

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes  
Ballroom A, University Club  
May 1, 2012

<b>Topic/Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b><u>Call to Order.</u></b> President Michael R. Pinsky called the meeting to order at. 3:00PM	The meeting commenced at.
<b><u>Approval of the Minutes.</u></b> President Pinsky asked for approval of the Faculty Assembly Minutes of April 3, 2012	The minutes were approved as written.
<b><u>Introduction of Items of New Business.</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal - Alexandros Labrinidis</li> <li>2. Vice President Patricia Weiss</li> <li>3. Beverly Gaddy</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Report of the Senate President Michael Pinsky</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been a very trying month for the students, faculty, staff and administration for the University with all the cyber bomb threats.</li> <li>• Even before the notice by the so-called "Threateners" was received saying that they were calling off the threats, they seemed to be more in line with the "hacker" mentality than merely that of a student who felt "wronged" in some way. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hacker mentality believes that if you, as the victim, do not have the wherewithal to avoid being a target, then you somehow deserve what's coming to you; that if you do not see the world through the perpetrator's eyes, having spent however many years learning their field, and do not have the expertise to avoid the pitfalls that they see, then you deserve what you get. And whether or not the perpetrators believe they are fighting because they perceived that they were being insulted in some way, the fact is that since these attacks went on for so long, they were about the terrorists' egos, and nothing more.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The petulant note they emailed to the Pitt News underscores this attitude. They said they were upset with the Chancellor for posting a ransom, so they targeted the student dorms, preventing our students from sleeping or from any feeling of security. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is that an attack on the chancellor?</li> <li>• How does preventing other students from sleeping at night or studying during the day punish the University?</li> <li>• They also sent a bomb threat to the Oakland School for the Blind forcing children as young as 5, to be herded out into the open. How can they justify such attacks on the innocent and vulnerable?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• This domestic terrorism has had a hurtful impact on the lives of Pitt students, interrupting their classes, disrupting their study for final exams, and turning what should have been a final welcome month of study and celebration into one of fear, frustration and regret.</li> </ul>	

- What these terribly misguided students do not also realize is that their actions are felony crimes against the United States under the domestic terrorism statutes, not merely pranks against the University. There is no statute of limitation, no forgiveness of a prank.
- Even if they are not discovered for another twenty years they will still be arrested and tried. As is usually the case with such juvenile behavior, often little thought goes into the consequences of such actions.
- What they do not realize is that they repeatedly pointed a gun at the head of the university and said they would shoot.
- It grieves me greatly to realize that there is an element, presumably small and hopefully consisting of only one terrible disturbed child who has used their knowledge to hurt and tear things down in an institution that for 225 years has focused only on building things up and making its students the leaders of tomorrow.
- Leaving this unpleasant topic behind, Sunday's Commencement ceremony was an amazingly joyous affair.
  - As the Senate President, I was again honored to be the Chief University Marshall.
  - After opening the convocation I stood at the podium and saw all the students assemble as their families and friends cheered.
  - It is always an inspiring sight to see the students file into the Peterson Event Center, school by school, each in their own school's colors and with the camaraderie that four years or more has instilled in them all.
  - To hear cheers from family and friends of each group, named person or just the entire event reminds one why we teach and teach at this level.
- The other major item we have been working on is the creation of an Ad Hoc committee to review transgender use of public and personal facilities, mainly locker rooms and dormitory housing.
  - I have been asked by news groups to report on this issue as it has gained some level of public attention.
  - Once the composition of this committee has been finalized, we will post the charge for the committee and the list of committee members on the University Senate website for all to see.
  - Until that time I have nothing more to say about the committee, which I hope to be completed very soon.
- The Senate Benefits & Welfare Committee met and addressed the newly announced Voluntary Early Retirement Program (VERP) for eligible classified non-union staff.
  - To qualify, eligible employees must be 59 years of age as of April 1, 2012 and have a minimum of 10 years of continuous service. This offer is not presently available for faculty.
  - New enhancements for the VERP include:
    - 1) Retiree medical coverage starting at age 59. And coverage is

also provided for the eligible spouse/domestic partner. Furthermore, contributions to retiree medical coverage are waived until age 65.

2) A transition to retirement payment equal to six months of base pay less required tax withholdings will be provided.

3) A one-time infusion of DDB credits equal to \$6500 for the retiree and \$6500 for the eligible spouse/domestic partner. These credits are in addition to the monthly credits received by retirees.

