

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
Via Hybrid
2700 Posvar Hall and Zoom**

Wednesday, January 18, 2023

1. Call to Order

President Robin Kear called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting

Kear asked for a motion to approve the minutes. On a motion duly made (Bircher) and seconded (Tashbook) the minutes of the November 30th, 2022 Faculty Assembly Meeting were approved as written.

3. Items of New Business.

Angie Bedford-Jack, OEDI, will introduce the Climate Survey.

Campus Climate Survey

- Survey sent to the entire Pitt community, please take a moment to fill this out
- <https://www.diversity.pitt.edu/engagement/campus-climate-survey-2023>
- The University has commissioned the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium to conduct a “Diversity and Equity” study of all students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- A link to the survey will be found in your University email beginning Jan. 16, and responses are due by Feb. 10.
- It’s the first time Pitt has ever done a campus-wide survey of this scope and nature.
- Answers will be anonymous and completing the survey should take about 15 minutes.

4. Report of the Senate President, Robin Kear (submitted in written form)

Welcome back to the start of a new term. I hope that you had a relaxing and restorative winter break, it seems so very far away now.

Last night I attended a talk by Nikki Giovanni as part of this week’s MLK Social Justice week activities, it was great to hear her stream of consciousness. And she loves libraries, so I am always happy to hear that.

We are continuing to work through repercussions of the direct dealing interpretation by the administration. The Union of Pitt Faculty’s late October letter to administration of the threat of unfair labor practice charges related to direct dealing on mandatory bargaining subjects with bargaining unit members has set off a chain reaction of sorts. This reaction first become evident to shared governance

through the University Policy Process, as we have discussed in November and December.

At the last Senate Council meeting, I mentioned one immediate effect will be the composition of existing Policy Committees related to mandatory subjects. Those who are in the bargaining unit have been removed. I have appointed new faculty to represent the Senate, those who are in the medical school or otherwise outside the bargaining unit.

Policy Committees in Process that are immediately Impacted

- **Travel Advance Policy**
 - Tyler Bickford, former Co-Chair of the Budget Policies Committee, removed
 - Tracey Olanyk, member of Budget Policies Committee, added
- **Travel and Business Entertainment Policy (FN28)**
 - Patrick Loughlin, Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Member, removed
 - Chris Bonneau, Immediate Past President Faculty Senate and Professor of Political Science removed
 - Anna Wang-Erickson, medical school, continues serving
 - Penny Morel and Doug Reed, both in the medical school, have been added
- **Education Benefits Policy**
 - Chris Bonneau, Immediate Past President Faculty Senate and Professor of Political Science removed
 - Linda Tashbook, Chair, Faculty Senate Benefits and Welfare Committee removed
 - John Maier and Ray Pitetti, both in the medical school and Faculty Assembly members, have volunteered

There are more Policies in the process of being chartered that will be impacted. These are Policies related to mandatory subjects.

Some University Policies that we are passing, if they are related to mandatory subjects of bargaining, will be applicable only to those outside the bargaining unit, i.e., medical school faculty, those considered management, staff, and postdocs.

- As announced at Senate Council, University Policy AC 69 [Tuition Exchange Scholarship Program Policy](#) that made its way through the Policy process was approved by the Chancellor and will apply to those outside the bargaining unit. The previous version of the policy will apply to bargaining unit members until further notice.
- The Chancellor recently approved University Policy ER 21, [Intergovernmental Personnel Act Assignments](#). This Policy applies to the University's administration of its participation in the Intergovernmental Personnel Act ("IPA") Mobility Program, except for IPA assignments with the Veterans Administration. All employees are covered by this Policy, except for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, who are excluded pending collective bargaining negotiations with the Faculty Union. Bargaining Unit Faculty Members will need to work with their supervisors to pursue an IPA opportunity.

