

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
September 3, 2013

Topic/Discussion	Action
<u>Call to Order.</u> President Michael Spring called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.	The meeting commenced
<u>Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 2013 Faculty Assembly Meeting.</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the June 4, 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. He noted that on the agenda, the Executive Committee has two items they will bring up at that time: NTS issues and videotaping a future Assembly meeting	No items of new business were brought forward by the assembly.
<p><u>Report of the President.</u> President Spring gave the following report: My presidential goal this year was to facilitate better communication this year among the faculty as it relates to shared governance. My personal goal this year is to learn from this experience and not make too many mistakes. Regrettably, I need to report two mistakes that I have already made. As some of you are aware a School of Medicine faculty member was inadvertently placed on the wrong ballot (other schools of the Health Sciences) related to the committee for the search of the Chancellor. The re-voting process began at 12:01 a.m. this morning, everyone has been contacted in several different way and they will have a full week to vote. On a more personal note, I wrote to many of you this summer asking for your help and ended my letter with the line “your contribution could not be underestimated”. Obviously most of you read it as I intended – your contribution cannot be overestimated. My apologies.</p> <p>When I was asked to run for Senate President, I was assured it would be an interesting experience and a reasonable work load. It surely is interesting, but only physicians could define the workload as reasonable! I want to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Thomas Smitherman for his quiet, competent and gracious service as President of the Senate. I had a sense during this past year about his efforts to work through matters quietly, collegially, and honorably, but I didn’t have a good sense of the extent of those efforts. I do now, and have already been the beneficiary of his quiet sage advice over the summer. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge his leadership and say thank you for both his leadership and his personal advice.</p> <p>While the University Times frequently asks the President for a</p>	President’s report was submitted.

reaction from the faculty perspective, this is not a one person job. I am learning just how important the team is and I am looking forward to meeting the broader team in October when all the chairs of the standing committees come together. I want to acknowledge the team that is taking shape and making things happen. I have already mentioned Tom Smitherman, I also want to acknowledge Linda Frank, who couldn't be with us today, but brings continuity to the team and provides a focused and critical view of issues. She has tremendous loyalty and commitment to the University and helps to keep things in focus. Professor Frieze is no less dedicated to Pitt and has encouraged and advised me as only a past president can do. Her passion and work ethic put me to shame and have been of great assistance these first few months. Finally, nothing would be possible without Lori Molinaro. Several of the items I will address in the remainder of my report are in large part her doing. It is hard to imagine that we as faculty could do this job without someone like her to manage the details. My thanks to them and to the many of you who have offered suggestions already.

As you all no doubt are aware, the Chancellor has announced that he will be stepping down next August. At the request of Stephen Tritch, Chair of the Board of Trustees, we initiated a process over the summer to fill five faculty slots on the search committee for a new chancellor. Electronic balloting began on August 26 and will end on September 10. I am very pleased with the responses we received for nominations, both in terms of the number of individuals (more than 50) as well as the prestige of those willing to serve. I think this is a tribute to Chancellor Nordenberg and the importance of his position to faculty involvement in the University. Related to this, Trustee Eva Tansky Blum has invited the executive committee to meet with her and Provost Emeritus James Maher, who will serve as vice chair of the search committee, to discuss the search process and seek our input. One of your colleagues has already written to me asking that the committee be made aware of the importance of finding a chancellor with a positive approach to shared governance. One of the items under new business is to discuss your view, which I will share with the chair and vice chair of the search committee

We have been working on a number of changes to our web presence. Some of you may have noted last year that when the University site was redesigned, references to the Senate all but disappeared. We were able to work with Provost Beeson and Vice Provost Balaban to restore those links and add more and making

the Senate more visible to the University community. Last year, President Smitherman worked with the Chancellor to secure funding for a new Senate website. Working with Dr. Smitherman over the summer, we were able to complete the negotiations for the design and execute it. It should be up within a week and if time permits I will show you a preview of what's there. Lori Molinaro put in many hours over the summer to populate the website. While it is still a work in progress, I believe you will find it to be more accessible to you from any device you might choose to use – from a smartphone to a tablet to a desktop. I also hope that you will find that the reorganization makes information you might need easier to find. I want to thank the Chancellor and Dr. Smitherman for making it possible. Of course, you need to make dreams a reality and I want to thank Lori Molinaro and her staff as well as Christine Cornely and the UMC team for making it happen.