- To qualify, employees must make an election to retire by June 30, 2012.
- Group meetings will be conducted on campus to explain the programs. In addition other resources will be available including TIAA-CREF, Vanguard, and Life Solutions.
- If early retirement plans will be offered to faculty in the future, my guess is that they will likely have a similar structure though the specific details may vary.
- Another major new item is the election of the senate officers and committee members for the next academic year starting July 1, 2012. A list of all committee members for next year is listed on a sheet at the front of the room and also on the Senate Website.
- The new senate officers are Professor Tom Smitherman President, Professor Jim Becker Vice President and continuing as Secretary Professor Linda Frank.
- Dr. Smitherman is a Professor of Cardiology in the School of Medicine and an established and respected academician.
  - Since coming to the University of Pittsburgh he has served as chair of the School of Medicine's Tenure Faculty Promotion Committee, Chair of the University Senate's Bylaws and Procedures Committee and been a Faculty Representative for many years.
- Professor Becker comes to us from the Department of Psychology with secondary appointments in Neurology and Psychology, where as a PhD scientist he has studied the impact of age on psychiatric illness and its differential response to treatment.
  - He has been one of our more vocal and active members within the Faculty Assembly for many years.
- Professor Frank, who is returning for a second year, is from the School of Public Health with secondary appointments in the Schools of Nursing, Medicine, and the Center for Russian and Eastern European Studies.
  - She is Principal Investigator for 2 DHHS-funded HIV training centers.
- As immediate past-president, I will follow in Professor John Baker's footsteps as being available for consultation and support next year. So you will still be seeing me around for another year.

### **Admissions and Student Aid Committee Chair Susan Shaiman**

- The University of Pittsburgh has experienced substantial growth in both the quantity and quality of undergraduate applicants to the Pittsburgh Campus. Guiding and shaping the University's recruitment efforts since 1986 is Dr. Betsy Porter, Director of the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid.
- Dr. Porter has implemented a strategic recruiting plan that has resulted in freshman classes with systematically increasing grade point averages, class ranks, and SAT scores. According to the Pitt Chronicle she has helped to shape policies that have improved student satisfaction, retention, and graduation rates. Under her leadership Pitt has been able to attract increasingly diverse, strong, and well prepared freshman classes.
- Dr. Porter has been an ardent supporter of the activities of the University Senate Admissions and Student Aid Committee. Dr. Porter will be retiring in June, very soon. As chair of the Admissions and Student Aid Committee, I would like to thank Dr. Porter for her remarkable legacy and service to the University over the past 25 years. Today we welcome her to the Faculty Assembly to reflect on the past, present, and future of Admissions and Financial Aid at the University of Pittsburgh. Thank you for joining us Dr. Porter.

### **Dr. Betsy Porter, Director of the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid**

- None of what I'm about to share with you could have happened without the active participation of the faculty. In the effort to move the University from being what anyone would have considered in the 70s and 80s a very good university to what we now believe is a great university.
- I typically present freshman profile information in somewhat of a longitudinal format to the Council of Deans each fall, also each year to the Senate Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid, periodically to the Senate Budget Policies Committee, routinely to the Enrollment Management Committee
- When Mark Nordenberg became chancellor and Jim Maher provost, they were interested in using 1995 as a benchmark for how the University was progressing
- I started at the University of Pittsburgh in 1978 and I am going to take you back in time. At that time, the University was a very different institution. The Office of Admissions and Financial Aid were on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor of old Schenley hotel which had not been renovated. Those were the days where we had grown as a public institution out of our private history but we hadn't quite come to terms with our growth.
- My first job was to do something about service, since the service wasn't all that good. My first experience during my first week was to sit in the reception area and what was happening was the phone was literally ringing off the hook
- Someone made the decision back then that the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid should physically be moved; not because they understood why we needed to be moved but more because the William Pitt Union was going to be renovated and everybody needed to be moved.
- In 1984 we got a new provost, Rodger Benjamin and the decision was made for Admissions and Financial Aid to be moved over to administration and away from the Provost Office.
- When I became Director in 1986, we got serious about merging Admissions and Financial Aid, meaning they would do admissions part of the time and then be

trained to provide financial aid services part of the time. So we did a lot with a very little in those days. Trying to train and retrain and negotiate with staff members to provide different services.

