

**Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
November 5, 2014**

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Michael Spring at 3:03 PM.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:03 PM.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of October 7, 2014.</p>	<p>The minutes were approved as written.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u> Michael Spring introduced that Expanded Executive Committee (EEC) will be meeting with the Chancellor on Friday 11/7. The topic is “Faculty Assembly: Comments and Concerns for the Chancellor. “ Are there other items of new business? Kovacs: It is important if you would bring up the issue of shared governance to the Chancellor. Spring: Yes, that will be part of new business (later).</p>	<p>See below (new business).</p>
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Michael Spring (November 2014)</u></p> <p>1. Intellectual Property Issues. As you know by now, the Provost convened a task force to examine how best to proceed with the matter of assigning intellectual property in accord with University policy. I appreciate the speed, collegiality and thoroughness with which the Provost engaged these matters. The task force of faculty convened by the Provost met several times over the last month to review the matter. A couple of us felt fine with the previous assignment, some preferred the new form labeled as option 2. Others felt strongly that option 3 was the most appropriate. I encourage you to check the Senate website for more information as well as the website set up by the Provost. The letter explained these options.</p> <p>I should also mention that the Provost was committed to providing Q&A sessions and providing enough time for faculty to think about the situation. In what seems to be a typical SNAFU, some of the deans established a date a week earlier to allow them to process forms. When this was brought to the Provost’s attention, a letter was sent to the Deans alerting them to the fact that the faculty deadline was November 21 and that they could take a couple extra days to process the forms to the Office of Research. The assignment agreement is required only for faculty who have or who are applying for federal grants (PIs and Co-PIs)</p> <p>I would also like to note that there is a separate but related set of discussions that are being set in motion by the Provost and the Chancellor to examine our policies on intellectual property with an eye to asking how these policies impact the dissemination of knowledge discovered by faculty, staff and students as well as examining how well our policies encourage innovation.</p> <p>2. The Fall Plenary took place on October 23rd. We are very pleased with both</p>	<p>See new business for call for FA ideas for Chancellor EEC meeting upcoming.</p>

attendance and the faculty reaction to the topic: “Managing Research Data: Challenges & Opportunities at the University”

Liz Lyon from the School of Information Sciences delivered the keynote -- “Gearing up for Data? Institutional drivers, challenges and opportunities” The panel included: Kelly Dornin-Koss, Director, Education and Compliance Office for Human Subject Research; Barbara Epstein, Director, Health Sciences Library System; Jay Graham, Enterprise Architect, Computing Services and Systems Development; Jennifer Woodward, Associate Vice Provost for Research Operations; Mike Becich, Chairman, Department of Biomedical Informatics; Alison Langmead, Director of the Visual Media Workshop, History of Art and Architecture

3. **We continue to work on our web presence** and are pleased that activity on the site has increased dramatically. We will continue to work on placing documents related to issues we are trying to address. Pertinent to the IPR issues there were numerous documents placed on the Senate site that helped to inform our discussion. We also opened an “initiatives page” with documents related to IPR, and research data management. Out of the approximately 1100 visitors since September 1, about 340 found their way to the IPR page and about 360 have made their way to the research data management page.

The plenary was streamed live and it appears that the number of real time viewers increased from the one last year to 11 this year. Since the 23rd there have been an additional 9 views. The viewers who looked at the site viewed about 90% of the video plenary. Viewers listened through Chancellor’s Remarks, Keynote, and the panel discussion.

4. **Irene Frieze** will be awarded the Iris Marion Young Award for Political Engagement tomorrow November 6th at a ceremony at the 21st Century Club that will begin at 4:00. The award recognizes Irene’s long history of leadership in the area of social justice. The award “honors those who work to promote justice in the University, at the local or national level, or across the globe. As many of you know, in 1972 Irene worked to establish the Women’s Studies Program and she has worked consistently on behalf of women and Women’s Studies, at Pitt, in the region, and in the field of psychology. She directed the Women’s Studies Program from 1984-1989 and 1993. Community projects included setting up a referral list of feminist therapists, serving as expert witness in sexual harassment cases, and co-coordinating a Southwest PA conference on the mental health needs of women. She has also edited the journals Sex Roles and the Journal of Social Issues.

