

Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
April 14, 2015

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Michael Spring.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:02 PM.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes</u> President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of March 17, 2015.</p>	<p>The minutes were approved as written.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u> Two new motions will be brought up related to research initiatives. We will discuss these later in the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion from Professor Thomas Hales -- Faculty report on Academy-Industry Relationships • Motion from Professor Michael Goodhart -- “Making an Impact through Commercialization” 	<p>See later discussion.</p>
<p><u>Report of Senate President, Michael Spring</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the 2015 Senate Elections – Elections are underway and will end on April 22nd. If you have not voted, please do so. A few people have reported that some views of the ballot do not show all those running on the same screen. President Spring noted that his recollection is that he did see all the candidates. Keep in mind there are two people running for president and 3 people running for vice-president. 2. Regarding the my.pitt.edu portal –The Senate Computer Usage Committee has been discussing the matter. We are being told by CSSD that they are unable, or unwilling, to make access to UPMC or retirement information an option. As you will recollect, the results of that survey to give us better information for the discussion showed, more than 60% were aware of the links, and 30% and 25% respectively had used it for retirement access and access to UPMC. When asked about single sign-on (SSO) access to these resources, 25% favored it, 41% did not favor it, and 34% preferred an arrangement where they could opt in. We will have more on the current state of the negotiation when Senate Computer Usage Committee (SCUC) reports. There is a motion also for later discussion today. 3. Regarding university travel – The Provost has proposed changes in the University’s international travel policy that would increase requirements for reporting travel abroad by faculty and students. Given the lack of any objections noted on our Senate website, President Spring suggested that Faculty Assembly vote to endorse the policy change put forward by the Provost. The guidelines were distributed for today’s meeting. <p>Frieze: In the guideline, what do “conferences” mean?</p> <p>Spring: If the conference is paid for by the University (it says “using University funds,”) it should be considered eligible.</p> <p>Savinov: This was originally announced as “encouraged to.” It now says “required</p>	<p>Discussion occurred regarding travel guidelines (see below, item #3). The item was tabled and will be brought back at the May meeting with more context.</p> <p>Other discussion/comment are listed below.</p>

to.” This is a big difference.

Spring: Two changes with the March 2015 update are: a) faculty are now required to record their travel itineraries; and b) students must register even if non-credit study abroad. Staff and graduate students were always required; faculty were strongly encouraged. Now it is “required” for the faculty.

Savinov: Are we voting on this?

Spring: I would like a faculty assembly vote on this as it is within our scope for the Provost. I am going to call upon a vote for the faculty assembly.

Savinov: I would like to encourage everyone to vote against this. I discussed this with several faculty, and every person I talked to views this as offensive. There are enough faculty that strongly object, that I am going to vote against this requirement.

Weinberg/Kovacs: What is reason for this?

Spring: This came out in Spring of last year during the Ebola outbreak. The University was queried by the government about faculty abroad and we could not answer.

Goodhart: With the existing guideline, the data will be limited to administrators – now it sounds like this information will shared with the government.

Weinberg: This talks about travel for university business. Many folks are traveling abroad not on university business and this is not completely protective.

Spring: This is meant to provide protection, and benefits far outweigh the cost. I do understand though the desire for privacy.

Bircher: We are being asked to take an advisory vote. I am not sure how this fits into the ordinary resolution process. We may need more time to formulate an opinion on this.

Spring: The University Times had an article on this. The Executive Committee reviewed this and did not have issue with it. We posted a faculty feedback link on the Senate website, which did not receive any comments. We are discussing this today as well. The accompanying documents on the website include background and the old and new policy. It has taken six months for the Provost to get the information together, and it was meant to be discussed today at Faculty Assembly.

Jones: What is the ramification if one chooses not to follow this? Is there any penalty?

Spring: My guess is that reimbursement of expenses will be at risk.

