

Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
October 6, 2015

| Topic/Discussion | Action |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p> | The meeting commenced at 3:00 PM. |
| <p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u> President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of September 8, 2015.</p> | The minutes were approved as written. |
| <p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u> There were no items of new business raised.</p> | None. |
| <p><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u> President Wilson did not do a verbal update at the 10/6/15 meeting, but instead provided his comments via email to FA members on 9/29/15. Those notes are provided below, for those not able to review in advance of the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will receive the final report of the Ad hoc Committee on issues related to Non-Tenure Stream (NTS) faculty, presented by Vice President Irene Frieze, who has served as its chair from the beginning. For the past two years the committee has carried out its mission, examining many aspects of the status and condition of full-time NTS faculty, giving progress reports, and making recommendations that were endorsed by the University Senate Council. 2. Related to that discussion will be consideration of a <i>Proposal to Amend Criteria for Appointment as Emeritus/Emerita Faculty upon Retirement</i>, submitted to the Executive Committee by Provost Beeson. This is an action requiring a vote by the Faculty Assembly. 3. There will then be up to an hour devoted to an interaction with Executive Vice Provost Dave DeJong regarding the next steps of the University-wide Strategic Planning Process (see his attached e-mail). From my discussions with him I know that we both are hopeful that the meeting will be “forward looking,” with substantive questions, critique, and practical suggestions. As many of you will recall, during the initial development phase of this project, Vice Provost DeJong and his team engaged the Faculty Assembly at our December, 2014 regular meeting. Subsequently, the Strategic Planning effort served as the focus of last year’s Senate Plenary, which became a significant “Town Hall” meeting that attracted a large University-wide audience. Going into this meeting, one framing question for me is, “What role should the Senate play as we begin the <i>operational phase</i> of the Plan?” 4. Our standing committees are active and dealing with many important matters. On October 19th we will convene an expanded Executive Committee meeting that will include not only the Senate officers, but also all of the committee Chairs. I expect that many progress reports will be forthcoming soon thereafter. | President Wilson added that Professor John Slimick, who was at Bradford campus since 1973, passed away last week. We remember him with respect. |

5. I also want to note that I recently hosted a meeting of the Faculty Senate Presidents and other officers from the Bradford, Greensburg, and Johnstown campuses, using the video classroom facilities at each of our locations. This experiment proved to be successful enough that we will be scheduling a follow-up session soon. We were able to discuss challenging issues and compare our experiences as we pursue our common mission of undergraduate teaching. Also eye-opening for all was to hear about the significant experiential differences among us. One realistic expectation is that using this technology will help link faculty from remote locations in collaborative efforts, and provide a way for them to become more directly involved in the work of the Senate. Similarly, I recently became aware that the Committee on Governmental Relations will be holding its initial planning meeting of the academic year as a *Webinar*. I'm anxious to hear how that works out, and would encourage all of us to explore possibilities for using new technologies to enable expanded and more effective participation in the operation of the Senate.
6. Finally, I want to report that Seth Weinberg (Dental Medicine) has assembled a planning committee for the March 30, 2016 Senate Plenary, which will focus on the contemporary meanings of *academic freedom*. Working with Seth will be Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee members Chris Bonneau (Political Science) and Rose Constantino (Nursing), Pitt's AAUP chapter President Beverly Gaddy (Political Science-Greensburg), Past Presidents of the University Senate Nick Bircher (Medicine) and Michael Spring (Information Sciences), Senate Vice President Irene Frieze (Psychology), and me. Of course, Lori Molinaro will be enabling our efforts.

One way you can help the committee is by sharing your ideas via the discussion board boxes that have been activated on the Senate's home page—which you can access using this link: <http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/>

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

Ad Hoc Committee to Investigation NTS Faculty Issues

Professor Irene Frieze, Chair

Professor Frieze reviewed the work of the Ad Hoc NTS Committee, which is at the end of its 2-year charge. In February of 2015, recommendations were approved at FA and Senate Council related to NTS issues. The Committee continued to meet over the last year, and their final report and recommendations, along with proposal to charge a new Ad Hoc Committee to continue this important work, was shared at the meeting. The Committee primarily worked on issues related to full-time NTS faculty.