Directly pertinent to the University Senate, she has worked tirelessly to make Pitt more women-friendly. In 2004, she chaired an ad hoc committee for the support and advancement of women at Pitt. A subgroup of the ad hoc committee planned the Senate plenary session on mentoring in 2006. Members of the subcommittee worked with Provost Beeson, who was then vice provost for graduate studies and interim vice provost for undergraduate studies, to improve guidelines for investigating complaints about sexual harassment. In 2007, she chaired the ad

hoc committee for the promotion of gender equity. This committee included subcommittees working on child care (and later dependent care); leadership networking and skills development for women; assisting trailing partners to find positions in Pittsburgh; faculty salaries and retention of women, and sexual harassment. The past two years she has chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Stream Faculty.

Irene's "effort and quality of contribution" — specifically her concern for NTS faculty has provided significant and critical leadership for the University in this time of transition as more and more NTS faculty are affected by policy and culture in the University.

Todd Reeser, PhD, Director, Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies Program, joined us today to help recognize Irene's accomplishments. He congratulated Irene and invited FA members to a panel discussion and following awards ceremony on November 6th

5. **The various standing committees continue their work.** The expanded executive committee will meet for lunch with the Chancellor this Friday, November 7th. We will spend some time discussing our concerns, answering the Chancellor's questions and asking how we might best work with this administration toward shared governance.

In taking with the Chancellor, we will continue to focus on two issues that seem to deserve some particular attention. First, one of the responsibilities that the Senate takes seriously is advising the administration on matters of University-wide concern. Sometimes, matters don't reach the Executive Committee or the relevant standing committee soon enough for us to provide feedback. We will be thinking about ways to make sure we get the appropriate faculty involved in issues at a stage where we can provide appropriate formative feedback. Second, as we focus on particular issues, it is sometimes more convenient to form special committees or taskforces, or Ad Hoc committees to focus on a given task. This can lead to less than optimal communication between all the involved parties. We will be thinking about how we can embrace such structures without losing track of the need to communicate with the involved Senate committees. I would welcome your feedback as we think about these issues and time permitting I would like to ask for any of your thought under new business. High on our agenda is the issue of pragmatic shared governance and appropriate kinds of structures to ensure that this occurs.

6. **There are also two Ad Hoc committees that are active** – We anticipate an update in December from the Ad Hoc committee charged with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream (NTS) faculty, both part-time and full-time with an eye to adjustments that may need to be made and positioning of responsibility for consideration of these matters within the standing committees of the Senate, as well as identification of issues not currently within the purview of an existing standing committees.

<p>A second Ad Hoc Committee has been formed to address the guidelines in current use for performance evaluation and salary reduction of tenured faculty in the University of Pittsburgh. This committee is in the process of starting its work. Finally, the special working group of tenure and academic freedom focused on academic freedom and electronic media will be making a report today.</p>	
<p>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</p> <p>TAFC Subcommittee on Academic Freedom & the Electronic Media <i>Barry Gold, TAFC Co-Chair: materials distributed in advance</i> <i>Seth Weinberg presented the material</i></p> <p>Seth Weinberg gave history on this topic. Universities were struggling with how to handle this, including disciplinary action. Our task force formed, and first worked to review existing policies (links below). Based upon concerns expressed by some faculty due to newspaper reports concerning the assault on academic freedom at several academic institutions, the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee (TAFC) appointed a subcommittee to look into the issue of academic freedom and the electronic media. The members of the subcommittee were:</p> <p>Nick Bircher (Medicine); Chris Bonneau (A&S); Barry Gold (Pharmacy); Michael Madison (Law); Marianne Novy (A&S); Russ Salter (Medicine); Michael Spring (Information Sciences); Annette Vee (A&S); Seth Weinberg (Dental Medicine); and Carey Balaban (Provost Office).</p> <p>The subcommittee met on three occasions to discuss whether current Pitt policies on academic freedom needed to be revised based upon the common usage of electronic media in teaching and scholarship. There was unanimous agreement that the existing policies on academic freedom are strong and do not need to be revised. The links to the different relevant sections on Academic Freedom were provided by Vice Provost Balaban:</p> <p>(1) Use of University Affiliation or Titles: http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-04-02.html</p> <p>(2) Academic Freedom at the University of Pittsburgh: http://www.pitt.edu/~provost/af.html, which includes http://www.pitt.edu/~provost/update.html, and http://www.pitt.edu/~provost/afstatement.html.</p> <p>(3) Computer access and use policy: http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/10/10-02-05.html</p> <p>(4) Policy on personal use of University resources: http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/05/05-08-01.html</p> <p>(5) Anti-harassment policy statement: http://www.provost.pitt.edu/information-on/antiharassment_statement.html and procedures http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/07/07-01-03.html</p> <p>(6) Tenure Obligations and Responsibilities: http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-02-03.html</p>	<p>No vote needed.</p>

The subcommittee suggested that it would be reassuring to the faculty if the Provost would make a statement to indicate it clearly that our policies extend to electronic speech, and covers all mechanisms of communication used in teaching and scholarship, including electronic media. The last document on this was 1999, so an update would be reassuring.

