

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes  
2700 Posvar Hall  
October 1, 2013

Topic/Discussion	Action
<u>Call to Order.</u> President Michael Spring called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.	The meeting commenced
<u>Approval of the Minutes of the September 3, 2013 Faculty Assembly Meeting.</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the September 3, 2013 Faculty Assembly meeting.	The minutes were approved as written.
<u>Introduction of Items of New Business.</u> President Spring asked if there were any new items of business to be brought forward. John Baker mentioned that the Post-Gazette is charging for online access and asked if Pitt would be willing to pay for it? Michael Spring responded that will be the first item under new business.	One item of new business was brought forward by the assembly.
<p><u>Report of the President.</u> President Spring gave the following report:</p> <p>I am pleased to announce that from the 52 distinguished faculty who allowed their names to be placed on the ballot, the Faculty of the respective schools have elected:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">From the Kenneth P. Dietrich Arts and Sciences: David Bartholomae from English</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">From the Provost's Professional Schools &amp; ULS: Carrie Leana from Business</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">From the Regional Campuses: Jerry Samples from Johnstown</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">From the Schools of the Health Sciences and Libraries: Anthony Delitto from SHRS</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">From the School of Medicine: Maria Kovacs from the Department of Psychiatry</p> <p>I was very pleased of the quality of candidates and the number of faculty who voted.</p> <p>At our last meeting, I mentioned that the Senate Executive Committee would be meeting with the Chair of the Search Committee, Eva Tansky Blum and Provost Emeritus Maher. All of the points made in Faculty Assembly were shared and we engaged in a lively discussion of the best characteristics of the Chancellor, current and future along with issues about the future of the University. I think the best summary to present of that wide ranging conversation is that I left the meeting confident that Ms. Tansky Blum and Provost Emeritus Maher would conduct an informed and exhaustive search that will give us a very good chance of coming up with an outstanding individual to serve as the next Chancellor of the University. I know it is a little unusual, but</p>	President's report was submitted.

I would like to invite the other members of the executive committee present to share any thoughts they have that I might have missed. Irene Frieze commented on the discussion regarding the important relationship with the university and the medical school; she also mentioned she was relieved that Provost Emeritus Maher was on the search for he clearly was representing the undergraduate and academic side of the university. I don't think this was mentioned in confidence, but the applicant pool is probably not that large for people who will be appropriate for this type of position.

Websites, both public and access controlled, are up and available to faculty. Related to the matters of communications, I met with Nancy Brown, editor of the University Times and with Ken Service Vice Chancellor for Communication who offered any help their offices might provide as we move forward. I appreciate Ken's reaching out to the Senate and will look forward to continued communication. I think it goes without saying that we rely heavily on the University Times to communicate what is going on in our various committees.

Regarding oversight of the Planning and Budget Process, the University Council on Graduate Studies has received the reports on graduate department closings and suspensions from the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences. The SBPC has been monitoring the process and my personal conclusion having attended the last meeting, was that while the process got off to a shaky start, the process has been fully in compliance with policy as it has moved forward. The SBPC has not made any final decision on it, but I invite Professor Baker as Chair of the SBPC to add anything. Baker commented that we are looking at the process and it has been discussed, the SBPC will have a report or a statement in the near future.

Regarding Senate Standing Committees, I have had an opportunity to meet with five of the Senate Standing committees – Tenure and Academic Freedom, Commonwealth Relations, Community Relations, Benefits and Welfare, and Budget Policies. Besides my assigned liaison committees, I hope over the coming months to attend at least one meeting of each of the standing committees.

Regarding video of Faculty Assembly, I spoke with the Office of General Counsel about the video taping of meetings and they indicated that what we want to do should be acceptable, especially given our bylaws which state: Observers:

*All meetings are normally open to members of the University*

*Community, although Faculty Assembly may meet in Executive Session when necessary and appropriate for dealing with confidential matters.*

The following advice was offered: Announce the video streaming in advance, and announce it on the day of the meeting. I was told that CIDDE has been trained in how to deal with taping and streaming as well. Given your comments last month, as well as the wording of the bylaws that the meeting is open to members of the University community, not the general public, I thought it best to suggest to you that we tape the meeting and make it available for asynchronous playback through the Senate portal. So, having it not streaming, we will have a chance to make sure that nothing inappropriate will be exposed and using the portal we will be able to restrict who will be able to view it. Depending on reactions, we can examine whether this or other options are appropriate for future meetings.

Revision of the COI Policy: After consultation with the Senate representatives to the University Research Council and the Conflict of Interest Committee, the Executive Committee endorsed, on behalf of the Senate, a revision to the policy on conflict of interest. The primary focus of the changes was to “facilitate commercialization of University Intellectual Property.” In the process of reviewing the document, it occurred to me for the second time this year that none of our standing committees were directly focused on research issues, which is why I consulted with the Senate appointees to the two University committees.