- Upon the arrival the new provost, Jim Maher there was significant interest in what was going on in the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid as being a critical component of moving the University agenda, certainly as it related to undergraduate students and the undergraduate experience. Gratefully we were moved into the Provost office.
- Provost and Jack Daniel and the senior management team there took seriously their charge to provide real leadership to Admissions and Financial Aid. From our perspective it was the first time there was a reality base to where the University was headed with undergraduate students and what the expectations were for an operation like ours. In the improvement of undergraduate students so that the experience we provided for them would be concomitantly approved as a result of what the faculty expected of our students. This is an institutional success story
- For those of you that have read the Middle States report, we have a lot of benchmark information in that report that is very useful for determining where the University was and where it is and where we hope to be. Just using that 1994-95 platform for comparison; 82% retention from freshman to sophomore is not bad. It's a reasonable expectation of an urban, public university that you would retain a little over 80% of the entire freshman that you bring. So for the past number of years we have been flirting with that 91-92% threshold of freshman to sophomore retention. That has much more to do with all of you and your faculty colleagues than it have to do with the admissions function.
- When you look at 1995 freshmen and you look at 2007 freshman you will see a remarkable change but that change has occurred incrementally over that period of time..... Progression from 7,825 applications to 23,409. .
- Back in the day we admitted 80% of all the students that applied. Now we admit a little more than 50% of all that apply. This is the profile of the class from last year. About 19% of freshman in that class ranked in the top 10% of their class. If you look at fall 2011 that figure is 54%, impressive in and of itself except that that's 54% of a significantly larger class of freshman. We are now enrolling 3700 freshman as opposed to 2700 freshman.
- Quality of enrolling student goes up the average SAT score is also going up.
- Considerable progress in our students coming from outside of Pennsylvania.
- Between 1995 and 2011 we had an application increase of 199%, 170 point increase on SATs, top 10%, and the increase in the size of class.
- The current status, application increase of 216%, this is an as of last week, for the fall 2012 class
- For applicants from 1995 and the majority of our applications, 7825, came from Pennsylvania.
- For 2012, this represents 378 applications from California, 314 from Illinois, 1064 from Maryland, 1735 from New Jersey, 1747 from New York, couple hundred from Texas, 500 from Virginia.
- We are currently implementing a new communication resource management system which frames our method of communicating with prospective students and families.
- This applies only to the Pittsburgh Campus. I'm doing no reporting on the regional campuses but we do have cooperative, collaborative options program where if a student is not admissible to the Pittsburgh campus we provide them with the closes

regional campus option that meets either their program requirements or their geography, their demographic profile.

- Challenges that we face are that Pennsylvania continues to have a decline in high school graduates; from 1978 to 1994 there was a 34% demographic decline; from 2004 to 2014 it is around 10%.
- Our tuition, both for Pennsylvania students and out-of-state students, provides its own set of challenges for us. Students do a lot of self-selecting, so once you start to advertise, which is why I've said to the University at times "Please don't print an average SAT score" because what happens is that students will decide if they have a 1270 that they won't get in, so we have to battle the reality vs. the myth. That's one of the reasons why we still want our staff out in high schools talking to guidance counselors so that they understand the reality.
- So the good news; we're operating from a position of real institutional strength. If we keep moving I think that we'll gain a lot from our institutional momentum.

### Comments/Questions

- Dr. Pinsky: We were all concerned about what the bomb threats would do to enrollment.
- Dr. Porter: We have to wait until Friday but as of today we're in good shape.
- Prof. Baker: I've had the privilege of being the senate liaison to the Admissions and Financial Aid committee for the last 6 years. Betsy's always been a gracious host to the committee and the slides you just saw give testimony to the remarkable job that she and her staff have done in recruiting students to the University of Pittsburgh over the last 15 years. In recognition of her excellent service, the senate executive committee has a small gift for Betsy and we wish her the best in her future endeavors.
- What is the percentage of international students
- Dr. Porter: Until 4 years ago, international student admissions reported to the Office of International Services in Student Affairs. The Provost made a decision to move International Recruitment Admissions into the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid. Over the past 4 years the applicant pool has literally exploded as has the number of enrolled students, although still relatively small for an institution of our size. Last year we enrolled 128 international students.
- In the slide where you showed Applicants, Admissions, and Deposits; I was struck by how low the deposits are. Is that that a factor as competitive students applies to many schools?
- Dr. Porter: You have a higher quality on average in the admitted group. Students of quality today may apply to 8-10 different institutions and many of them are getting admitted to most of the schools to which they apply. Probably half of our applicant pool is outside of Pennsylvania so the sheer number of competing institutions is fairly significant. The other phenomenon is the international component; 2500 apply, 600 admitted, 1-6 yield.