- This will also likely be the case with the revised Relocation Policy that also recently went through the Policy Process.
 - At the last Senate Council, the voting administrators again did not vote on a policy recommendation, the Relocation Policy revisions.
- This is not the situation that we want, as evidenced by the recent shared governance principles document, but this is situation we are in. If you have concerns or questions about these policies and you are a bargaining unit member please communicate with your union leadership.

As a reminder, also still stalled is the Community Engaged Scholarship and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion recommendations that we passed for tenure and promotion updates in May of 2022.

There have also been changes to the ways that some Senate Committees are conducting business. For example, the Budget Policies Committee has on their regular schedule of topics a presentation and discussion of Pitt salary data related to AAU peers. The administration representatives on the Committee objected to sharing and discussing this information with bargaining unit members present to avoid direct dealing, and as the info could be used in future bargaining sessions. In order for this discussion to take place, the chair asked the bargaining unit members to leave, including myself and others, so that the information could be presented. The University Times writer was present, and the information was reported on January 6th.

I believe that lines are being defined more sharply on managerial areas by our administration, which is outside the contract negotiation, and this includes budgeting. It has come to my attention today that another item related to the mission of the Budget Policies Committee, the unit-level Planning and Budget Committees, have been affected. Last week, the Provost sent a memo to the Deans about discussing budgets with unit-level Planning and Budget Committees and that bargaining unit members should be removed for these discussions. When I asked the Provost if I could view the memo, I was told that it was “an internal management document that was not intended to be shared with bargaining unit faculty members.”

This raises real concerns for me on how to accomplish the improved functioning for these PBCs that we had negotiated last Spring. It raises concerns for me on how this will be implemented, and how the unit-levels PBCs function, discuss, and vote. It raises concerns for the entire Planning and Budget System in place to help ensure shared governance. However, if this is being implemented as a managerial function, I am not sure that the Budget Policies Committee can provide oversight.

The Senate leadership continues to meet with Union leadership to discuss these and other matters. I hope that a clear agreement can be reached between the union and administration on definitions of direct dealing as it relates to shared governance, the purview of management areas, and discussions of mandatory subjects between administrators and bargaining unit members. Shared governance is outside of these negotiations, unsurprisingly, no one will take my legal advice, and I cannot ask the administration or the union to violate labor law as they see it.

Until that happens, the impact reverberates through our work here. I will need to continue informing you of these issues and what I think needs to be called to your attention. I do want to shift focus this Spring onto what we can do, instead of what we are presently constrained from doing.

Other matters:

- Regarding the academic freedom resolution from October, I did pass it on to the Provost with the request for a discussion to achieve the goals. Due to the administration's new interpretations of direct dealing on mandatory subjects, the Provost was able to meet with the two co-chairs of TAFC.

Thank you for your service and dedication to shared governance. I know I have shared quite a bit of information, and I would like to openly discuss your views.

Any questions or comments on my report?

Stoner: I can confirm. Until last week I was an elected member of the Dietrich School PBC committee, and I received a memo saying I was removed by Dean Blee without, in my mind, sufficient explanation other than to reference ongoing union negotiations, but there was no mention of direct dealing.

Kear: I am not sure what the justifications were as I have not seen the memo. Did you mean you were removed from the committee or just barred from taking part in budget discussions.

Stoner: Good point – it did not say I was removed but it said the because of the union negotiations discussion of detailed budget issues will be limited to PBC members who are not members of the bargaining unit. This will be a vastly circumscribed group of people able to discuss these issues

Kear: voting members tend to be members of the bargaining unit, so how does that impact the vote. We had fought for the ability of the PBCs to see budgetary information over the last year and now that has gone away.

Tashbook: I was removed from a policy committee that would normally come to the Benefits and welfare committee. Generally, I, and other voting, members raise questions and comments about these new policies. My question is are committee members going to be allowed to comment on the policy when they come to the committee?

Kear: The committee members and one of the new non-bargaining unit members of the policy committee would be able to discuss but the administrators would not be there. Those people outside the bargaining unit would present the policy. It changes the robust level of discussion that would occur when everyone can be present.