Additionally, in order to help Pitt faculty understand the limits and responsibilities associated with academic freedom, it was proposed to develop a best practices website, perhaps a Senate "initiatives" page. The AAUP recently published a resource on this that is very helpful. It should link out from the website. This website would have to be generated in concert with the Provost's Office to ensure that we provide faculty with accurate information that is consistent with existing Pitt policies.

It was suggested that a webinar or plenary session on the topic of Academic Freedom be developed.

Novy: I can clarify Kansas case or other cases if needed. (no requests)

Spring: I am pleased that a close look at our current policies showed that we cover this already. I share your idea for a best practices document or webinar.

Horvath: Educational policies considered the idea of creating digital ethics training videos with CIDDE. We are going to make a working group between Educational Policies and TAFC on this issue, as they overlap. Alignment of best practices would be very good.

Spring: For as long as I've been a faculty member, in discussions with colleagues, noted a serious lack of understanding between Freedom of Speech (guaranteed by the Constitution) and academic freedom (guaranteed by the University in your field of research). Definitions are different. The concern in the Wisconsin case was using university email system. The Kansas case used Twitter. The Wisconsin case struck me most. In class, faculty may make irreverent remarks verbally. The remarks made in Wisconsin were sent in email, and the email was sent around and eventually made its way to the Governor, and back to the Chancellor, demanding action. It was an unfortunate situation that created tension for a lot of people. There are new practices to learn throughout this with today's media, although past voice mail had examples. I would hate to see anyone go through unnecessary agony if it is unintentional.

Weinberg: You have to start thinking about your emails as potentially being public and publicly available.

Spring: Nothing ever disappears. We will raise this issue with the Provost on Friday at the EEC, and appreciate your work. I am glad that we collegially feel that the University policies are sufficient. Perhaps we need better education and cautions on this.

Weinberg: All we can do is try to mitigate the occurrences that inevitably will occur one day.

Slimick: Before I retired, I was invited to orient the new faculty at Bradford. We do not do that anymore, but that was a good forum to review committees and issues like this. Perhaps this topic should be included in new faculty orientation.

<p>Stoner: In the Chronicle in the last few months, there was an article about checking media for job applications. Also, discussing with colleagues the recording language in syllabi, indicating prior approval is important. (this is standard language now)</p> <p>Spring: We should ask the Provost about language regarding disabled students, plagiarism, recording in the classroom, etc. Questions on these issues come separately. It might be good to have a boilerplate phrase for each of these topics for syllabi.</p> <p>Manfredi: If you go into Courseweb, There is a syllabus template that includes all of these phrases and policies. It is there for instructors to use.</p> <p>Baker: This document was well-prepared. I agree that the university policies are adequate. Biggest problem is that the faculty is not aware of these policies. Education is a good idea. On item 2, the policy states that academic freedom resides with the university, not the faculty member. There is a word of caution with this; you need to be familiar with these policies.</p> <p>Frieze and Spring: We thank the committee members for their hard work and we will make a new initiatives page related to this. There is no need for a vote on our part. The documents reflect substantive thought on the issue. They are carefully worded.</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p>President Spring asked for any items that FA would like to get mentioned in our first large-scale meeting with the Chancellor. The Chancellor will be exposed to all of the standing committees of the Senate and what they do. The Chancellor will bring up issues that he wants to talk about. The FA issues we will bring up are the reinforcement of the shared governance and the parallel committees (Senate, Provost, and Trustee) that are now forming. We do not always have the appropriate liaison to maximize communication. We will talk about how to improve that.</p> <p>Frank: I would like to ask the Chancellor how we can help with the changes in the Governor, and what he thinks the advocacy priorities are for the Commonwealth. Also, how he feels the change in Congress will affect research funding. I would like to hear his thoughts on that.</p> <p>Spring: Chancellor noted that he was surprised that Pitt does not have an office in Washington for advocacy in DC. This topic came up in a discussion.</p> <p>Frank: I was recently in DC, and met at the UCSF office in DC. That is a very good point.</p> <p>Labrinidis: Regarding shared governance, there is more that can be done at school level, where faculty have no input. Could be related to admissions software, policies, etc. The University-wide committees are broad issues. There are more items that could be decided and done at the School level.</p> <p>Spring: The main Senate Committee that interacts closely with School level committees is Budget Policies. We could bring up better relations/interaction between Senate Committees and School committees. There could be another structure.</p> <p>Novy: An example of where more communication could have occurred was related to early retirement for staff. There was not faculty input into this issue. More staff</p>	<p>Topics will be shared with the Chancellor at the upcoming meeting.</p>