### Special Committee Reports

#### Senate Computer Usage Committee - Prof. Alexandros Labrinidis

- Ongoing initiatives
  - "Read Green" has been implemented. So far haven't seen level of adoption that we think would be appropriate. Attributed to lack of awareness.

<p>Recommending that “Read Green” become default but not mandatory option. If people prefer to get announcements in paper they still can but default would be electronic so we are not wasting paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital Vita, part of the faculty information passport that the Provost is building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reiterated to CSSD feedback from Faculty Assembly that this not be yet another system that we add information to.</li> <li>○ The version that’s being build will try to integrate with existing systems and will try to be customizable.</li> <li>○ This was slated to be available in late March but due to the disruptions from the bomb threats it has been pushed back a bit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Postini and Spam filtering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In March of this year there were 37.5 million email messages sent to the University; 30 million were spam or viruses.</li> <li>○ To make this manageable there are 3 levels to handle mail, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the final level is you getting the email in your mailbox,</li> <li>▪ previous level mail is marked spam or virus and quarantined and you can see it through my.pitt.edu portal,</li> <li>▪ There is also another level – some are marked blatant spam and not even delivered. This is tricky; detecting spam is not an exact science. There are cases where things are marked spam and rejected even though it isn’t spam but you aren’t going to be able to see it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Given the volume and so far it seems to be reasonable but if it becomes an issue please bring it to attention and it will be addressed in the future.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Background for motion to be put forth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Over the past two years we have identified multiple places on campus where there is the potential for improvement in term of doing things electronically rather than using paper.</li> <li>○ When the Provost mandated cost cutting measures it became less of an academic discussion and more a need to make this a reality.</li> <li>○ We identified essentially 3 areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are still processes that are done exclusively on paper.</li> <li>▪ There are processes that in part have been switched to electronic but there is still a paper component.</li> <li>▪ There are processes that are electronic but have not reached their full potential.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ There is also electronic but done from different units of campus at the same time that introduces redundancy and that is really bad.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> We recommend that the University redesign current processes with the goal of completely eliminating paper forms through the use of information technology. This would be done at every level i.e.: departments, schools, and university and with input from all stakeholders including faculty. The thoughtful implementation of this initiative is expected to improve efficiency and reduce costs while having a positive environmental impact.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Does this motion address the issue of synchronizing the databases?</p> <p><u>Prof. Labrinidis:</u> We said the thoughtful implementation of this initiative. We didn’t put it explicitly but that is the understanding once you rethink the design of the entire</p>	
--	--

process at every level you need to consider the different levels and how they interact.

Has there been any study done of the actually paper reduction? For example in graduate admissions the students apply electronically but then everything is printed.

Prof. Labrinidis: Again this goes on the thoughtful implementation. When we say all process we do mean to make everything electronic so that you don't have to use paper. I really like Dr. Porter's admission that she did not like the paperless office initially but she could see the benefit. In the Computer Science Department for example we implemented applications management software to handle graduate applications and we set it up so that the whole process is electronic including the reviewing, adding comments to the different folders, voting on the folders. We did the same for faculty recruiting as well. If you have a system that only goes half way then people are going to print things and do stuff with printed forms. If you design the system from the beginning to handle all the activity that it should handle, then this is taken care of.

Dr. Pinsky: I think the way you phrased it; you were talking about thoughtful involvement. We have for example smart boards that you are projecting from the screen and you can actually touch the screen and move it around for when we look at admissions or we have our several committee meetings for promotion or reappointment so there's not these great big packets of paper. But I don't believe that this will happen overnight and this proposal doesn't say it will.

According to you motion is says "redesign current processes with the goal of completely eliminating paper." Do we have an absolutely secure facility for signatures on these documents? We have documents which require 5 signatures plus the students.

Prof. Labrinidis: This is an implementation detail. I agree security definitely needs to be a part of this and needs to be addressed. But I don't think a signature on a piece of paper is more secure than an email reply for example.

But we have some documents like purchase orders that we have to keep with a signature, because people from Harrisburg come here and look at them.