Frieze: I had a similar question about the Faculty affairs committee

Songer: The current change that is affecting unit PBCs could be expanded to affect Senate committees. In essence, we could have a discussion among all members without administrators being present, then we would have to have a separate meeting of voting members consisting of one faculty member, one staff member and 4 students. That is extremely cumbersome and

reduces the input of faculty in shared governance. That is the situation right now, but I see that, if this is not adequately covered in the CBA, it could extend even after the agreement is reached. It is vitally important to have a CBA that recognizes the importance of shared governance, and has a role for the process of elected governance so that we can have good communication between all elements of our university.

Kear: Faculty affairs, PBCs, and benefits and welfare are the committees most affected

Bonneau: What we are hearing is that in the 14 months since the vote to unionization we are in worst position than before. We no longer have oversight over budgets, we no longer have input in the planning and budget process at the unit level or university wide. Our Faculty Affairs committee, which we set up to deal with issues related to appointment stream faculty can no longer interact with administration. In this period of 14 months a lot of the processes and structure we put into place over the last decade have gone away. The faculty right now, in terms of representation, oversight and being able to hold the administration accountable is significantly weakened. I hope this is only temporary, but I am skeptical. We are also hampered to discuss the ELI closure as we cannot meet with administration. We came through the pandemic with no layoffs now, 14 months after unionization, 8 faculty may lose their jobs and we are not able to meet with administration about this.

Balaban: There could be unintended consequences that result from the position the bargaining unit has taken, and we should try to learn from these unintended consequences

Kanthak: I agree with your sentiment, and we are continuing to have meetings with union negotiators. It is my sense that there is not an appropriate level of understanding of the importance of shared governance, or of how this may have effects on members of the bargaining unit. I am hoping that this is correct and that we will see a course correction by members of the bargaining unit. I urge folks who are concerned about shared governance to make the union negotiators aware of its importance. We are doing what we can to help move that forward.

Balaban: Speaking as someone who is outside of the bargaining unit who works through shared governance, I hope that faculty who are part of the bargaining unit can remain part of it. We are working for all members of the university We have to decide what is the right place for the union within the system that we have developed over the years, and we need to sit down to work this out

Stoner: I am not member of union and although I am supportive of it. What is good for faculty is good for all faculty, regardless of union membership, and that should be enshrined in any agreement. I witnessed some of the lack of information presented at PBC meetings last year and now see that the administration is being very conservative about what information it chooses to share. Excluding bargaining unit members from a meeting that is covered by the U Times does not make sense. I would love to have agreement and quickly and one that is the best agreement to represent the rights and interest of faculty. It is not one sided in terms of deciding the pace.

Kanthak: It is pretty clear that the administration is taking advantage of unforced errors the union has made, that hopefully we can fix.

Denman: Hear, hear to Carey and John's comments. Many faculty who voted for the union are not in this body and they have concerns that made them vote for the union. Are we being as proactive as we could be in collecting information from these faculty? The closure of ELI is an indicator of some of the problems that we've had with faculty input in major decisions. I don't know if the bargaining unit or FA could have saved ELI, it is just one example.

Kear: I am going to close discussion and Stoner has an announcement to give.

Stoner: Educational committee talked about extreme weather memo given each year. Remind all instructors to be transparent and proactive with their students concerning weather related challenges. Students should also be transparent with their professors concerning difficulties getting to class.

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

Elections

Professor Chris Bonneau, Elections Committee Chair

Our Senate elections for Vice President and President are coming up this Spring. Incumbents are interested in running again and additional nominations are welcome. Also, elections of FA members and committee members will occur this Spring, in early (FA) and late (committees) April. Please nominate anyone you would like, and the senate election committee will be meeting shortly to finalize the slates.