Professor Frieze noted that NTS faculty are important to our university, and make up the majority of the faculty today. The respect they deserve is getting better, although it is not where it needs to be. The Ad Hoc Committee first learned how different parts of the university operate with respect of NTS faculty. The Committee outlined NTS items determined by the *individual units* and these were listed on the Faculty Assembly report, such as contract length, career tracks, and promotion procedures.

Questions/Discussion:

Stoner: What was the longest contract you found for NTS?

Weinberg: University policy allows for 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year contracts. Five year contracts were the maximum awarded we found.

Frieze: The School of Medicine, for example, has one year contracts routinely.

New recommendations in the final report were listed in *italics* on the updated October 2015 report and are noted below. Each new piece was voted on separately.

Previously Approved Ad hoc Committee Recommendations
[formally approved at Faculty Assembly on 2/10/15 and by Senate Council on 2/18/15, with verbal endorsement by Chancellor Gallagher and Provost Beeson]
With additional recommendations in italics

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. *We further recommend that policies relating to salary reductions or termination be included in these policies.*
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 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.
6. ***Institutional support and recognition.*** *NTS faculty members should enjoy institutional support and recognition appropriate to their faculty roles and responsibilities. All faculty members benefit from partaking in activities that*

Vote on updated recommendation #1, #6, and #7):

Approved as written:
None opposed; 1 abstention.

facilitate their development as academicians. Funding for such activities is often critical (e.g., travel to professional conferences). The process of allocating professional development funding should be fair and transparent.

7. **Shared governance:** *All units should include NTS faculty members into their decision-making processes and governance structures. Areas of governance where NTS faculty members could contribute include, but are not limited to, curricular revisions and development, recruiting and selecting faculty for new appointments and for promotions (especially of fellow NTS faculty members), student affairs and conduct, and graduate admissions.*

Questions/Discussion:

Updated recommendation #1: Clearly explained/accessible policies
No questions were raised.

Updated recommendation #6: Institutional support and recognition

Rohrer: This makes abundant sense. Was this included because it makes sense, or were complaints raised?

Frieze: This was included as it was raised as an issue that has occurred.

Goodhart: It is sensible and fair. I would like to see to an addition to this that work be done by increasing resources versus expanding further the existing faculty duties.

Updated recommendation #7: Shared governance

Professor Frieze continued her update to note that on the back page of the report, the different Senate Committees were noted for topics they could take on related to NTS issues.

Kovacs: It seems you are leaving implementation up to the units. I am wondering what will make the units change to make sure these recommendations are implemented.

Frieze: That is interesting and is one of our recommendations for the new AdHoc Committee: that it will follow-up on NTS issues for implementation.

Kovacs: Have you thought of anything else that can be done instead of just having a new committee?

Frieze: Many changes have already been made through the Provost's office, for example in Arts and Sciences, with consequences. Our feeling that publicizing the NTS issues has already resulted in positive changes.

Bratman: The follow-up committee refers to some who teach an occasional course and some who have a relationship with the school. This is another divide.

Frieze: The full-time recommendations are clear. The part-time definitions are more complex and need the 2nd committee.

Bratman: But what we are voting on says full-time and part-time in the Background section. Can that be clarified?

Wilson: Initially, we talked about full-time and part-time NTS and quickly we realized we could not deal with the complete spectrum, and changed our focus to full-time. The 2nd committee will handle part-time issue.

Frieze: The document does state full-time faculty, but we can emphasize that further.

Jones: Recommendation #7 implies that NTS would be voting on tenure stream issues.

Weinberg: This would not be happening – it would violate university policy.

Bircher: What is the feeling that if contract lengths vary (within law school) -- are the faculty comfortable with the variance?

Bratman: I do not think there is concern. We are close to equity.

Call to question:

All in favor of the new italicized recommendations: None opposed; 1 abstention.

Professor Frieze next presented the proposal for the new Ad Hoc Committee to address the following goals below:

Proposed Ad hoc Committee to Investigate Part-Time and other NTS Issues

Building on the ad hoc Committee to investigate NTS Faculty issues established in September 2013, we are proposing that a new ad hoc committee be established to continue the work of the earlier committee. Current committee members will be able to continue their membership on this new committee, and we will open membership to new members as well. We hope to include full and part-time representation from an array of units within the Provost area schools as well as within the Health Sciences units. We welcome suggestions or self-nominations.