Over the last couple years, the University Senate portal under my.pitt.edu has languished with the exception of voting. I asked the University's CIO, Jinx Walton, if we could get help in revitalizing it. She assigned Bill Rupp and Kit Ayars to work with us. We asked for the moon, and while a moon was not quite in the cards at this time, Jennifer Decima worked with Lori and the University Marketing and Communications team to give us a new portal. At this point in time, we were able to accomplish a couple of our goals. Basically, the main Senate Portal will be open to all faculty, but it will be controlled access unlike the public Senate website. The portal will provide access to 15 sub portals one for each of the standing committees that will only be accessible to the members of the standing committees. Each committee will have an announcements page and a discussion page where threaded discussions can be undertaken in private among committee members. Our goal is to make the lives of the faculty who do the critical work of the Senate easier.

I am pleased to report to you that it was my pleasure to open the Freshman Convocation on August 21st and to greet new faculty on August 22nd. Today I had the opportunity to meet with new members of Assembly.

As many of you will have noted, we have returned to Posvar Hall for meetings. This reduces our costs for the meeting room, allows us to return to our tradition of a little more in terms of refreshments and provides what I believe is a little better seating arrangement

Finally and this will be a discussion under new business, we asked Cynthia Golden of CIDDE, if it would be possible to stream and

<p>record a faculty assembly meeting as an experiment in opening up our activities to the broader University community. She graciously agreed to do it at no additional charge to the senate. We will discuss this matter under new business.</p> <p>I received, on behalf of the Senate a request to join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). Some of you who have a longer tenure will recognize that this was discussed once before, in 2005 I believe. The Coalition is an alliance of faculty senates and councils at schools in the NCAA’s Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS, formerly Division 1A), devoted to addressing major problems in college sports through faculty engagement at local and national levels. COIA was founded in 2002 and has grown to 61 member senates, half of the total number of FBS school senates, with faculty representatives from all conferences serving on its national Steering Committee. I have spoken to James Irrgang, co-chair of the Senate Athletics Committee and am referring the matter, which is a recurring invitation that has historically been declined, to the Senate Athletic Committee.</p> <p>President Spring concluded his report and no questions were raised.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.</u></p>	<p>none</p>
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p> <p>Vice President Irene Frieze discussed a motion to create a new ad hoc committee which is a continuation of earlier work which was done and came to Faculty Assembly in 2012. We were delighted with that process, but since then, I have been hearing informally about part time NTS issues as well as issues at the regional campuses. I have spoken to Carey Balaban from the Provost’s Office and he is happy to continue to work with us. Our specific focus this time will be to see how this can be implemented for the long term through our senate committees. A foci will be...what committees might deal with these issues in the future and how that might be done.</p> <p>The motion was read:</p> <p>Resolved, the Faculty Assembly endorses the creation of an ad hoc committee charged with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream 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</p>	<p>.</p>

well as identification of issues not currently within the purview of an existing standing committees. As examples, issues might include:

- Senate bylaws changes related to membership in the Senate
- Consistency of School and University policies on non-tenure stream faculty
- Use of titles for non-tenure stream faculty
- Contract wording, evaluation process, and grievances
- Benefits

Members of the ad hoc committee may be drawn from faculty, staff, and students. In particular, key constituencies will include: the Provost's office, heavily impacted departments and schools and standing committees of the Senate.

Professor Frieze asked for any comments/questions.

Paul Munro (IS) asked if there were NTS faculty on the assembly; also asked if NTS and TS faculty would both be on the ad hoc committee. Response was yes to both questions. Irene also elaborated that the NTS faculty on FA, are full time faculty, not part time faculty. Munro then asked if adjuncts were considered part time NTS? Irene responded in the affirmative.

President Spring commented that the only operative change for the Bylaws are... those part-time untenured faculty who annually indicate to the Director, Office of the University Senate, their desire for membership and who, during each of the two academic years previous to the desired year of membership, have taught a minimum of 6 credits per year for remuneration. That tends to put an onus on them taking action. As far as I can tell, that is the only thing in the Bylaws that may be reconsidered if this committee feels the Bylaws Committee should look into that.

John Slimick (UPB) – There is currently in place a policy regarding adjuncts from AAUP and I would hope the ad hoc committee would at least visit that. Irene responded that would be helpful and asked John to send her the link.

