

**Faculty Assembly Minutes  
2700 Posvar Hall  
November 4, 2015**

<b>Topic/Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b><u>Call to Order</u></b> The Faculty Assembly (FA) meeting was called to order by Vice-President Irene Frieze, who is chairing the meeting for President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00 PM.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of the Minutes</u></b>  Vice-President Frieze asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of October 6, 2015.</p>	<p>Friendly amendments to the minutes were proposed by Dr. Bircher regarding his comments at the October FA meeting.</p>
<p><b><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u></b>  There were no items of new business raised.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><b><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson, given by Vice-President Frieze</u></b>  President Wilson was away for the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, and Vice-President Frieze gave his report of Senate activities over the past month.</p> <p>Expanded Executive Committee: October 19<sup>th</sup> was the annual Expanded Executive Committee Meeting, where the Senate officers and most of the standing committee chairs engaged in valuable discussions about what each Committee had been doing and, most important, what they intend to do this upcoming year. Today’s FA meeting will have progress reports from our two <i>new</i> standing committees—Research and Student Admissions, Aid and Affairs—both of which have been meeting and working to clarify their mission statements and engage their important agendas. Discussions at the Expanded Executive Committee took place in the context of an important new phase of Pitt’s ongoing Strategic Planning process, as the development of an operational plan is now center stage. The Senate is, and should continue to be, actively involved in this effort. Our working committees this academic year are the practical means by which we will most effectively help shape the final payoff—implementation.</p> <p>Pitt is a “system” of many moving parts, sometimes not coordinating very well. With that in mind, we recognize that there are many issues that can and should be addressed by multiple committees. More intentionally coordinating those individual efforts will be a main goal as we move forward. One example of this is the Senate’s ongoing focus on non-tenure stream (NTS) faculty, now centered on our part-time colleagues and the role they play serving Pitt’s distinct missions. Our standing Budget Policies Committee and our newly renewed Ad Hoc Committee to investigate NTS Faculty issues are working closely together as we try to clarify the number of various types of part-time faculty, and with the Provost’s Office, to jointly develop a salary survey.</p> <p><i>NTS Faculty Update:</i> Vice-President Frieze reported an update from Senate Council related to NTS faculty: Last month, we approved a recommendation to change Emeritus Status designation to more clearly include NTS faculty. A handout was distributed as an amended proposal that was passed at Senate Council at last meeting, and she wanted to bring back the</p>	<p>The amended Emeritus statement was unanimously approved by Faculty Assembly. (no abstentions)</p>

amended version back to FA. The amended document was distributed at the meeting. General question from Muenzer: Does Emeritus designation use/require faculty resources? Frieze: No resources are consumed except bus passes, access to library resources and email account. Vice-President Frieze asked if there were any other concerns with the amended proposal. Hearing none, a vote was taken. All votes in-favor; no opposition; no dissention.

**Senate Membership:**

Please also revisit the Senate’s website, <http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu>, especially the important opening section *About the University Senate*, which includes the following in the section detailing who is eligible for Senate membership: “Those part-time untenured faculty who annually indicate to the Office of the University Senate their desire for membership and who, during each of the two academic years previous to the desired year of membership, have taught a minimum of 6 credits per year for remuneration.”

**Plenary:**

Seth Weinberg, the primary organizer for the Senate Plenary set for March 30, 2016, gave an update. He noted that the primary speaker has been chosen, Henry Reichman, from AAUP. He has accepted the invitation, and the planning committee is moving forward in an effort to organize a series of events that will lead up to the main session in the spring. If you have other ideas for the Plenary, contact Seth directly with your suggestions.

**Provost’s Working Group for Salary Reductions:**

Having accepted the report from our Ad Hoc Committee concerned with salary reductions of tenured faculty, the Provost has formed a smaller working group to address the report’s recommendations that were previously endorsed by Faculty Assembly and Senate Council. Barry Gold, who co-chaired the committee’s report, is serving as the Senate’s representative on the Provost’s group.

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

**Research Committee**

*Professors Penny Morel and Pat Smolinski, Co-Chairs*

Last year, the University Senate formed the Research Committee with the mission statement:

The Senate Research Committee focuses on research within the University of Pittsburgh, non-funded and funded, including relevant policies and procedures, research operations, research regulation and compliance, support of researchers, and the management of intellectual property, to assist the University Senate in its provision of advice and recommendations about these issues to the senior administration of the university and, also, to faculty, staff and students.

The Senate Research Committee communicates with researchers at the University of Pittsburgh and the various research offices of the University, including the Vice-Chancellor for Research Conduct and Compliance, the Vice-Provost for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Biomedical Research, Health Sciences, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Clinical Research, Health Sciences, the Executive Director of the Health Policy Institute, and, as needed and appropriate, research offices at the School/College or Department levels. It communicates with the University Research Council (URC). The

Discussion for both committees occurred.

activities of the Research Committee of the University Senate are complementary to the related activities of the URC, which provides advice directly to the Provost and the Vice-Provost for Research, and whose members (including the two members who are nominated by the University Senate) are appointed by the Provost. The other major mission of the URC, to aid faculty members in identifying funding and liaisons and collaborations for research, is not a part of the mission of the Senate Research Committee.