Savinov: I feel exceptionally strongly with this “required” word. This is a small part of a bigger picture. There are people that want faculty to live by certain standards. We are going to play along with this and lose, and this is how they destroy academic freedom. I suggest everyone consider not supporting this

proposed guideline change.

Kovacs: Nick – can you clarify what is going on? These are little insults that add up over the years to lose our academic freedom.

Bircher: As I understand it, there is not a resolution on the floor. We are being asked to take an advisory vote by President Spring for the Provost. The Provost has shared with the Senate a new policy on travel with two new pieces: faculty are required to report, and students are required to register for credit/non-credit.

Kovacs: The Provost decides the policy, and sends to the Senate. Is our approval required?

Spring: The Provost sent the policy to the President and it was shared with the Executive Committee. I asked for a month of time so I could post the document and its background on the Senate website and invited comments. We have received no comments. I put this on the Faculty Assembly agenda today and since we have received no comments, we can give her the opinion of the President, Executive Committee, and the Faculty Assembly at-large. I see personally no problem with this. I think what we do is a personal matter. I would feel better if we take an advisory vote from Faculty Assembly. We don't owe the Provost that, but I would like Faculty Assembly's vote.

Kovacs: Most of us do not sit around looking at the Senate website. We should work on improving communication between administration and faculty with what is going on.

Spring: I respectfully disagree. I said to the Provost that we would need a month. I thought this was motivated by legitimate causes. We posted information that we are discussing today.

Smitherman: Carey Balaban presented this to the Executive Committee as a helpful guideline, so the University could let you know about problems and assist with help or extraction.

Kovacs: Why be punitive?

Spring: If the new policy is in place, the question that was asked was where would the teeth come from? One answer is you lose tenure and be fired (will not happen). The second approach is that your university expenses may not be enforced (more likely). The exact teeth are not in the guideline as it is written, however.

Tananis: Some of the issues in question are: a) no rationale for this has been provided on the handout; and b) no teeth are explained.

Spring: All of those documents were provided on the website last month. We try to provide all faculty with information, and keep paper printing to a minimum.

Jones: Was the enforcement (teeth) on the website?

Spring: No.

Tananis: I have not read those documents on the website. I think it makes sense

for us to read it and encourage our colleagues to read it, rather than assume things.

Spring: I suggest we table the item today. I will explain to the Provost what transpired today with this discussion. I will bring up as an advisory vote next month (May).

Bircher: Could it be brought up in the format of a resolution with more information?

Spring: Yes, I will do that.

- 4. Regarding OMET surveys** – President Spring asked if it is time to examine whether we should use on line OMET surveys. There have been differing reports on the number of students responding and the composition of the students who do respond. It might be good for Educational Policies Committee to review this again.

Horvath: This was discussed at our EPC OMET Working Group meeting, and we meet Friday and then Monday (full EPC). We reviewed the last OMET reports of 57% response rate and will discuss further.

- 5. Regarding the Standing Senate Committee structure** -- We put information out and solicited your input following discussions with those most involved. Generally, the changes were positively received and we have had no input suggesting there are any further matters of concern related to the changes. There has been one other development. Early on, we thought the reorganization might involve some changes related to the University Press (UP) committee. It became clear that the suggested changes were not well-received, and we put the matter on the back burner. However, as a result of the initial discussions, it became clear that there were structural issues related to the bylaws for Standing Committees (structure and function) and the important role played by the Press Committee in advising the outside Press. After discussion, and a vote by the Standing UP Committee, it became clear that the needs of the University and the Press would be better served by a Provost's level committee design. Requirements of Senate Committees do not fit for the operations of University Press committee. The Provost has considered the matter and has agreed to immediately form such a committee should the Senate vote to dissolve the current UP Senate committee. Thus there will be a motion related to the UP Committee reorganization later in the meeting.
- 6. Regarding Standing Committee reports** – We will have only one report today from the Senate Computer Usage Committee (SCUC). The Senate Governmental Relations Committee (SGRC) report is deferred.
- 7. Regarding new business** - President Spring mentioned that there are two items of new business that have come to our attention. They are loosely related and focus on issues related to research.
- 8. Establishing a larger entity for computing and data issues** – There are five units that discuss this frequently. A meeting with the Provost occurred; we were