Goals of the new committee would include:

1. Our first goal is to develop a greater understanding of the nature of part-time non-tenure stream appointments throughout the University. Based on this analysis, we expect to be able to distinguish at least two groups of these faculty, some of whom teach an occasional course or teach on one occasion, and some of whom have a continuing relationship with the University.
2. Once groups of part-time NTS faculty are established, we hope to propose ways in which their terms of employment and work environment might be improved, considering the needs of each group separately.
3. In our discussions, we hope to enhance our understanding of how the terms of employment and work environment for full-time non-tenure stream faculty can continue to be improved and review implementation of former recommendations. Our working assumption is that all full time faculty should enjoy institutional support and recognition appropriate to their faculty roles and responsibilities.

Savoia: All three goals seem important. The third goal seems most important, to keep track of NTS improvements, and Faculty Assembly could be kept updated on progress.

Goodhart: Has there been discussion of when it might be appropriate to create NTS positions versus tenure-stream appointments? In some circumstances, use of NTS might be a way to neo-liberalize the academy, with no mention of the broader use of NTS across the university.

Frieze: We have talked about it, but it is not within our purview. A separate committee would have to handle that resource/hiring issue.

Kovacs: Is it a fiscal or academic unit decision to create these positions?

Tananis: As a member of the NTS Ad Hoc Committee, I agree strongly with Michael's question. There is broad support for discussion of that, but it is a very large issue that we could not properly address.

Rea: Does salary come into our purview?

Formation of a new NTS Ad Hoc Committee for Part-time faculty, and to monitoring progress for full-time NTS faculty was approved unanimously.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Frieze</u>: That did come up, and I will be discussing this with the Provost’s office, especially as it relates to part-time faculty. Part-time faculty salary in particular is an issue.</p> <p><u>Stoner</u>: There are definitely issues with salary compression with NTS faculty. I was just looking at 2010 AAUP report for tenure and teaching appointments, and this is an issue.</p> <p><u>Rohrer</u>: Michael’s report is very important, and the new committee, could they consider it?</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: It certainly is important, and the work of the new committee will make this broader reach if needed. For example, our Standing Budget Committee is beginning serious interaction about this and will keep it out in the open.</p> <p><u>Bircher</u>: Correction to the report: last phrase needs and “r” for stream. Additionally, the tenure and NTS faculty need to have protections built into university policy. Persistently separating tenured and NTS faculty fails to achieve that goal. There are substantial fiscal issues to consider as they go forward.</p> <p><u>Weiss</u>: Is this report being done purely because the committee is ending its term?</p> <p><u>Frieze</u>: We are asking for new membership with part-time experience to join the committee, as well as doing this final report as the Ad Hoc Committee is ending its two-year charge. If anyone is interested or has a colleague who would be interested in joining, let Irene or the Executive Committee know.</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: If no more discussion, we should call for a vote.</p> <p>Any objections? None. All in favor? Yes</p> <p>Next, Professor Frieze presented a letter that highlights that NTS faculty previously were not eligible, except under “exceptional circumstances” to achieve Emeritus Status at the University. This practice dated back to 1958, and was stated in the Faculty Handbook by-laws. It was noted that “Senior Lecturer,” the NTS designation in Arts and Sciences, was not included originally in the updated letter of change from the Provost, but will also be included in this consideration moving forward. The Provost has been supportive of this and is asking for Faculty Assembly vote.</p> <p><u>Munro</u>: Where did this directive come from?</p> <p><u>Frieze</u>: It is in the by-laws for tenured faculty. The issue was raised to the NTS Ad Hoc Committee by Associate Professor Skledar and has been endorsed by the Provost and Council of Deans as needing to be changed.</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: If we pass this today, it will go to Senate Council for a vote next Wednesday.</p> <p><u>Stoner</u>: Can we make a friendly amendment to say “an equivalent rank”?</p> <p><u>Frieze</u>: Would the Provost accept “or equivalent rank”?</p> <p><u>Kirsch</u>: Yes, this would be accepted as a friendly amendment.</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: Let us call the question and vote.</p> <p>Any opposed ? No. Abstentions? No. All in favor.</p> | <p>The modification to the Emeritus Status for NTS faculty upon retirement was accepted as written, with friendly amendment. Unanimous approval.</p> |
| <p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p><u>Implementing the Strategic Plan</u></p> <p>President Wilson provided a brief introduction about how we bring ourselves into alignment with the new Strategic Plan. Executive Vice-Provost DeJong was present at the meeting to facilitate the discussion. Our Town Halls and Plenary sessions involved this work last year. Vice-Provost DeJong asked for time at Faculty Assembly today to discuss the Strategic Plan. All are encouraged to get things out in the open for beginning the implementation process. He noted that there was a short version of the Plan</p> | <p>There was significant dialog and information-sharing about the new Strategic Plan.</p> |