5. Unfinished Business and /or New Business

ELI closure

Dawn McCormick, Faculty Assembly Member (comments provided in writing)

Good afternoon,

My name is Dawn McCormick. I am a Teaching Professor in the Department of Linguistics, and one of my roles as a faculty member is to serve as the Director of the English Language Institute, or as I'll refer to it today, the ELI.

As many of you know, this past December, Dietrich School Dean Kathleen Blee informed the ELI and the Department that the ELI would be closed on June 30, 2023. My thanks to the Senate for the opportunity to address this closure at this Faculty Assembly meeting. My thanks also to everyone who has expressed their care and concern to the ELI since the announcement of the closure. Your support has been heartening.

I started my role as director in September 2020, but the ELI was not new to me. My past roles have included associate director, instructor, part-time instructor, and teaching assistant, so

when I talk to you today about the ELI, I talk to you as someone who has participated in 30 years of the ELI's service to the University, the School of Arts and Sciences, the Department, and thousands of students around the world. AND, for 30 years, I have witnessed the impact of world events on the English language program industry and the ELI and the rebounds and reinventions that have happened in response.

Today, I will highlight some of the ways that we currently serve the University and beyond, identify key contributors to the current financial situation of the ELI, and make a request for your support.

First, our service. Our service to the University started in 1964, when we began as an intensive English language program through a Ford Foundation grant. The current mission of the ELI is to teach non-credit English classes, support matriculated students at the University, and contribute to the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages, so our purpose has grown.

On paper, we are a cost-center in the Department of Linguistics. This means that we must earn revenue to pay our expenses, including faculty and staff salaries and fringe and the cost of using University space, which means classrooms, faculty and staff offices, waiting areas, and our main office. Our two main revenue streams come from:

- 1) non-credit intensive English programs, which include the intensive English program that we operate three terms a year and a 6-week summer program directed at incoming graduate students; and
- 2) courses that we teach for schools as part of their support for students who use English as an additional language. We currently work with the School of Computing and Information and the Swanson School of Engineering to provide English courses that help their students meet the specific academic demands of their programs. During the height of the pandemic, when students could not come to Pitt, Global Experiences reached out to us to create virtual English support courses for their Pitt on Location students in China, and we responded immediately to meet those needs.

Our service extends far beyond these examples.

- The ELI offers internship opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students through the Department of Linguistics.
- ELI non-credit and credit classes and instructors are observed by graduate students in Department of Linguistics degree and certificate programs and undergraduates at other branch campuses to fulfill requirements for their courses and programs.

- ELI faculty are responsible for the state-required English proficiency testing of international teaching assistants and fellows and designing and teaching English support classes for them.
- ELI students in the intensive English program serve as conversation partners for University undergraduates to provide opportunities for students to engage with international students and possibly earn Outside the Classroom Curriculum credit.
- ELI faculty support University Fulbright applicants by reviewing applications and participating in practice interviews.
- The ELI partners with the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid and the School of Law to create pathways for students from the intensive English program to degree programs.
- The ELI as an institute and ELI faculty are resources that have been written into grants across units and programs on the Pittsburgh campus.
- Intensive English programs students and ELI faculty participate in PittServes and United Way volunteer activities.
- ELI faculty serve multiple international and national professional organizations and present at their conferences.
- The ELI is associated with 12 PhD dissertations and over 70 published papers since 2003.

The fulfillment of our mission is evidenced through the examples of our services that I've shared and is thanks to the expertise and hard work of the ELI faculty and staff, the strong connection between the ELI and Department of Linguistics, and our partners across the University and the globe. We believe that our service directly connects to the Plan for Pitt by supporting the changing student population, enriching the student experience (Our People – 3), creating more learning experiences (Our Programs – 2), and expanding opportunities for global engagement (Our Programs – 5).