<p>encouraged to work with unit planning and budgeting committees on a proposal.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></p> <p><u>Computer Usage Committee (SCUC)</u> <i>Professor Alex Jones and Ms. Fran Yarger, Co-Chairs</i></p> <p>The Senate CUC has been talking about the single-sign on (SSO) and federated access regarding availability of sensitive user information to external third party accounts such as TIAA/CREF/Vanguard retirement accounts through the SSO university portal. A report, and motion, were distributed for the Faculty Assembly. As a result of the discussion last month at Faculty Assembly, this issue did generate a lot of response on the Senate website, with a level of concern raised, suggesting this not be mandated for all users. We discussed this at CUC under the guide of what technologic issues exist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Education of faculty and staff regarding sharing user credentials: Some users share credentials when they want to delegate email, calendar, or grading. It is difficult to delegate in legitimate ways. We wanted to educate the faculty community about how to properly do this. Those sharing credentials should be aware that their personal information may be shared if passcodes are shared and that this is against university policy. b) What is the right solution for SSO and federated access to sensitive information: Four options were discussed for access. As part of the discussion, CSSD reported that some of the options were not technically feasible. It is difficult for us to make a motion on this. <p>A motion was raised by SCUC that the issue of SSO and federated access to sensitive information be returned to Benefits and Welfare Committee (B&W) and the SCUC to reconsider if this is the right strategy for us and that a global policy on these issues be reconsidered and potentially amended to consider technical issues raised.</p> <p>Munro: Some faculty are ignorant to the dangers of sharing passcodes. An opt-in would be better than an opt-out. Education will not reach everyone. If people do not understand the risk of sharing credentials, that is dangerous.</p> <p>Jones: We hope to address this in the referral back to B&W and the education plan.</p> <p>Frieze: Faculty give their codes for updating grades. It is not possible to delegate this function easily.</p> <p>Jones: This is not true. It can be delegated and that will be part of the education.</p> <p>Spring: I am convinced anything faculty want to do can be done securely. The University has not done a good job of educating us. Short of a personal visit for teaching, I am not sure CSSD puts it out enough ways. We are in agreement that a SSO is beneficial. The question is about the federated access. We established a SSO from PITT to UPMC and TIAA/Vanguard. Some question this. The question really is opting in or opting out of federated access stores. It is complicated but it can be done. B&W approved this originally, as long as both were secure. The motion is that we consider looking at this with B&W and SCUC. Voting was taken.</p>	<p>Motion from SCUC to return SSO discussion to B&W and SCUC:</p> <p><i>Unanimous approval except for one abstention.</i></p>
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p>	

Professor Tom Smitherman: Motions Pertaining to Standing Committee Reorganization

A document was sent to the Faculty Assembly prior to the meeting summarizing the Senate Committee Reorganization efforts to-date, and the three motions for Senate Committee reorganization. (see document, [motions](#))

Resolution #1 (draft)

Creation of a Senate Standing Research Committee

The goal is to give the Senate the opportunity to review research policies, conduct and regulation documents and then give recommendations to senior administration. We have seen recently that not having a Committee such as this has hurt us. I call the vote.

Spring: Any comments or questions? All in favor (unanimous; no abstentions)

Resolution #2 (draft)

Merging Admissions/Student Aid and Student Affairs Committee

This combines two existing Committees. The goal is to combine both committees into one as there is synergy between them. This has full endorsement of both committees. I call the motion.

Bircher: A quorum is one-third of the elected (faculty) members for voting on this committee.

Smitherman: A quorum is one-half plus one, from my recollection.

Bircher: A quorum is one-third from my recollection, of faculty members, students and staff. (Smitherman will correct as a friendly amendment.)