retired than was expected, and there was not faculty input into the reorganization.

Spring: That might be a management issue, so not related, but it is a point well-taken.

Bircher: Homogeneity between Schools is a university-wide Senate issue. If one school can assert that shared governance does not apply to us because we are our own school, that is problematic. It is our responsibility to ensure that shared governance pervades the entire culture instead of letting certain schools to sign off of certain programs.

Spring: I have found Provost Beeson to be exquisite in knowing example where the policy does not allow enough differentiation, or where it needs to allow more freedom. An example is faculty reviews.

Kovacs: I think something would help the Standing Committees would be to have a better decision of how decisions are made as to what is a school-based policy versus a university-based policy. We do not always understand what is involved in these decisions and their history. Some decisions made inside Schools are university-wide issues. Our tenure committee is an example of a school-based decision regarding tenure actually was a university decision. At what point does an issue become a university-wide issue versus a school issue? What are the criteria for this? Transparency would be better on these issues.

Smitherman: On a separate note, we had a meeting with Dr. Levine and senior administration, and it was suggested that Dr. Nordenberg would be an ally to broaden activities of the Government Relations Committee.

Baker: An issue of concern is faculty salaries at the lower levels (Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer). The University has the lowest salary for that group of any AAU members. It should be a priority to review and raise these salaries, including part-time faculty. The problems in Harrisburg have precluded this, but it is an issue that could be and should be brought up.

Spring: We have lost new faculty due to salary issues, but I am not sure how to get this information of the exact number. It is a sensitive legislative and cost-of-living issue.

Labrinidis: Another idea is to have a better policy to deal with dual hires (spouses of recruits). Other institutions do have a better way or a policy to deal with this.

Novy: I wanted to go on record regarding a concern with our University being dependent on NTS faculty. Instead of giving departments TS positions, more NTS are being created. This is a problem at many universities.

Spring: We will continue to champion these issues through a variety of places. It is my belief that we are internally more sensitive to issues with this than other universities. Attention to appropriate paths, salary, titles, promotion, incentives, etc., has been a front-burner here at PITT for 3-4 yrs. I am so glad that we have not ended up on the front page of the paper for exploiting faculty. We are very sensitive to this to improve the situation. Job stability in the academic disciplines

is rapidly changing.	
<u>Announcements</u>	
Topics for the Chancellor are very good. Thank you.	
<u>Adjournment</u>	Adjourned 4:00 pm.
Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.	

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Skledar, RPh, MPH, FASHP

Senate Secretary

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

Members attending:

Alarcon, Baker, Bircher, Clark, Dahm, Dewar, Donihi, Evans, Fort, Frank, Frieze, Gaddy, Groark, Horvath, Hughes, A. Jones, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kear, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Leers, Molinaro, Morel, Nelson, Novy, Olanyk, Shafiq, Skledar, Slimick, Smitherman, Spring, Stoner, Weinberg, Withers

Members not attending:

Beck, Caldwell, Cauley, Cohen, Erickson, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Goodhart, Helbig, Hravnak, Irrgang, R. Jones, Karp, Kearns, Lewicka, Lin, Mauk, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, Munro, Nisnevich, Poloyac, Ramsey, Riccelli, Rougeux, Savinov, Schmidhofer, Scott, Smolinski, Soska, Triulzi, Weiss, Yarger

*Excused attendance:

Ataai, Buchanich, Burkoff, Costantino, Flynn, Fusco, Guterman, McKinney, Miller, Savoia, Sukits, Tananis, Vieira, Wilson

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Fedele, Manfredi, Reeser

*Notified Senate Office