Jay Sukits (Bus) – Both of the Business school reps on Faculty Assembly are NTS. Jay has been here 13 years and at the Bus. School they also have faculty who are on one year contracts “visitors” and he didn't know how they fit into this.

President Spring commented that there is a diverse set of terms used in various schools

Jane Cauley, GSPH – Things are very different in GSPH as compared to the Business School, so make sure the committee has a mix of representatives from various schools.

Marilyn Hravnak (Nursing) – originally the NTS report you presented last year was a product of the GDI (subcommittee of the ADPC), do you feel your agenda is now larger and doesn't fit that structure? Frieze responded that the subcommittee was disbanded and no longer exists. Plus it isn't a gender issue, it's much broader.

President Spring commented that it should be an ad hoc committee, but it does touch upon many committees. The idea is not to solve problems, but to identify issues and find things that might fall between the cracks.

Carey Balaban (Provost's Office) It's a very complex issue and this is a great way to look at issues. I applauded the effort

Tom Smitherman, Immediate Past President - My personal perspective, the ideas/concepts are tremendously of value and strong. I had some of the concerns that Marilyn (Hravnak) expressed. Sometimes when we set up ad hoc committees it becomes something of a parallel universe: parallel to FA, to our standing committees of which we currently have 15. It's a little hard for me to understand if we need a new committee. I have one other concern since this does set up a parallel universe and our bylaws require the tenure to this committee to be limited to two years with an opportunity to be renewed for another 2 years. I personally think we should consider putting a time limit on this process so that knowing the issues, which committees need to deal with these issues, understanding if we need new committees, so we could do that sooner rather than later.

Frieze responded that one year may not be enough and she hopes to have a preliminary report by the end of the academic year. She personally would like to have the two years to work on the issues.

President Spring mentioned that Irene will be under great pressure from the Executive Committee to complete this as rapidly as possible to hand this back to the standing committees.

John Baker thought it was a good idea to form the committee and thought a two year limit was adequate. He then called the question.

Voted unanimously all in favor, no abstentions, no – no’s.

Irene thanked everyone and will solicit members as well as concerns that anyone has. She also plans to contact all of the committee chairs to solicit their input.

President Spring: Whereas the bylaws of the Senate state, “The Senate shall foster discussion and maintain adequate communication channels among students, staff, faculty, administrative officers, and the Board of Trustees on all matters affecting the welfare of the University or its constituent members.”

Resolved, the Faculty Assembly supports an experiment to provide streaming video and a recording of one meeting of the Faculty Assembly in the Fall of 2013 to members of the University community. The Assembly will be informed two weeks in advance of the meeting of the date selected and viewing of the video will be restricted to University IP addresses. Any portion of the Faculty Assembly meeting considered closed will be excluded, and the recording link will be accessible only through the Senate portal on my.pitt.edu.

To share a little background, we are a high tech institution and sometimes we use the most antiquated technology for our teaching, discussions and needs. This is just one way to say, you don’t need to walk across campus, you can sit at your desk to see what happens at the Faculty Assembly meeting. President Spring asked for discussion.

Bob Daley (CS) – asked if it would be streamed live or streaming of a recording?

Spring responded that his intent would be to stream it live, but to save it as a recording accessible through Mediasite.

Pat Weiss (HSLs) – Would you do any publicity regarding promoting this option?

Spring commented that the University Times has been very responsive to our efforts and that we would take various steps to let faculty know that the meeting will be recorded.

Bob Daley (CS) - Who would have access, students, staff?

Spring: I believe it would be very difficult to restrict it only to faculty, but I could ask. I believe the viewing of the streaming would be restricted to computers that have an IP restricted to Pitt.

Cindy Tananis (Education) – Can anyone attend FA or Senate meetings?

Spring: Meetings are open to anyone unless we choose to close a meeting

Tom Smitherman - many in the SOM have computers that are owned by UPMC and may not have Pitt IP addresses.

Claire Withers (ULS) – if it's a device at a UPMC site, some of the holdings are restricted there.

Marilyn Hravnak (Nursing) – Possible concern that if it's a live stream then the public will be able to get their hands on it. The potential does exist

Spring: I believe everyone would be sensitive to that and it would probably be a very bland Faculty Assembly meeting

Seth Weinberg (Dental Medicine) - Does the University have a general policy on university recordings of meetings?