Spring: All in favor (unanimous; no abstentions)

Resolution #3 (draft)

Dissolution of the University Press (UP) Committee

Spring: If the Senate UP Committee dissolves, the Provost will immediately establish a Provost Committee for this so the function of the Press Committee can continue.

Smitherman: There were questions about how the Senate generate committee operations relate to UP Committee function. Much of the work of the UP Committee work is highly confidential, so it is not typical Senate committee work. In querying other universities, this work is not done by an elected Senate Committee, but is more of a board or advisory committee function. The UP Committee and Provost agree that this change (resolution presented) would support establishing an Provost's advisory board to continue the functions of the existing UP Senate committee. The motion is supported by the UP committee themselves after much discussion, and states that the current UP Committee be dissolved and reconstituted as a Provost-office committee.

Stoner: Why did three of the UP Committee members not vote to support this?

Meislik: Most everyone was in agreement. The three who voted against it had some reservations, but we do feel as a whole that this is the right course.

Resolution #1:
Creation of Research
Committee

Unanimous approval

Resolution #2:
Merging Admissions
and Student Aid
Committees

Unanimous approval

Resolution #3:
Dissolution of UP
Committee and
change to Provost
Committee

*34 in favor; 7
abstained; 2
opposed.*

Spring: Once it was agreed to be a Provost-level committee, these concerns were resolved.

Frieze: There was a concern that it would no longer be an elected committee if it changes to a Provost Committee.

Savinov: I would like to express my concern. I fear that allowing more of these committees associated with Provost office places more power to the Provost office. I am going to vote against this to keep this in the power with the Faculty Assembly.

Munro: Did the Provost say how this new group would be constituted?

Spring: As has occurred with other Provost’s committees, she will ask for a Senate nominee. I am not concerned about this. I had a chance to participate on this discussion. All Senate committees are university-wide. The UP Committee tends to be a “Provost-area schools” committee versus university-wide. In this case, there is a tremendous commitment to the Press and the advisory board (or Provost Committee) formation, and this is the best interest of the Provost and the Press, and the faculty who are serving on this group to change this.

Smitherman: We elect the UP Committee University-wide. Their focus now is very specialized, including Slavic languages and poetry, so we would have to change the bylaws to a involved a special subset of faculty.

Kracht: The scope of the UP Committee is Slavic language, philosophy, poetry etc. If the elections are honest, we have unexpected outcomes, as faculty may not be qualified. I understand the concern with the Provost power. We are the only university in the country with an elected membership to their UP Committee. Other universities have this function as a Provost-level committee or advisory group.

Spring: Let’s vote. Opposed 2; abstain 7; 34 in favor.

Spring: The Executive Committee is recognized for its outstanding effort with moving this two-year committee reorganization effort forward. Professor Smitherman was thanked for his leadership.

Additional two items of new business (continued from above)

Professor Thomas Hales: Faculty Report on Academy-Industry Relationships

A motion was discussed to recommend that a faculty committee compare PITT policies with AAUP principles for guiding academy-industry relations. Industry relations are increasing and the need to review this policy is necessary. We need to look at how the research mission of the university is affected, to promote free dissemination of information and preserve integrity of research. An abridged version of the principles was shared. It is suggested that this topic be referred to the new Research Committee.

Spring: Unless objection, we should pass this document onto the new Research Committee. All in favor? (no opposed)

Motion to revisit PITT-AAUP academy-industry relations policy content at the new Research Committee

Unanimous approval

Professor Michael Goodhart: Response Letter to Chancellor regarding commercialization

Professor Goodhart reviewed the drafted letter regarding commercialization that will be sent to the Chancellor from members of the University of Pittsburgh community. This letter will be published in the *University Times* on Thursday. Many of us do research that is not commercializable, and this research is important to the community as well. There are over 70 signatures on this topic, and we would like to refer this to the new Research Committee for discussion.