Reflecting on Senate involvement in Research Policy, I would like to discuss this matter with Assembly today. It is also my intent to discuss the matters at the upcoming expanded executive committee meeting later in October. Further, I have extended an invitation to Vice Provost Mark Redfern and the Senate appointees to the two committees to discuss these issues and the state of research support at Pitt with the faculty assembly at an upcoming meeting – hopefully as early as our next meeting.

This focus on research is an outgrowth of a discussion with the Chancellor and his leadership team to discuss possible foci for Senate activity over the coming year. The meeting was very collegial and we discussed areas such as research, assessment, faculty issues, educational policy issues, operational productivity and research. We will be discussing these same issues with the Standing Committee chairpersons. Further, we have invited faculty comments through the website and through the University Times Senate Matters column. I welcome the comments of the Assembly members as to what you see as the important issues we

should be addressing.

There is one final matter that I would like to bring to your attention and about which I invite your feedback. I believe both that our discussions should be open and honest and carefully controlled so as not to provide ammunition to those who are not prepared to fully understand an open academic dialog. Over the past 45 years, much of the shared governance at Pitt has supported this view and the Senate is an outstanding example of such dialog. Some standing committees and administrative liaisons have encouraged closed meetings to allow for an open and frank dialog. Some faculty committees have expressed concern that some administrative input is insufficient. Some faculty have felt more comfortable in meeting without the administration to discuss matters. I understand how and why most of these practices developed, and I have been persuaded that the amount of closure some committees have adopted may be for the best. So, my dilemma is this: I would like to imagine that most meetings would be open to all members of the University community and that executive sessions could be held as necessary without raising suspicions. While this is my naïve belief, I find myself holding a minority position. I would like as time permits to hear your views, if not today, by email or phone call.

President Spring concluded his report and asked for questions:

Roger Flynn asked where the faculty question of the month appeared. Spring responded that it is on the Senate's public website, tab 2.

Bob Daley commented that he thought about the possibility of videotaping a FA meeting since the September meeting and had two comments: If we tape a meeting and discuss many controversial things that will probably garner the most interest, but will also turn many people away. Secondly, if we tape a "vanilla" type meeting with standard reports, a lot of people may think it's boring and not want to get involved.

Spring responded: I tend to agree with you. However, there are close to 4000 faculty and I think 3500 doesn't realize the Senate exists. I'm not in a rush to do videotaping, but it might be a useful adjunct to the orientation for new members.

John Slimick, UPB asked about the regionals involvement. Spring mentioned that "Lync" may be an option to make that connection.

<p>The videotaping is not two way, it is just for people to view.</p> <p>John Baker commented that the mentioning of “open meetings” was very well put and one advantage to an open meeting is the University Times can cover things and share with the University community. I don’t know of many committees other than Budget Policies which is open.</p> <p>Spring responded he feels there are a reasonable number of committees which are open, but for various reasons some committees feel it’s not appropriate for the UTimes to be in attendance given the matters that are discussed. I want to raise the issue of open committees, but will respect their needs. I don’t think there is an easy answer, it’s an ongoing struggle.</p> <p>Angie Riccelli (Benefits and Welfare) wants to bring greater awareness to wellness issues. I ask for support from Faculty Assembly, to help bring awareness and market these issues to the university community. Any feedback or support would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>No other comments/questioned were raised.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.</u> Laurie Cohen, co-chair of the Community Relations committee gave the following report. It’s an extremely active committee and is also co-chaired by Lovie Jackson Foster (Social Work). We meet with a lot of the community partners, Oakland Planning and Development, Oakland Business Improvement District, Community Human Services and they are members of our committee. They attend our meetings they present information at our meetings.</p> <p><u>2012-2013 Yr – Highlights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Service Events promoted/supported by the CRC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greater Pittsburgh Food Bank – Monthly Distribution Day</li> <li>○ Oakland Food Pantry (CHS)</li> <li>○ United Way Day of Caring</li> <li>○ Sleep-in for the Homeless (CHS)</li> <li>○ Christmas Day at Pitt</li> <li>○ Hat and Glove Drive</li> <li>○ Sock-a-Thon</li> <li>○ Pitt Partnership for Food, Virtual Food Drive</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Community Relations Committee gave a report</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pitt's People for Pets</li> <li>○ Pitt 225 Acts of Caring Community Calendar</li> <li>○ Plant to Plate (CHS)</li> <li>○ The Corner's parties and art market</li> <li>● Presentations by Oakland Planning and Development Corporation (OPDC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discussion of Oakland 2025 final plan and initiatives emerging from the plan.</li> <li>○ Informed the committee about new initiatives such as Oakwatch activities, façade grants, partnership with TreeVitalize.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Presentations by Community Human Services (CHS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Informed the committee about services, including free tax preparation, shelter services for LBGTQ clients, youth programs, community club space, Oakland Food Pantry staffing, housing assistance, computer literacy classes, and housing eviction prevention.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Presentations by Oakland Business Improvement District (OBID) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Informed the committee about new developments, including Innovative Oakland's plans for interactive light poles at Forbes and Bouquet Street.</li> <li>○ Reminders about weekly Oakland Farmers Market, Oakland Restaurant Week, and Drink for Pink.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Joint Meeting with Senate Commonwealth Relations Committee (October 2012)</li> <li>● Discussion about Bus Rapid Transit plan (September 2012)</li> <li>● Field Trip to Hazelwood (October 2012)</li> <li>● Presentation by Kannu Sahni and John Wilds on efforts to increase cooperation and respect between Pitt students and Oakland residents, with the Be a Good Neighbor parties, Love Your Block event (September 2012)</li> <li>● Learned about Wayfinding project in conjunction with Pitt's iSchool (January 2013)</li> </ul>	
--	--