available for members of Assembly to view for the open discussion. He then turned the session over to Vice-Provost David DeJong.

Executive Vice-Provost DeJong noted he appreciates the chance to engage the Faculty Assembly in the Strategic Plan. He noted that the Plan at this point is a skeleton, and needs much more detail. The Plan itself is continually subject to revision as feedback and input comes in. The engagement process is critical to this. In the coming three days, three separate engagement sessions will be occurring, with more Open Forums occurring, including sessions with students, as we move from development to implementation. He noted that related to implementation, there are two parts. The Chancellor describes the Strategic Plan as the “North Star,” to guide our efforts in the same direction. One critical piece is alignment at the unit level, where the actions come to fruition. Units need to align with the university plan. There was a meeting yesterday with Council of Deans on this exact topic. There are supporting institutional plans, for example, the new capital campaign, will be aligned with the Strategic Plan. To help facilitate this, we have organized working groups around the five strategic goals of the plan. The leaders of those groups are here today to benefit from the Faculty Assembly discussion. The question is: *what actions should we be taking to advance on the Strategic Plan implementation?*

The leaders of the working groups then introduced themselves and/or were mentioned, including, but not limited to: Mark Redfern (research), Steve Wisniewski (foundational strength), Rebecca Bagley (partnerships, strengthening communities), Laurie Kirsch (community with PITT), Darlene Zellers (internal PITT community), Paul Supowitz (regional community with PITT), Pam Connelly (diversity and inclusion), and Juan Manfredi (educational excellence).

The floor was then opened for discussion.

Rohrer: By timing, our department had a retreat with Strategic Planning in mind. This grew out of a discussion in our school with alumni to increase our profile in the community and on a national level. How do we integrate what we did with this overall process?

DeJong: Do you see overlap with the Strategic Plan? Once piece looks at areas of current strength and leveraging those, for example, education centers that specialize in how best to teach subject matter. We also want to see how we can get the research coming from those centers into the classroom. There may be other areas where we are starting from scratch. We need to see what maps well, what new we should do, and what we can improve on. We also may be able to identify duplication and get a critical mass in an area of teaching.

Groark: We have roughly 70 people in our Department and have been doing work in strengthening the community. Are you saying if we see an overlap or overlay, we should go through Rebecca Bagley to connect and have conversations?

Bagley: There is so much going on across campus that is going into the community, that we need to know what those things are, and figure out how to align and scale the activities. The more activities that are woven into the fabric of the Strategic Plan, the more sustainable it is.

DeJong: If you know of initiatives going on, let the appropriate Working Group know. We are engaging broadly, and at times we will need to be narrow. Communication is a key goal.

Bircher: As part of the engagement process and development of metrics, there should be university-wide recognition for taking part in this effort. There is currently a wide

Topics of and leadership of the five Working Groups (and their associated subcommittees, if applicable) will be placed onto the Strategic Plan website.

range of encouragement to discouragement, for example, with teaching in other schools (as an example).

DeJong: We have heard this already, and we want to get leadership recognizing the benefits of this interprofessional teaching.

Bircher: In some schools, participation in shared governance is discouraged. Encouragement and incentives should be put into place. Effective reporting systems are very important so you can get real feedback.

Savoia: The expression “expanded opportunities to study abroad” is in two of the goals. Foreign language learning is not there. Is there an opportunity for foreign language learning?

DeJong: The working group on global community is working on this issue. This is in developmental phase right now, as our new Director has been here for just one year. For a Center to occur in this area, this would require more discussion in Arts and Sciences, but the discussion could be starting.

Bagley: This is a great example of alignment to decide if this Center is relevant.