Prof. Labrinidis: I'm sure there are some legal exceptions or something that is outside the University. But there are all these processes that are internal to the University that still have forms in triplicate that I think should be eliminated.

I want to see the secure signature and then I'll get more enthusiastic about this.

Dr. Pinsky: I think that this is part of the technology that's evolving. I have to sign things for the NIH electronically all the time. I never mail them my signature ever and I've got three grants. They do that.

Can you go over the part about synchronizing databases? Which Databases are we talking about?

Prof. Labrinidis: The idea is that for the same type of data there are two records being kept. There is the official University record and then the Department or the School typically has its own shadow database to provide updates during the one month interval.

At some point there needs to be some reconciliation. There are 2 ways to do this, either you provide the University data at more frequent intervals for updates or this reconciliation but you make it as automated as it can be. So there is no reason for matching side by side numbers that are 95% the same. This could be done by a program if these two databases were talking to each other.

To what extent is this already happening spontaneously?

Prof. Labrinidis: In the Computer Science Department we try to automate as much as possible. But I'm guessing we are the exception.

It seems to me any centrally mandated decision like this has to take into account the fact that different units will be in different places

Prof. Labrinidis: Sure. There is a requirement and there is making it easy for people to do the right thing. If the University makes it easy for the University processes to happen electronically and provides a good way for the departments to do things electronically then I'm pretty sure they're going to do the right thing.

Dr. Frank: Have you discussed the cost of implementation of this; the cost of equipment, hardware, software, training of staff, to actually do all of this electronically?

Prof. Labrinidis: No, I have to admit we haven't discussed it. There is a bit we don't know, how much the current cost to run things by paper is. We're not saying within one month of implementing this that the cost savings from paper are going to make it better. But we believe that in the year 2012 we should not be filling forms in triplicate around campus. I agree some processes may be too expensive but I'd much rather this is an exception and everything that can be handled electronically be done electronically. It's not just the cost of paper but the price of getting things from point A to B. Hardware and software do have costs but given even small benefits across campus, multiplied by how many faculty and students, I think this would be worth it.

Dr. Frank: Has there been any consideration of where you would begin with implementation?

Prof. Labrinidis: We are not privy to all the systems that work in the University but Research Accounting is one that we've identified already.

Dr. Pinsky: The motion carried with 3 against; 2 abstains.

#### **Senate Educational Policy Committee – Prof. Kathleen Kelly**

**MISSION OF SEPC**: [our mission statement remained the same --we added some examples of issues that the committee has dealt with in the past few years]

The responsibilities of the Educational Policies Committee include:

- 1) Initiating proposals and recommendations related to the development of excellence in the intellectual programs and teaching climate of the University.
- 2) To study reactions to University-wide issues and proposals related to the educational

aspects of academic plans and programs.

3) As appropriate, our committee may study and offer advice on preliminary papers related to academic policy and planning that emanate from the offices of the Chancellor, the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for the Health Sciences, and other major administrative offices.

- The proposals and recommendations related to the academic programs or the intellectual climate and image of the University. Such proposals or recommendations usually will be channeled through the Senate for further discussion before being brought to the attention of the University administration.
- Does not preclude the possibility that in some instances the Committee will explore the feasibility of a proposal directly with administrators before it is transmitted to the Senate. Examples include: developing a statement re: classroom recording; explore issues related to ADD/DROP deadlines and policies; collaborate with the Senate Committee on Admissions & Student Aid to address issues related to retention; and working with the Registrar's Office to suggest changes to the Pitt transcripts.
- Our committee met 5x this year and will meet again in May. At the start (and at the end of the Academic Year) we invite Dr. Cynthia Golden from CIDDE to present on new initiatives and updates.
- Monthly updates from Vice-Provosts Juan Manfredi and Alberta Sbragia: Both routinely attend the SEPC meetings and give the committee relevant updates from their respective areas of responsibility.
  - Dr. Manfredi provided our committee with ongoing updates on the progress of the Middle States Accreditation Self-Study preparation and the goals of the site visit which occurred last month.