Based on this mission the new **Research Committee** has been doing information gathering and has the following report:

- Meeting with Mark Redfern, Vice-Provost for Research, regarding on-going efforts in the review process for conflict of interest, intellectual property and copyright policies
  - Subcommittees in each of these areas have formed and are doing additional information-gathering
- Meeting with George Huber, Interim Vice-Provost for Research Conduct and Compliance, to review issues and potential changes in the areas of conduct and compliance
- Formulating plans to meet with various committee chairs and administrators related to conflict of interest, intellectual property, copyrights, institutional review board and research operations
- Updating the mission statement of the Committee as the work begins; this will be a continual process (updates will be brought to Faculty Assembly once finalized)
- Connecting the Committee's work to the new strategic plan of the University as it evolves

These actions are being done in order for the Committee to participate in the planning process for these reviews, to make recommendations and comments for the reviews. If faculty has questions or concerns related to research, please contact the Committee Co-Chairs.

Discussion:

Frieze: Have there been any controversial issues raised so far?

Smolinski: Not yet; we are still in the information-gathering phase.

Morel: Our new policies will come through the Faculty Assembly as they are developed.

Smolinski: A call for input on the IRB process has gone out, and the Research Committee will be discussing this at our December meeting.

Muenzer: Will your committee at some point talk about humanistic research and requirements, and about items "undiscussed," for example, research that has implications for the long-term and the media for research such as monographs, textbooks, and new information-age dissemination? This could have promotion implications.

Morel: The Committee is very broad in its membership, and we have discussed topics such as commercialization of research, and what research is defined as. The Committee is waiting to hear from the Chancellor on principles of research, defined.

Muenzer: Hopefully there will be some content on this, especially related to commercialization of research.

Frieze: In Arts and Sciences, I notice that that the standards are different at each unit, and this perhaps should be decided at the unit-level, as to what is considered as counting for "research." It is different in each unit.

Muenzer: This is true. Units respond to that with research funding. This determines what people do, especially in the humanities where little funds are available. Parts of the university are not meshing with the greater whole of the university and this needs reflection.

Novy: In Humanities, you may be told a textbook is not useful for promotion.

Weinberg: This is true in the Health Sciences also. Data sets are another item of question. What counts for scholarship is changing.

Bircher: As an organization, the entire University should embrace that dollars are not the unique measure of scholarship. Some schools evolve to where this is the only measure, but it is wrong.

Smolinski: The Committee discussed funded and non-funded research. Both are research from the Committees perspective.

Constantino: We are to teach and perform service, and academic freedom is involved there too. It is not all research.

Weinberg: This is why we chose this topic for the Plenary. All comments and ideas are welcome. Please contact me (Seth) if you have ideas.

### **Student Admissions, Aid, and Affairs Committee**

*Ms. Robin Kear, and Cho-Cho Lin, Co-Chairs*

*Joined by Joe Kozak and David Gau (GPSG President and Past-President)*

In the spring of 2015, the University Senate voted to combine the existing Admissions and Student Aid Committee and the Student Affairs Committee into one large committee that focuses on many aspects of student interaction with the university. Our newly combined **Student Admissions, Aid, and Affairs Committee** has been working on defining its new role.

The primary mission of the Committee is to serve as a channel through which concerns relating to admissions, financial aid or student affairs among undergraduate and graduate students may be brought to the attention of the faculty, the University administration and the University Senate.

In order to carry out the above mission, this Committee shall:

- Facilitate communication between undergraduate and graduate students and the University Senate.
- Offer counsel to undergraduate and graduate students, the University administration, faculty, staff, and the Senate on matters regarding student admissions, financial aid, relations, programs, and services within the University.
- Formulate recommendations to the University administration and to the Senate on the implementation of University policies affecting undergraduate and graduate students in the areas of admissions, financial aid and student affairs, including admission criteria, financial aid policies, recruitment activities and retention efforts.
- Review trends in undergraduate and graduate admissions, financial aid and student affairs and their impact on the University.

While these activities are necessary in order to make recommendations and identify potential problems/issues that need further investigation and/or action, it is not necessary for all these activities to be done yearly. It is the responsibility of the Committee members to identify areas to be addressed each year.

We have purposefully identified a distinction between undergraduate and graduate students in our new mission. While creating this expanded committee, there was a scan of how other university senates handle committees related to students. Some separate them into two, one for graduate and undergraduate concerns, and some were combined. The concerns of graduate students came up in several different ways during our first committee meeting. The committee would like to respond to these concerns throughout this academic year.