- Learned about Office of Community Relations' efforts to inventory all volunteer activities on campus and update the Office's website to reflect these activities (January 2013)
- Presentation by Kannu Sahni to unveil new Student Guide to Campus Life newsletter and to discuss a new organization aimed at increasing participants for volunteer programs at Pitt (February 2013)
- Branch campus call to Greensburg to discuss how community relations are conducted on other campuses (March 2013)
- Discussion of talks with Councilman Kraus regarding "responsible partying" (March 2013)
- Field Trip to Larimer (April 2013)
- Presentation by Ryan Gayman, who is the Community Engagement Advisor in the Honors College (June 2013)

#### 2013-2014 Yr

##### Monthly meetings (3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, 272 Hillman Library)

- Preparation for Fall Community Service Events  
Food Drive, United Way Day of Caring, Pitt Make a Difference Day, Greater Pittsburgh Food Bank, Blood Drives
- Joint Meeting with Commonwealth Relations Committee (September 2013)
- Presentation by Browne Fellows on their film and project about South Oakland (November 2013)
- Updates from our Community Partners, including Innovation Oakland, OPDC, CHS, The Corner, and OBID
- Branch campus conference call to discuss community relations issues across campuses (February 2014)
- Field Trip TBD (April 2014)
- Planning for second annual Oakland Forever event

Laurie concluded her report. Spring commented that the joint meeting was very collegial and open and if the meeting had been public that it may not have been as open. I also was surprised how many great things Pitt does in the neighborhoods/off campus. Laurie Cohen commented that the UTimes does attend the CRC meetings.

Irene Frieze gave an update on the ad hoc committee on issues related

<p>to non-tenure stream faculty. The Committee has met once, there are 12 members on the committee and at least 6 of the members are NTS. Carey Balaban and Stephen Ferber are representing the administration. The draft minutes are posted. We started reading the Bylaws regarding NTS faculty, we are also going to start to review policies from individual units which people thought were good examples, such as Education and Engineering. We invite anyone who has NTS concerns to contact the committee. We are hoping to schedule another meeting in late October.</p> <p>Irene asked for questions/comments. Seth Weinberg (Dental Medicine) asked if the committee was looking for additional members. Frieze responded in the affirmative.</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p>Access to the Post Gazette: John Baker mentioned that Laurie Cohen had shown him that you can get on through the library. John had originally tried from home and was unable to pull it up. Baker had an email from the PG Educational Services Dept. which said the University of Pittsburgh currently does not have a plan that includes on-line access but they have reached out to the Dean of Students at Pitt to offer digital access to the students and faculty.</p> <p>Cohen said ULS subscribes to the PG as a database.</p> <p>Spring asked which committee/person should get involved, possibly library committee, Rush Miller, Kathy Humphrey or even Ken Service.</p> <p>Roger Flynn asked what the cost of the service was?</p> <p>Spring moved on to an open discussion regarding committees. He stated that faculty do community service, teaching and research. When looking at the 15 Senate Committees it's easy to see community service, our welfare and teaching, but hard pressed to find a committee that says this is how we should move forward on research. There was an IRB administrative committee that was formed which reported back to Randy Juhl. There is also the University Research Council and the Conflict of Interest Committee, both actively engaged. The Senate representatives on those two committees had only positive comments to say they are engaged, being listened to, etc. There is nothing wrong. The question is, should we as a faculty have a committee or charge an existing committee with oversight of faculty concerns related to research?</p>	

Baker commented that there is the potential for problems. For example the Research Integrity Policy has to be done confidentially and it is done quite separately.

Balaban commented that the Research Integrity Policy was reviewed by the Senate leadership. TAFC is a very important committee. Not just regarding tenure issues, but fundamentally is academic freedom.