Now, onto the second point – the financial challenges that we face. Dean Blee's statement about lower enrollments is correct. Because of multiple factors, with the impact of the pandemic being one of the more significant, enrollments in English language programs across the U.S. reached a 15-year low in 2020 as reported in the *2022 Open Doors Report on International Education Exchange*. The ELI's non-credit program enrollments dropped from 402 full-time and part-time students in AY2019 to 300 in AY2020 because of the impact of the pandemic and related travel restrictions in the summer term – and 123 in AY2021, BUT last year (AY22) we were up to 195. Revenues are down but rebounding, special groups like the one from Yasuda Women's University are returning, we have worked to learn how the market has changed are responding accordingly, but recovery takes time.

The ELI is no stranger to drops in enrollments due to world events, and we worked to prepare ourselves for this very scenario. After enrollment drops related to 9/11, the ELI Director at the

time, Dr. Alan Juffs, had the forethought to work with the University and the Dietrich School to create an ELI savings account so that the ELI could hold onto reserve monies needed for the next crisis. Prior to this arrangement, any profits made by the ELI in a given year went back to the School and University. By the end of 2012, the ELI was about halfway to its goal of having a full year's operating expenses in reserve - 1.8 – 2 million dollars. Unfortunately, in 2012, a previous Dietrich School administration decided to move the ELI out of the Cathedral of Learning, use about three quarters of its reserves to pay for construction of classrooms and offices in a non-Pitt-owned building, and charge the ELI a fixed rent rather than an overhead percentage from 2012 to the present day. This decision was made despite warnings from Alan and the chair of the department that this spending of reserves and extended financial burden of the rent would severely hurt the ELI in the future.

The fixed rent structure has resulted in the ELI's being billed for over 3 million dollars over the past 10 years, and the ELI remains in Parkvale, which is now owned by the University, despite requests to allow us to revert back to an overhead percentage, decrease the space allotted and charged to the ELI, or move the ELI to a less expensive location.

The combination of the construction costs and the continued high rent expense derailed the ELI from achieving its savings goals. This meant that when the pandemic hit, we did not have the reserves needed to cover our expenses. The University and Dietrich School stepped in to help, and for this, the ELI is truly grateful. The ELI has taken measures within our control to cut costs and increase enrollments, but these measures have not offset the loss of revenue nor the cost of rent.

As Dean Blee's message states, declining enrollments have impacted the ELI's ability to sustain itself, but from our perspective, the ELI's ability to sustain itself was decidedly negatively impacted years before the pandemic by the Dietrich School's decision to use ELI reserve funds for construction and saddle the ELI with the current rent structure.

So, here we are. We face the closure of the ELI. Here's my request. The Department's current chair, Scott Kiesling, has asked for a meeting with Provost Cudd to discuss the closure, and the Provost has agreed. The ELI would like the University and the School to reconsider its decision and work with the Department and the ELI to identify options other than a complete closure on June 30. I ask for the Faculty Assembly's support for this request. A key message in the current Pitt branding campaign states "Reinvention never stops. Neither do we." Let's work on reinventing the ELI – together – to help fulfill the Plan for Pitt.

Kear: thank you Dawn. I first heard about the closure of ELI in mid-December, right before winter break, when Dawn brought it to the attention of the Educational Policies Committee. I was dismayed to hear this and hope that it can be avoided. My thoughts related to shared

governance turned to processes. The Budget Policies Committee has examined the cessation of academic programs before, notably a decade ago, and processes related to the budget system. However, upon examination, it does not seem that these mechanisms apply to the institute, inside a school, a non-degree, non-credit, unit. Also different from a decade ago, the affected faculty members are bargaining unit members and will be represented by the union, so the Senate cannot intervene for them.

Educational Policies did a deep dive into University Policy and Lori Molinaro did a dive into Senate records and other policy and guidelines. John Stoner or Bonnie Falcione can speak to their discoveries. From our examination, it seems that Dietrich School processes were not followed in the elimination of the ELI, this matter did go before the Dietrich School Council for discussion and/or vote and was not publicized to the faculty of the School (via the good old Dietrich School Gazette).

