

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
November 7, 2017

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:03 pm.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting</u> Minutes (October 10, 2017) were approved as written.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
<p><u>Items of New Business</u></p> <p>Senate Plenary Suggestions</p> <p>Last year we focused on metrics/analytics for faculty research productivity. Plenaries are often useful to put important issues forward for continued action. Prior year the topic was academic freedom.</p> <p>A number of topics have been emerged. Discussion involved a number of members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation of Teaching – Wilson indicated 2011 similar focus, though not the same focus 2. Year of Healthy U: Democracy on Campus, A Look at Shared Governance Kear: this could be a different style using intergroup dialogue; effectiveness, purpose of shared governance. Wilson indicated there was a similar topic in 2003 3. Future of Public Higher Education Wilson: broad topic with national and state interest. Kear mentioned that Kovacs had suggested a similar topic last month. 4. Technology on the Learning Process Sukits – discussed studies of uses of personal technology in classes; some people assume all additional technology is “good” 5. Return on Investment in Higher Education Balaban – what are the metrics, formal and informal, quantitative and qualitative; what does an educated person of the 21st century look like? 6. Teaching in the 21st Century Stoner – brings into debate a number of issues including technology; Landsittel likes the large umbrella. Tananis noted that we were already 17 years into the 21st century. It was also noted that resources are often behind times. Students born in the 21st century will soon be entering college. Munro – access to, storage of, use of knowledge/thinking has changed. Preparing to teach Generation Z. <p>LANDSITTEL: Whether we had an update on the resolution out of the ad hoc committee on teaching; update on OMET. Asked as recently as last week --- will</p>	<p>Executive Committee will select topic</p>

<p>keep asking.</p>	
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u></p> <p>State Budget Resolution Breathing a sigh of relief with passage of funding for Pitt; panic phase over, however the issue is not going to be any easier next year. We shouldn't be complacent. This leads to a question about what comes next. Planning and Budget Committee has a normal schedule of meetings including this coming week for orientation, and there are a number of others from Faculty Assembly that serve. This year a second meeting has been added to discuss budgeting considering similar strategies given state politics for next year. The University and Faculty Assembly need to take this issue quite seriously. Our own Senate Budget Committee will be considering these issues as well. Regional campuses are of special concern since privatization and/or serious budget cuts may mean that regional campuses may fail.</p> <p>Appointments to Committees</p> <p>University Times Advisory Board. Officers have been involved in getting this Board revitalization of this committee through the Chancellor. We've provided advice for the function of this Board and recommendations for membership. The Chancellor has accepted these and is in the process of forming the committee through appointments, this week.</p> <p>UTimes discussion --- Spring request for discussion by Assembly members: Bircher suggests that the UTimes is a very important to report independently for internal and external audiences. Important to the faculty community and for shared governance. Has the potential to go back to the 90's to actively seek out controversy and move toward full discussion, or to address issues in a balanced and fair discussion of substantive issues. Morel suggested the scope of the UTimes has shrunk since going online. Some pieces are missing – perhaps PittWire is designed to replace, though it is missed in the UTimes.</p> <p>Spring suggests we lost some independent reporting of news; not clear whether this is transitional or going to be more set. Research Notes is missed in more full and matter of fact way (news rather than marketing).</p> <p>Socially Responsible Investing Committee is in a similar status. We've made recommendations as has Staff Council and Student Government for membership. This group will consider investment strategies for socially responsible choices. These appointments are in process through the Chancellor, this week.</p> <p>Proposal of Extending the Tenure Clock from 7 Years to 10 Years for Medical and Health-Related Professions Schools We received notification of this administrative request. We've asked the administration to contact the Tenure and Academic Freedom</p>	<p>Report and Discussion</p>

<p>Pam Connelly – Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion Asking for Senate representation: Review possible revisions to non-discriminatory, equal opportunities, and affirmative action policies and procedures, and make recommendation on a University technology accessibility policy and procedures. We are requesting our representatives come from the Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-Discrimination Advocacy committee.</p> <p>Pitt Principles Discussion Feedback on the document is on the Senate website, including a larger piece by Jack Daniel regarding diversity and inclusion. Encourage you to continue making comment. The Student Government Board met with Dean Bonner and they have also submitted feedback.</p> <p>Provost Beeson Stepping Down at the End of the Academic Year President Wilson didn't see this coming, especially in a milieu of change with a number of newer Associate Provosts and Deans. We are in a changing environment. We will wait and see how this will play out. We will look at the rules for Senate engagement; will require an election of representatives. Chancellor will form the committee, and we have slots.</p> <p>Frieze: Suggests we might want to have the Faculty Assembly form a response (drafted by Executive Committee and then shared for FA commentary and endorsement) for Provost Beeson to acknowledge her service to the University and faculty, including the non-tenure stream committee. Wilson suggested that we do that and the Executive Committee will consider next steps.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></p>	<p>Community Relation Committee: Resolution to Pursue the Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification Paul Harper and Tracy Soska, Co Chairs</p> <p>Written report and additional comments:</p> <p><i>Paul Harper provided some history and background on the committee action that has led to this written resolution. The committee feels strongly this is a good time for next steps with this resolution.</i></p> <p>At its initial fall 2017 meetings, the Senate Community Relations Committee discussed the upcoming 2020 Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification and process. From these discussions, the Community Relations Committed moved unanimously to present the following, resolution for discussion and action by the Faculty Assembly, and, based on action there, to the Senate Council for the University to consider applying for the Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification.</p> <p>The University of Pittsburgh has established a history and growing capacity of university-community engagement including such initiatives as a HUD and university-funded Community Outreach Partnership Center and, more recently,</p>
	<p>No discussion</p>