Manfredi: One of the key objectives of Goal 1 is to use the latest pedagogical techniques in our courses. If there is a feel that we need to progress in foreign language, we can move forward on this to create potential Centers.

Kovacs: This sounds like top-down planning at the present.

DeJong: We hope it is not that. We started with a lot of engagement bottom-up. We are trying now to get back to groups like this, units, committees, to feed back what we heard, and see how we can identify key things we can focus on as a university.

Kovacs: The top-down approach in neurosciences is very positive and means you are using your brain, which is very good! I am curious about the specific initiatives included in these goals. These are very broad. I would like to see more specific lists for the initiatives and how we will get there. I would like to see the administration work with the Faculty Assembly existing committees to get a cross-section of input from the faculty.

DeJong: We need actions, metrics, charges, and responsibility for the goals and initiatives. Regarding engaging with targeted groups, we absolutely will do this. DeJong asked that if there are specific Committees that exist in these five areas, they should be engaged with the WG leader now.

Manfredi: For example, the SEPC Committee was involved and we presented information there and received great input.

Munro: I am wondering in the long-range, is there consideration of alternative energy sources? The university is a large consumer of energy.

DeJong: This will be addressed in the capital plan and building/facility planning of the strategic plan. The Senate PUP Committee has been very integral to this.

Wilson: I have had interactions with DeJong on this already, and so far, there have been many opportunities to interact and demonstrate shared governance. The issue for me (budgeting) has been where is this action supposed to take place. We are supposed to move forward but the policy is inconsistent on this and has been a paper process. All of us should look at our own areas of responsibility, and have we been doing the right thing all along, or should we improve our practices in alignment with the plan, from a budgeting perspective.

DeJong: We have been focusing on going through this with the current planning processes in place.

Wilson: What is the role of the Senate in this was my initial question. I hope we go back to our units to share this sentiment and move the strategic plan into our unit plans.

DeJong: This is a key set of constituents for us to engage with today (Faculty Assembly). In the next 3 days, we are engaging with planning and budgeting groups. The

engagement is not going to happen from the 8th floor of the cathedral. The entire plan is published at <http://www.pitt.edu/impact>.

Weiss: I find myself wondering – what is an example of something that would be different in 10 years?

DeJong: An example is the discipline-based approaches and centers actively engaged in research in that discipline, and then informing the way we teach those subjects in the classroom.

Manfredi: Personalizing experiences is a component of the plan. We have resource limitations on small class sizes but we can use technology to leverage this. This is possible in 10 years, as another example.

Kirsch: One of the things we envision is an environment where we can recruit and retain diverse faculty and have diverse faculty development programs.

Zellers: A mentoring culture could cross faculty and staff boundaries, and we have big ideas and hopes for this.

Bircher: Regarding strengthening planning and budgeting, it would be useful if the Deans and leaders would publish who is on these committees and working groups.

Goodhart: Many things come up across the five big priorities (strategic goals). It raises a challenge. There was a big event for university-based community engagement, and how scholars are doing research related to students, community and diversity. One of the recommendations from it was a Center to help make all of this advance. Where would one try to insert an idea like this – it fits into 4 of the 5 goals. What is the way to introduce suggestions that overlap goals?

DeJong: The overlap and synergy is purposeful. The working group leaders meet every Tuesday at 8am to go over synergy and collaboration between the groups. We want this collaboration to grow.

Bagley: Your topic has been a hot topic at the working groups. There is a lot of opportunity for knowledge transfer on what we are giving to the community and what the community is doing for us, and hopefully to scale these, perhaps in a Center. Impact is bigger if things are connected.

Norris: What is the research goal across the university?

Redfern: We are trying to come up with initiatives that span as much infrastructure as we can, for example, computation. We are listening to the disciplines at the schools to see what they are doing to come up ways to support them at the university level.

Norris: I am looking for examples that would cover across disciplines.

Redfern: It is interesting and challenging. They will be broken down and broad also, for example, big data analysis across schools. It could also be social sciences support across the university. We are trying to integrate these at the university level.

DeJong: Our “Year of” campaigns help us to identify issues, like the Year of Sustainability, across the university. These are coordinating mechanisms around a subject that comes from faculty and student discussions and raise it to a university level.

Bagley: What is going on across the university spans research elements in many areas.

Savoia: I think you will find that faculty in general are open and excited to do cross-disciplinary work. How on-board are the Deans?