If the current decision-making holds, I am concerned about gaps that the Institute will leave related to two University Policies where it is specifically mentioned, AC 07 (assessment of English language proficiency for admission) and AC 09 (certification of English language fluency). One policy, AC 09, is related to PA State Code 1990 Act 76, which requires institutions of higher education to evaluate their faculties for fluency in the English language and provide certifications as to that fluency. The ELI has been fulfilling this role, and the elimination of the institute at the School level has implications for the University level.

Upon learning more about the background and circumstances, I think that there has not been meaningful opportunity given for discussion by the Department of the restructuring of ELI prior to its elimination.

We have on the floor support for ELI and for their request for reconsideration of this decision. Are there any comments from the floor?

Discussion

Bonneau: Thanks for the presentation, it was very well done. It seems there is a disconnect between your ask and Scott's ask. As I understand you want the decision to be reconsidered so that restructuring can be discussed.

McCormick: I do not have a specific request. Reconsideration could mean a delay that Scott or suggesting a restructuring. If you're facing closure why not be open to all possibilities.

Bonneau: Sorry I misunderstood but delaying for a year would not address the issues you raise in your presentation. From the Assembly point of view we should be supporting a reconsideration rather than just a year delay. We should be helping to come up with a way to go forward. This should be made broader outside the Dietrich School. We should consider enlisting help from outside the Dietrich School from schools and Dean that value the work of

the ELI that could help delineate the value of ELI to the university as whole. Maybe the ELI should be moved to the Center for Teaching and Learning that resides in the Provost's office. There are avenues that we can pursue, but a one year stopgap does not help the university much.

Kiessling: To speak to the year delay. I am against the closing but the proper process was not followed. I feel that if the process is done properly a decision will be different. There are things that ELI does that were not taken into consideration and that if these had been considered the ELI would be looked at in a different way. I feel that a year to reconsider with the proper process and with a new Dean is the way to go about it. There are many options that we have discussed, and we even made proposals to Dean Blee but these were never discussed with us or with other groups in the Dietrich School. These do impact the entire university and so the Provost should have input into this decision and it is not clear if consultation with the Provost occurred. I agree with Chris that we should go for the maximalist position. I argued that we should invest in the ELI and allow it to grow. We really appreciate the support for the unit. Closing it in 6 months is difficult to reorganize all of the programs.

Bonneau: That makes sense, and I like the idea that we use the delay to reconsider the decision. From the Assembly point of view we can support this effort

Tashbook: I am speaking as the elected member of the law school. I am personally very distressed about the announcement as I work directly with the foreign attorneys who come to the school for their Master's or doctorate degrees. I reached out to the international law faculty about this closure and have asked that these comments be included in the written record of this meeting. Since I have the floor I will read one of them to you now:

Tashbook read the letter from Professor Charles Kotuby

"I would like to express my disappointment in the decision to close the English Language Institute at the University of Pittsburgh. I write this in my capacity as a Professor-of-Practice and Executive Director of the Center for International Legal Education at the Law School, but also against the backdrop of 20 years practicing law around the world.

Education is useless without an ability to effectively convey the knowledge one has obtained. For better or worse, English is the *lingua franca* of the global legal community. The provision of legal advice to corporate clients, the representation of parties before international courts and tribunals, and the discussion of global norms that form the foundation of the rule of law, all happen in English. Law school teaches the law but it also teaches a trade, and if we are serious about training foreign lawyers to become stewards of the rule of law we must also be serious in teaching them how to practice law in English. I'm sure this is a reality in any discipline that has a global focus

Pitt stands at the forefront of international legal education, especially in those regions of the world where quality legal education is needed most, but it cannot meet its goals without an effective English language program. The closure of ELI will not only decrease enrollment of foreign law students at Pitt, but with less of those law students becoming lawyers in their home countries, it will slowly-but-surely decrease our visibility and reputation where we have worked so hard to grow it.