Working with the Graduate and Professional Student Government (GSPG), the Committee is starting conversations around graduate students. In particular, anecdotal evidence suggests that graduate students feel disconnected with the University and/or feel that more support service is necessary. GPSG is currently gathering data from graduate students this fall on these and other questions of interest. Some of the topics include:

- Graduate students certainly consider themselves a part of their departments and schools through the admission and enrollment processes, and through the coursework, research, and teaching that they are doing. Graduate students makeup approximately one-third of the student body. Some school-level graduate student organizations recently reported to GSPG that they feel disconnected from the larger university. This feeling of disconnect was echoed previously by graduate students during the University-wide Strategic Town Hall meeting in the spring 2015. How can this be addressed?
- Graduate student groups are unique and have different expectations of their department and the larger university. Some graduate students are arriving right after receiving undergraduate degrees. Some come from universities, like Pitt's, with very strong undergraduate programs, services, and identities. Are the expectations of the connection with the larger university changing?
- There are many existing support services available to graduate students, such as the Counseling Center, Student Health Center, Hillman Library Dissertation Writing Carrels, and teaching support from CIDDE. Are graduate students aware of all the support services available to them? Do they find them adequate? Is there anything that they feel is missing?
- There are overarching points of contact that potential and new graduate students could have with the university including general orientations and tours. Currently, attempts for university-wide orientation and campus tours are entirely student-run by GSPG or other graduate student organizations. These are not uniform and some students may not receive them at all. Is there a better way to support this?
- Pitt's Office of Student Affairs does wonderful, engaging work with programming and events for our undergraduate students. Some of their programming is open and targeted to both undergraduate and graduate students, such as the career fair. A majority of programming specific for

graduate students comes from the student-run GPSG. Is there a better way to support this?

The Chairs asked for comments/feedback on these key points, or on their mission statement.

Stoner: A lot of what happens in the Office of Student Affairs is in response to pressure from other peer institutions. Are graduate students participating in reputational surveys? International students? Is there someone that should hold Administration accountable to make sure graduate students are not forgotten?

Kear: Our Office of Student Affairs does not yet have a graduate student arm of their office.

Stoner: A national reputation survey (SERU) was distributed a few years ago, and I wondered if our graduate students were a part of it, including concerns and positive comments. I will send it to you.

Kozak: GPSG holds events to bring together graduate students together from different units. They sponsor speakers, have events, and life-long learning topics such as career and academic services. A GSO orientation event is now held along with a resource fair each year. The current survey they are sponsoring is going across all units, so please encourage your students to participate.

Gao: Advocates for the graduate students are the Vice-Provost's office and the GSO itself. Resources are limited but our goal is start the programs and show their worth.

Hrvnak: Your information is very useful. I am on a Committee where we are looking at international students and the graduate students feel there is little resource for them. It seems to be graduate students in general perceive less resources are there for them. Some of it might be that funds are not centralized for graduate students as they are for undergraduates.

Kozak: All graduate students pay a \$30 activity fee each semester, which is split between the school and the GSO.

Sukits: In the text of the document distributed, "graduate student" is used generically.

We have many different graduate student levels, and they have very different paths.

PhD students are much different than the Master's students. That may be true in many different schools. It may be important to distinguish these students.

Kear: It is a different student that is here full-time versus part-time as well.

Muenzer: This strengthens the need for professional people in the Office of Student Affairs to deal with graduate student complexity. The challenge of developing programs is much more complex and speaks to the need for a unit within the Office.

Kear: We are looking at this heavily and may come back with recommendations in the Spring.

Frieze: We should give our graduate student leaders Joe and David applause for what they do to help our graduate students.

Munro: Where does the graduate student fee money go?

Kozak: We spend it on programs, services, travel grants, conferences, etc.

Weinberg: Are there any services at the unit level for graduate students?

Kear: Yes, they exist. There are 14 unit GSOs that report to GPSG. Different schools do different things and we are looking at the larger issues and connections to those schools.

Frieze: This is very important work. When the committees were initially suggested for merger, the thought was a split into two committees. That can still be considered.

**Unfinished Business and/or New Business**

No new business items were raised.	None
<b><u>Announcements</u></b> No announcements were made.	None
<b><u>Adjournment</u></b> The meeting was adjourned by Vice-President Frieze.	Adjournment at 3:50 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:

Bircher, Clark, Cohen, Cole, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Donihi, Fort, Frieze, Goodhart, Guterman, Hartman, Helbig, Horvath, Hravnak, Jacob, Jones, Kanthak, Kaufman, Kear, Kearns, Leers, C. Lin, Mauk, Molinaro, Morel, Muenzer, Mulvaney, Munro, L. Nelson, Novy, Olanyk, Savoia, Schmidhofer, Skledar, Smolinski, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Triulzi, Weinberg, Withers

Members not attending:

Alarcon, Bratman, Czerwinski, Falcione, Gaddy, Gleason, Gold, Irrgang, J. Lin, Loughlin, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, S. Nelson, Norris, Poloyac, Ramsey, Rigotti, Swanson, Toto, Velankar, Weiss

\*Excused attendance:

Ataai, Beck, Buchanich, Corral, Flynn, Frank, Fusco, Groark, Kaynar, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Marra, Miller, Rea, Rohrer, Scott, Vieira, Wilson, Yarger

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Fedele, Gau, Kozak, Urban

\*Notified Senate Office