, plagiarism, inappropriate salary cuts, harassment, and unexplained inactivity by Administration to resolve specific issues. TAFC has also been presented with cases involving a variety of interpersonal disputes between faculty and their supervisors, which typically do not meet criteria for a grievance. Nonetheless, for such cases, TAFC offers "informal" guidance by reviewing approaches to dispute resolution.

Weinberg: These are not leveling off – the numbers seem to be increasing. I am curious if anything is behind it.

<p><u>Kovacs</u>: I feel this is random variation. I think what percent this represents is more important.</p> <p><u>Bircher</u>: Having run this for the medical school, there is a slight upward trend but it does not reach statistical significance. We may need to look further back, it may be a flat.</p> <p><u>Spring</u>: TAFC should look at this internally.</p> <p><u>Smitherman</u>: Type A removal is a temporary removal so the clock stops ticking. This would not lend itself to statistics; it is not related to chance.</p> <p><u>Kovacs</u>: Can we know how many of these cases were reinstated?</p> <p><u>Spring</u>: Can we resolve this in committee? The Committee should discuss this further off-line.</p> <p><u>Benefits and Welfare Committee – this was deferred to next month.</u></p> <p><i>Professor Angie Riccelli, Chair</i> Annual Report '14 -15</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p><i>Professor Tom Smitherman</i></p> <p>I summarized in two pages the conversations for the last three years about the need for restructuring Senate Committees. A report was distributed on this at FA. The university has changed and the Senate has changed very little. The Executive Committee brainstormed how to make this more efficient. We would like to hear from you today or via the Senate website over the next month.</p> <p><u>Spring</u>: The Senate website is set up to allow for comments on this now.</p> <p><u>Smitherman</u>: We are recommending to form a new research committee and wrote a mission statement; we are suggesting to make a more manageable committee merging library with university press (they used to be one, and were split decades ago; we are saying now to recombine them); we are suggested merging admissions and student aid with student affairs (chairs endorsed); we are suggesting bylaws expand to help other committees do their work regarding senate handbook and an operations manual for the committees; and increase the role of the computer usage committee to assist with technology issues across other committees..</p> <p><u>Bircher</u>: I am in support of the concept. Bylaws and procedures should not assert itself to micromanage the other committees. We would not assume jurisdiction on this.</p> <p><u>Spring</u>: I'd like to make a public apology for rushing discussion and decision. I am glad we are debating issues. We needed to move items to Senate Council and we have done that. I appreciate your tolerating this. Thank you to Angie for deferring.</p> <p><u>Tananis</u>: The NTS Adhoc committee made some direct recommendations into committee redesign - be sure to consider those. I raise another issue, over the last 5 years, what kind of Ad hoc committees have needed to be formed – should this work be added into standing committees?</p> <p><u>Labrinidis</u>: Agree with the computer usage recommendation discussed via email.</p> <p><u>Leers</u>: As a librarian, the merging of the publishing committee with library is odd. Should we put the library with the computer usage committee?</p> <p><u>Smitherman</u>: We did talk about that a lot.</p> <p><u>Spring</u>: This is a complex issue. This is a good question and comment. We will post documents.</p> <p><u>Smitherman</u>: This item of new business was designed to give you information to start</p>	

thinking. We thought about library and computer merging and it was thought to be too large. <u>Spring</u> : Nothing has been decided; no ulterior motive. The comment box is up on Senate Website for comments. Please comment over the next month.	
<u>Announcements</u> None.	
<u>Adjournment</u> Meeting was adjourned at 4:36 pm.	Adjourned 4:36 pm.

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

Associate Professor, School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy and Therapeutics

Members attending:

Alarcon, Atai, Baker, Beck, Bircher, Burkoff, Cauley, Cohen, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Evans, Falcione, Fort, Frieze, Fusco, Goodhart, Groark, Guterman, Hartman, Helbig, Horvath, Hughes, A. Jones, Kaufman, Kear, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Leers, Mauk, McKinney, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Munro, Nelson, Novy, Poloyac, Riccelli, Savinov, Savoia, Schmidhofer, Scott, Shafiq, Skledar, Slimick, Smitherman, Smolinski, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Triulzi, Weinberg, Wilson, Withers

Members not attending:

Caldwell, Donihi, Frank, Gibson, Gleason, Hravnak, Irrgang, R. Jones, Karp, Kaynar, Lewicka, Lin, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, Nisnevich, Olanyk, Ramsey, Soska, Weiss

*Excused attendance:

Buchanich, Erickson, Flynn, Gaddy, Gold, Kearns, Vieira, West, Yarger

Others attending/guests:

Balaban, Barlow, Becker, Cahalane, Fedele, Meislik, Richard, Winter

*Notified Senate Office