	<p>establishing student office of community engagement and services, PittServes, and a long-term initiative for Community Engagement Centers that underscores the university’s commitment toward its strategic goal of “Strengthening Our Communities.”</p> <p>This strategic goal and our establishment of key offices and initiatives to enhance community engagement through the work of faculty, students, and staff represents a strong foundation upon which to consider applying for the Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification, which would demonstrate our commitment to making community engagement a center of excellence at our university for integrating our service mission with our missions of teaching and research.</p> <p>The Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification, established in 2008, provides a process whereby universities can benchmark, monitor, and assess their institutional progress and collective impact toward excellence in community engagement. Many leading public and private, research-intensive universities are already participating among the 360 campuses that have applied and reapplied for this Community Engagement Classification, which now opens on five-year cycles. These include several campuses in our Athletic Coast Conference – North Carolina, North Carolina State, South Carolina, Clemson, Duke, Notre Dame, Wake Forest - as well as other Division I research universities in Pennsylvania – Penn, Penn State, and Temple.</p> <p>The New England Resource Center for Higher Education, which administers this classification, defines this work thusly: “Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and the larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchanges of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.”</p> <p>The University of Pittsburgh through its University Senate has on several occasions conducted Plenary Sessions that examined, advanced, and recognized community engagement as fitting the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>teaching, research, and service work and missions of this university. Our university has now made significant progress in institutionalizing our community engagement efforts.</p> <p><i>Therefore: We request the University of Pittsburgh explore and make every effort to apply for the 2020 application cycle for the Carnegie Community Engagement Voluntary Classification and that this would include a cross-divisional team be assembled/appointed for the purposes of data collection and application writing as required in this application process.</i></p> <p><i>Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of the Community Relations Committee</i> <i>Paul Harper and Tracy Soska, Co-Chairs, Community Relations Committee</i></p> <p>----- end of written report and comments -----</p> <p>Discussion: MUNRO: Is there a cost involved? Not known, Harper will explore. BALABAN: Why didn't we join this originally? What is different now? Harper suggests that in the past data were not readily available (in 2008) to complete a self-study to develop a persuasive argument for inclusion. Balaban agrees we have made tremendous strides in this area. Wilson added that there has been more group engagement towards this effort with expanded and intensified discussion. Balaban suggests this is a natural progression. Harper suggested that we have additional expertise now as well, via Assistant Vice Chancellor for Community Engagement Centers Lina Dostilio. Stoner asks how much time is involved in five-year cycle? Harper answered that the timing will take about a year for the self-study to be approved for the 2020 cycle. Probably somewhat less effort to reapply or renew. 2nd paragraph, 3rd line --- missing "a" or "the" student office of community</p> <p>VOTE: Two abstentions, otherwise affirmative passage.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements</u></p>		<p>No announcements</p>
<p><u>Adjournment</u></p>		<p>Moved and accepted, 3:59p</p>

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,



HAIL TO PITT!

Cindy Tananis, Ed.D.
University Senate Secretary

Associate Professor
Administrative and Policy Studies, Education Leadership
Director
Collaborative for Evaluation and Assessment Capacity

Members attending:

Balaban, Becker, Betru, Bircher, Bonneau, Bratman, Brodt, Bromberg, Cassaro, Conley, Cook, Dahm, Dewar, Fort, Frieze, Goldberg, Guterman, Harper, Jones, Kaufman, Kear, Kiselyov, Kubis, Landsittel, Long, Lyon, Morel, Munro, Olanyk, Perry, Phillippi, Rigotti, Salcido, Sereika, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Tashbook, Wilson, Withers

Members not attending:

Adams, Bilodeau, Borovetz, Buchanich, Clark, Danford, Deitrick, Gold, Irrgang, Kanthak, Kaynar, Landrigan, Martin, McGreevy, Mendeloff, Muenzer, Mulcahy, Nelson, Roberts, Sant, Smolinski, Soska, Swanson, Taboas, Thorpe, Weikle-Mills

*Excused attendance:

Bachman, Czerwinski, De Vallejo, Gaddy, Harries, Henker, Horne, Infanti, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Loughlin, Molinaro, Mulvaney, Rohrer, Van Nostrand, Weinberg, Yarger

Others attending:

Fike, Wisniewski

*Notified Senate Office