Spring commented that he doesn't have any issues with the COI policy, but the document was sent to the Senate Officers and that is when he thought that we didn't have a group focused on research issues. Last year Provost Beeson spoke to the IS School and she mentioned her concerns for the shrinking research pool, new opportunities for industrial research, she will be concerned for how to make all of these things better for the faculty. Are we thinking about these issues as well?

Balaban commented that the URC is made up of faculty.

Chris Groark – Is there a problem here to be solved? Why is this coming up now?

Spring: Standing committee members are elected but Senate appointees are appointed by the executive committee, not elected. Generally speaking do appointees to these types of committees make a report back to Faculty Assembly?

Baker responded no, they are appointed to the committee, they can be asked to make a report. When John was Senate President he made appointments to URC by choosing faculty who would be interested. To have people be elected to a standing committee may be a problem, for most people don't have the expertise. On the Research Integrity Policy, I served on two different committees where that was revised. The second time it was revised I was Senate President, I basically turned it over to TAFC. I think that is normally what we do. You can also ask for volunteers/members.

Penny Morel: It's becoming extremely difficult to get reagents from other universities; its onerous material transfer agreements put in place can often take years to get a reagent.

Tom Smitherman: I endorse what Penny just said. The last meeting, I made the comment over the last few weeks that we didn't need a research committee. To emphasize what Penny just said, I had a meeting a few weeks ago with a dept. chair who said I don't know who can help us, but is this something for the Senate? It seems comparing us to our peers in research bureaucracy (which has to be

there) and our research procedures (which have to be there) are more difficult, more drawn out, more slow, more hard to understand than at comparable universities. This has been a long standing problem and on the clinical research side, it reached such a magnitude that a separate IRB is run more through UPMC than the university. I don't know how that would mesh into the situation. I do think it is worth a lot of thought. We shouldn't create something that is not needed or adding to the problem.

Seth Weinberg: A lot of the complexity is due to federal guidelines and regulations. It would be helpful if we knew what the purview of the University Research Council is, it may then help us to know if something is missing.

Michael Butterworth: Is this overarching? There are many issues to individual departments, is there something that would be common to all units? Which would be dealt with under the purview of such a committee or is this something that needs to be dealt with at a lower level?

Spring: Raising the question doesn't mean I have a comprehensive answer. We do a herculean job with everything that is around us. I began to think about this when the Provost indicated that under her leadership the University needs to think of how to expand our research base. More industrial collaboration, more commercialization, more corporations, etc. I thought that is a worthwhile goal. Randy Juhl wrote a Senate Matters column and Lew Jacobson responded with great sense of humor that sometimes bureaucracy gets in our way of doing our work. All of those things made me think about how to make the research environment more conducive to faculty. If we are looking, I believe that there are enough places for improvement that broad based input can help. That is not to say it has to be a standing committee, it may be a plenary session, an open forum or something else. I will share with Vice Provost Mark Redfern what was discussed here today.

Frieze: When I was Senate President, there were concerns regarding unfunded research in the Provost's area and how the IRB Office was functioning. These issues were raised in FA and Randy Juhl heard the concerns and appointed an administrative committee to work with the IRB office. It's been an extremely productive committee and we have been meeting all of these years. We spoke to Chris Ryan, Director of the IRB Office and he thought a possible Senate committee was an excellent idea and was interested in serving as a staff member on the committee. Where he can hear faculty concerns on the function of the IRB Office. These are some of the concrete things that could be done if we had this kind of committee.

Spring: This discussion is not done and I urge you to continue to think about it.	
<u>Announcements.</u> No Announcements	None
<u>Adjournment.</u> The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 pm.	Meeting adjourned.

Members attending:

Alarcon, Baker, Buchanich, Burkoff, Butterworth, Cohen, Daley, de Montmollin, Flynn, Fort, Frieze, Fusco, Goodhart, Groark, Hravnak, Hughes, Karp, Kelly, Lewicka, Lunsford, Molinaro, Morel, Neft, Poloyac, Riccelli, Shafiq, Slimick, Smith, Smitherman, Song, Spring, Tananis, Tisherman, Weinberg, White, Wilson, Withers, Withiam

Members not attending:

Alexander, Bircher, Caldwell, Cauley, Chiarulli, Clark, Clermont, Erickson, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Jackson Foster, Jones, Leers, Lin, Majumdar, McKinney, Mohammed, Mulcahy, Munro, Nisnevich, Ramsey, Savinov, Skledar, Smolinski, Vieira, Weiss

\*Excused attendance:

Ansell, Beck, Chase, Costantino, Frank, Gaddy, Irrgang, Kear, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Lyon, McLaughlin, Miller, Novy, Savun, Sukits

Others attending:

Balaban, Barlow, Fedele

\*Notified Senate Office