Spring: It's my understanding that what has been done in the past is to inform faculty in advance and post a clear message about the fact that it is being recorded. We would have to be sensitive and respectful of our colleagues who might choose not to attend.

Paul Munro (IS) – What's the purpose of this? As I understand it, it's to increase faculty participation. If that's the purpose then let's try it, it's a good first step. There are lots of benefits.

Michael Goodhart (Political Science) - If the goal is to increase community participation of the Assembly then maybe we should start with the question, what are the barriers to greater participation in the work of the assembly and the senate, rather than with a solution which we hope will achieve a goal that we think is a good goal. In other words if we would like to have people more involved in the work we are doing, then maybe we should spend some time in thinking why aren't people involved in the work we are doing. We have a solution which doesn't seem likely to solve the problem.

Bob Daley (CS) – maybe try a multi-level approach, the first one limit to faculty only, then a 2nd recording one open to the entire community.

John Slimick (UPB) – called the question

No one was opposed; there was one abstention and everyone else in

<p>attendance voted in favor.</p> <p>Michael Spring commented that he will go back to the Executive Committee and seek advice on legal issues. He thanked the Assembly for their comments indicating that everything that was said makes sense. Further, he agreed that this might not make a difference but it is worth a try.</p> <p>President Spring: Trustee Eva Tansky Blum, Chair of the Chancellor’s Search Committee wants to meet with the Senate Executive Committee to find out what the faculty would like to see in the next Chancellor. I’m now asking you, what you would like us to say to her and Provost Emeritus Maher who is Vice Chair of the search. Pat Weiss, has already written to say we have had a Chancellor for the past 18 years who has been devoted to shared governance and that it is important that the next Chancellor also be interested in shared governance.</p> <p>John Baker (Dental Medicine) Person should be an academic & have academic experience.</p> <p>Cindy Tananis (Education) – Are there already statements or descriptions of shared governance that we could review/endorse as a group and ask that shared governance continues.</p> <p>Jane Cauley (GSPH) – We don’t want to rule out an internal candidate</p> <p>Jay Sukits (Business) – Someone who is committed to the community, understands the community, someone who understands Pittsburgh, someone who understands the relationship that the university has with the community</p> <p>Jane Cauley (GSPH) – Experience with working with governments, negotiating with the state.</p> <p>President Spring plans to report back after the meeting.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements.</u></p> <p>John Slimick (UPB), Bradford is kicking off its 50th anniversary with a Founders’ Day celebration today. Fifty years ago today, Sept. 3, Pitt-Bradford opened its doors to 288 students from several communities in Pennsylvania as well as towns in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. We are grateful for the collaborative relationship between forward thinking individuals in Bradford and the University of Pittsburgh to make a regional campus of this great university possible.</p>	<p>Information only; no action needed.</p>

President Spring mentioned that the Chancellor would be hosting a reception next Wed., Sept. 11 at 4 p.m. in the Chancellor's Office, 107 CL for all Faculty Assembly and Senate Council members.	
President Spring gave a brief presentation of the new Senate website and portal. www.univsenate.pitt.edu	Meeting adjourned.
<u>Adjournment.</u> The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 pm.	

Members attending:

Alarcon, Alexander, Baker, Butterworth, Cauley, Clark, Costantino, Daley, de Montmollin, Flynn, Fort, Frieze, Fusco, Goodhart, Groark, Hravnak, Hughes, Jackson Foster, Kelly, Labrinidis, Lunsford, McLaughlin, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Neft, Munro, Nisnevich, Ramsey, Riccelli, Savun, Shafiq, Skledar, Slimick, Smith, Smitherman, Spring, Sukits, Tananis, Weinberg, Weiss, White, Wilson, Withers

Members not attending:

Buchanich, Chiarulli, Erickson, Gaddy, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Jones, Leers, McKinney, Mohammed, Mulchay, Savinov, Smolinski, Vieira,

*Excused attendance:

Ansell, Beck, Burkoff, Caldwell, Chase, Clermont, Cohen, Frank, Irrgang, Karp, Kear, Kovacs, Lewicka, Lyon, Novy, Poloyac, Song, Tisherman, Withiam

Others attending:

Balaban, Barlow, Fedele

*Notified Senate Office