Tananis: Could you comment on the climate change issue? Why did you not write two letters?

Goodhart: One of the concerns that motivated us was that the emphasis on commercialization to frame growth and we felt that this has contributed to climate change. We are concerned that the folks that will be affected by climate change the most may not be part of commercialization. We encourage a holistic approach to research.

Bircher: Is this purely informational? Or, do you expect action?

Goodhart: I hope the Research Committee will do research and talk to the writers of the letter to understand the differences in research between the different departments. Medical School research is much different than humanities research, and both are important.

Bircher: The Research Committee should put this into their mission statement in some way.

Goodhart: We hope that the new committee will take on this issue to discuss it.

Smitherman: We have encouraged the Chancellor to update the research policies and make a more nimble, flexible, and accurate research process. We hope to get the new Research Committee in place to help the Chancellor as soon as possible. I feel he will welcome this.

Frieze: It would be useful to have someone from this group run for the new Research Committee to represent this issue.

Weinberg: Academic freedom is a key part of this issue. I would suggest that TAFC members be involved, at least ad-hoc, with the Research Committee.

Goodhart: Our goal with the letter is to require a wider reflection with research.

Kearns: This is a well-stated letter. I do not know though exactly what we are asking the Research Committee to do with this.

Smitherman: I would suggest that we refer this to the Research Committee to consider along with the other motion.

Motion to refer the commercialization impact topic to the new Research Committee:

Unanimous approval

<p>Goodhart: I would be glad to make a motion that the Committee consider the content of the letter.</p> <p>Kearns: We are suggesting a normative view from the start. I would suggest we take a more active view and put commercialization at the top of their list.</p> <p>Goodhart: I wanted to bring this letter to the Senate and refer the discussion to the new Research Committee for discussion. A normative perspective is acceptable for this.</p> <p>Kearns: Are we asking the Committee to endorse this letter?</p> <p>Goodhart: No.</p> <p>Spring: For background, the Senior Administration was initially opposed to formation of new Senate committees. They have warmed very much to the Research Committee concept. Other Provost committee work will come through the Senate. My sense is that the Provost and Chancellor are very open to this communication. It is exactly what the strategic planning process is all about. I have grown in my confidence with their honesty about what they like and don't like. These matters going to a deliberate body of the Senate are appropriate. I can see a new set of policies within the next five years. I think referring documents to this new Committee is a good idea. I thought these two motions were very good, and once Senate Council endorses the new Research Committee, this will be a critical committee, especially with the new Chancellor focusing on dissemination of new knowledge of research. Let's vote: the recommendation was unanimously approved.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements</u> None</p>	None were reported.
<p><u>Adjournment</u> Meeting was adjourned at 4:22pm.</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:

Alarcon, Ataa, Beck, Bircher, Buchanich, Cauley, Clark, Cohen, Costantino, Dahm, Donihi, Evans, Fort, Frieze, Goodhart, Groark, Horvath, Hravnak, Hughes, A. Jones, Kaynar, Kear, Kearns, Kovacs, Leers, Mauk, Molinaro, Morel, Munro, Novy, Savinov, Savoia, Schmidhofer, Scott, Skledar, Smitherman, Spring, Stoner, Tananis, Triulzi, Weinberg, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

Members not attending:

Baker, Burkoff, Caldwell, Erickson, Falcione, Fusco, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Helbig, Irrgang, R. Jones, Karp, Lewicka, Lin, McKinney, McLaughlin, Miller, Mulcahy, Nelson, Nisnevich, Olanyk, Ramsey, Riccelli, Shafiq, Smolinski, Soska, Sukits, Weiss, West

*Excused attendance:

Dewar, Flynn, Frank, Gaddy, Guterman, Hartman, Kaufman, Labrinidis, Poloyac, Vieira

Others attending/guests:

Balaban, Barlow, Fedele, Hales, Kracht, Meislik

*Notified Senate Office