#### MAJOR ISSUES THIS YEAR:

Content of the Pitt transcript: This issue was brought up that the official Pitt transcript does not list AP (or IB) courses on its official transcript. Rather, the transcript merely reflects that a block of courses worth **x-number** of credits were accepted by the University—the Pitt transcript **only** lists courses that were taken at the University. We invited Ralph Hertel to our meeting to begin to address this issue. At the first meeting we circulated example transcripts from AAU and non-AAU institutions were circulated (AAU schools represented were: Penn State; University of Michigan; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Indiana University; University of Rochester; the non-AAU transcripts were from West Virginia University and the University of Delaware)

- In order for the University of Pittsburgh to include AP and IB detailed information on the official transcript a modification of the PeopleSoft software will be required-- the Registrar's office is requesting the modification to PeopleSoft. The Fit Gap document will assist in determining the cost of the project. Once the cost has been determined, the PeopleSoft Project Management Teams will work with the Provosts office to determine if the project should be implemented, and if so, where it should reside on the project priority list.
- At the present time a DRAFT design of the new XML Transcript is in progress and includes detailed test credit information. However, it is not the highest priority project we are working on with CSSD. Once the design is completed, it will require approval from the Provost's Office prior to implementation. I would anticipate a project completion of early to mid-Fall Term. An example transcript was brought to the meeting

as a demo.

Student access to OMET evaluations: This issue comes from students requesting that course evaluations be made accessible *prior* to them registering for classes. They would like to have legitimate access to student feedback about specific courses and faculty before they register AND they made the point that many students are currently using information on public websites such as 'Rate My Professors'. Mr. Zimmerman (UG representative to SEPC) presented the committee with benchmark data that he and his SGB colleague, collected from several institutions which included: Tulane, Maryland, CMU, Duke, Rutgers, Georgetown and Johns Hopkins. The summary of these schools' experiences was generally positive and in many cases there were incentives built in for students to complete the evaluations so they would have access to the information.

- The committee agreed that this was worth pursuing but would require careful study of the implications. As well, there would be different implications across the schools.
- Dr. Sbragia reported that she met with a representative from the Pitt Business School who shared their experience with this process. The Business School has made the quantitative aspect of course evaluations available for several years now. The decision was voted on by the Faculty representing both the undergraduate and graduate programs. The average scores are listed for ***all*** courses and are available in a binder that is kept in the library. Anyone is able to review this information. The Business School has used this as part of their internal and external benchmarking and as a means of continuous improvement.
- The SEPC was in favor of exploring this option and will await the result of discussions when it is brought to the A&S council.

#### Comments/Questions

- Dr. Pinsky: The Chancellor did report to us that in fact the (Middle States) evaluation was highly favorable and they commended us. They said some Universities think that they've got something special going, you do. That was very pleasing to hear.
- One other question: apropos of what Betsy Porter was saying about the significant increase in the absolute number of students – has the process of teaching and evaluations kept pace with the number of students because I don't know if the number of faculty has increased proportionately to the number of students that we've had. At least my recollection is that is not the case. Have you looked into class size, turnaround of grades, that sort of thing?
  - We have not discussed that. That was some of the discussion that the students brought discussion around that sort of quality issue as well as other issues and knowing more about what they are registering for before they register.

#### Elections Committee – John Baker

Available to you are two handouts, one for the newly elected officers of the senate and the newly elected representatives to faculty assembly.