DeJong: Of course, we have been extremely engaged at that level. We had a retreat yesterday (the 2nd one) with the Council of Deans for engagement and focus on the plan, including this goal. Deans need to have their plans aligned with the university’s plan, and measure the right things.

Savoia: Could the Deans come to the Faculty Assembly?

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Wilson</u>: That could be talked about and could be valuable. Deans have to align plans and practices with this. There needs to be confidence that top and bottom and middle will all align.</p> <p><u>Bircher</u>: Alignment of impact definition will have mid-level friction. Deans need to buy-into scholarly outreach in the community, for example. We need broad guidelines from the top on this.</p> <p><u>DeJong</u>: Commercial impact, patents, etc., are being discussed currently.</p> <p><u>Redfern</u>: Everyone agrees that definitions of impact on society, school, community must be recognized, all the way to faculty review.</p> <p><u>Norris</u>: I am hoping all of the Deans buy into this process</p> <p><u>Swanson</u>: Can we request that the implementation be done carefully? Deans will go to Department Chairs who will give to faculty who will not know details of metrics. That depth is not there. Please be careful with this.</p> <p><u>DeJong</u>: It does make a difference. The Provost meets with a Dean, and talks about relevant metrics and reasonable targets. There is coordinated discussion of metrics at the school, unit and provost level. We expect reports of metrics and targets that are reasonable, and that aggregate and represent unit level work also.</p> <p><u>A member asked</u>: Are the working group meetings open?</p> <p><u>DeJong</u>: This is up to the WG chairs. (Chairs commented on when some of them are meeting). There is not a list on the website of WG and chairs and members. We need to do a better job at communicating this. A listing of the Working Groups, and their related Subcommittees will be posted on the University's website at www.pitt.edu/impact.</p> <p><u>Kovacs</u>: I have not looked at the website, but is there a way if you can come up with a statement on the faculty in this change process. This is multi-year grandiose planning, and please keep the faculty involved in these changes as they (we) are directly affected. It is not clear how faculty are directly related to this. Faculty will be affected by this, but we can also affect the change. We will be more willing to contribute to this.</p> <p><u>Goodhart</u>: If the strategic plan becomes the plan for faculty to do what they want to do, this is great. If it becomes another metric for measurement, it may not succeed.</p> <p><u>Wilson</u>: Due to time, I have to call this discussion to an end. Faculty were encouraged to continue to provide input and thoughts through the available forums.</p> | |
| <p><u>Announcements</u></p> <p>Professor Seth Weinberg set up a question on the Senate Website about academic freedom and what faculty would like to hear about at the Plenary. If you could send a message out to your school to ask them to share thoughts, that would be appreciated. We would like to tailor the program to the interests of the faculty.</p> | <p>Please provide your input on the Academic Freedom tab on the Senate Website.</p> <p>www.univsenate.pitt.edu</p> |
| <p><u>Adjournment</u></p> <p>The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.</p> | <p>Adjournment at 4:38 pm.</p> |

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:

Beck, Bircher, Bratman, Clark, Cohen, Cole, Costantino, Czerwinski, Dahm, Donihi, Fort, Frieze, Goodhart, Groark, Helbig, Jones, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kear, Kovacs, Leers, C. Lin, Marra, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Munro, S. Nelson, Norris, Olanyk, Ramsey, Rea, Rigotti, Rohrer, Savoia, Skledar, Stoner, Swanson, Tananis, Toto, Weinberg, Weiss, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

Members not attending:

Alarcon, Dewar, Falcione, Frank, Gleason, Gold, Guterman, Irrgang, Kanthak, Kearns, J. Lin, Loughlin, Mauk, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, L. Nelson, Poloyac, Savinov, Schmidhofer, Smolinski, Triulzi, Velankar, Vieira

*Excused attendance:

Ataai, Buchanich, Corral, Flynn, Fusco, Gaddy, Hartman, Horvath, Hravnak, Jacob, Labrinidis, Muenzer, Mulvaney, Novy, Scott, Spring, Sukits

Others attending/guests:

Amato, Bagley, Barlow, Coghill, Connelly, DeJong, Fedele, Gentz, Kelly, Kirsch, Manfredi, Redfern, Wisniewski, Zellers

*Notified Senate Office