- President Pinsky has already announced the new officers and you can read the names for representatives to faculty assembly.
- 2012 Senate election committee winners, you can read this as reported in the in the University Times
  - Vote totals for this year is down; in 2011 20% of the eligible voters voted, this year 13%.
  - For Senate Officers; 2011 11%, same at 11% this year.
  - Personally I would like to see more faculty voting than we had.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next year's election committee will be chaired by Michael Pinsky.</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>Items of New Business.</u></b></p> <p>1. Patricia Weiss: The Senate Matters column in the University Times has been on hiatus. With the extraordinary spring we've had it was difficult to pull back and get some perspective and find people who wanted to write columns. But we still have a couple of months left in this year and I would be very interested in having submissions from people on any topic but especially maybe you want to reflect on what we've all just been through.</p> <p>Dr. Pinsky: I also want to thank Pat who's been chairing the Senate Matters column for the last two years. I had that delightful chore for two years myself; it is a lot of work.</p> <p>2. Beverly Gaddy: I'm concerned when faculty governance, shared governance does not work the way it's supposed to and procedures are not followed. So I am dismayed and concerned about the decision that occurred in the Arts &amp; Sciences school regarding the suspension of the three grad programs, German, Classics, Religious Studies, apparently I understand, without the full involvement of the faculty and students in those decisions. I know that this was a matter in one school but I know it occurs in other schools as well. I've heard of other incidences of this, certainly it's occurred in Greensburg. But we have procedures and processes and policies in place to ensure faculty involvement and yet there doesn't seem to be a good check on that when that does not occur. I think this is a matter for this body to investigate, to look at, and to ensure that when these procedures and policies do not occur as they're supposed to what is the recourse, except to come to this body and ask that they take a look at it.</p> <p>Dr. Pinsky: I have been approached by the three chairs of those various departments and they have talked with their dean and also we're had private and public conversations with the Provost and the bottom line is that what is happening is a discussion is occurring and no final decisions have been made but there will be progress towards consolidation of the departments as part of the school of Arts &amp; Sciences mandate. But it will be done using appropriate process and with dialogue between the departments within the school of Arts &amp; Sciences based on policy. So statement that the graduate schools were going to be eliminated and that was it is actually inaccurate. It was to start the discussion of how would they decrease them or mold them into other departments, analogous to how Italian and French are merged into one department.</p> <p>Gaddy: The point is that these decisions are being made without faculty input.</p> <p>Dr. Pinsky: There will be faculty input.</p> <p>Gaddy: The decision had already been made and there was not faculty input on that decision.</p> <p>Dr. Pinsky: My understanding is, and we have talked with people from the various departments who are at the table here, that faculty input is being sought now. What happened was, not the final decision, the decision was made they will come to the table. This is also an internal matter within the Dietrich School of Arts and Science, we have also gone forward as your executive committee to discuss this with the Provost and have had conversations in which we are assured that the conversations will go along policy and will be between the groups. So this is not a fait accompli, it is the start of a discussion of what will happen. So I can't say any more than that because I don't know any more and it's internal to the School of Arts and Science.</p> <p>Gaddy: There is still the large concern about when these policies are not followed what</p>	

<p>recourse the faculty have.</p> <p>Dr. Pinsky: I believe they came to me almost immediately and I believe we talked to the Provost almost immediately after a little due diligence. So the answer is that there is a process by which there is concern of anyone in the faculty about anything that has to do with the academic life at the University they can bring it up at the Faculty Assembly and they can talk to your elected officials and we will be there for you, as we were in this case.</p> <p>Though we will not be meeting over the summer we are meeting next month. The senate executive is going to actively be here and will be in consultation as needed if Arts &amp; Science should feel this is appropriate. I was given assurances by the Provost that due process would be done and everyone would be talked to and it would not be a fait accompli it would be a discussion of process. And that this would be meant in a way that would benefit Arts &amp; Science. But Arts &amp; Science is remodeling, as are most of the schools. And this is a part &amp; process of becoming a better University no matter what. The only thing I can guarantee you is that things will change. And that will always be the cast. That's the only thing constant is there will be change.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senate council meeting will be held Wednesday, May 9<sup>th</sup> in Posvar Hall</li> <li>• Next Faculty Assembly meeting is June 5<sup>th</sup> here in the University Club</li> </ul> <p><u>Adjournment.</u> Meeting was adjourned at. 4:32PM</p>	

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Rose Frank, PhD, MSN, ACRN, FAAN  
Associate Professor, GSPH  
Senate Secretary

Members attending:

Baker, Bircher, Chaiklin, Close, Constantino, Costantino, Frank, Frieze, Gaddy, Gallagher, Galloway, Hartman, Hravnak, Kearns, Kelly, Labrinidis, Lin, Lyon, Miller, Molinaro, Munro, Neft, Neufeld, Pinsky, Redmond, Rickman, Sereika, Shaiman, Singh, Slimick, Smith, Smitherman, Song, Sukits, Terry, Weiss, Withiam

Members not attending:

Barker, Bauer, Beatty, Bonneau, Caldwell, Chase, Chiarulli, Clermont, Cohen, Daley, Feuer, Greenberg, Looney, Lunsford, Majumdar, Muenzer, Pan, Rougeux, Savinov, Skledar, Smolinski, Steinberg, Towers, Wendell, Wilson

\*Excused attendance:

Balaban, Bartholomae, Beck, Becker, Berkowitz, Buchanich, Burkoff, Culley, Fabian, Flynn, Gleason, Harbert, Kane, Kear, Kovacs, Savoia, Spring, Tananis

Others attending:

Blair, Barlow, Fedele, Fort, Hart, Porter, Withers

\*Notified Senate Office