Charles T. Kotuby Jr., FCIArb

Professor of Practice and Executive Director of the Center for International Legal Education, *University of Pittsburgh School of Law*

Honorary Professor of Law, *Durham Law School*

Note : the letter from Ronald Brand, Director of the Center for International Legal Education is attached to these minutes also

Denman: I want to advocate for a statement of support from this assembly about the closure of the ELI. I say this because it affects faculty, staff across the university. I find the whole process of how this happened is very disturbing. There was no discussion with the chair and other faculty, or other governing body. I was wondering if we could also ask for clarification from the Provost, or administration, on procedures and processes. University violating its own policy should be discussed, debated and denounced when necessary.

Kear: I did ask the Provost and she said this does not fall into shared governance, as it was a school matter. This was why we delved into the detail and saw that this closure would affect more than the Dietrich School.

Kanthak: My understanding is that the ELI plays a role in determining the “comprehensibility” of TAs before they can teach in the university. This ensures our undergraduates get the best possible teachers. By closing the ELI we lose that backstop and do you have any understanding that the University has a plan to replace this important function?

McCormick – ELI provides two types of English testing. We test undergraduates and graduate students to ensure their English proficiency is adequate. Based on the results of these tests additional English classes may be recommended. The faculty member who does this testing is not one of the eight. I don’t know what will happen when ELI closes, but ELI does provide support for that faculty member.

The other testing we do is for TAs to ensure that English proficiency is adequate. Currently, one of the faculty members slated to lose their position is the one who manages that whole process. Someone else designs, coordinates the instructors who teach the courses that support those TAs who need extra help for pronunciation for example. The ELI is very involved in all aspects of this. We do not know what the university is planning for replacing these functions, and we have not been consulted

Kanthak: This is worrisome that you are not privy to the plans to ensure that these important services are still provided.

Gill: Many graduate students in chemistry go through ELI to help them improve their English. We depend on many of these students to teach. This is a factor for all the natural sciences. We get a great deal of help from ELI with improving the language skills of our GSR. We would not be able to have those students teach and work with us without ELI

Scott: Are there legal ramifications to this decision? The process used was wrong and there is a state requirement for this teaching. The administration may be opening itself up to legal issues because of this.

Bircher: The Provost is mistaken that this only affects one School. There is abundant evidence presented here that this is a matter of university wide concern and thus is a matter for appropriate consideration by this body.

Kiessling: It is correct that there is no plan. On the same day we heard about the closure I got an email from the Provost that we need to talk about this. As chair of the department I can see ways that we can move some of these functions into the Department but we need to hire more faculty to do that. We do not have the expertise outside of the ELI to do that and the Dietrich school would have to pay for this. We would need office space, and additional faculty. One of the functions is a state mandated, and we have to do this. There are fiscal implications to this since if we close ELI the costs of providing these necessary services will move to the Dietrich School.

Kear: I am going to call for a vote and I suggest the following. Following discussion, the statement below was agreed upon.

The FA stands with our colleagues in the English Language Institute and supports their request for reconsideration of the decision to eliminate the Institute.

Kanthak: I move that we adopt this statement

Tashbook: Second

Vote

Yes 47 No 0 abstain 0

Kear: Thank you for this. I thought it was important, since this was so very public, for us to talk about this now and to state our position before any decisions are finalized. I hope this helps our colleagues, and ensures that the important services that the ELI provides university wide will be continued.

6. Announcements

None

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 pm.

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

Respectfully submitted,

Penelope (Penny) Morel
Secretary, University Senate

Members attending:

Almarza, Archibald, Balaban, Bell, Bircher, Bonneau, Bratman, Buchanich, Burton, Cousins, Cutsumbis, Denman, Epitropoulos, Fort, Glynn, Guterman, Hall, Jacobs, Jones, Kanthak, Kear, Keown, Labrinidis, Lemery, Maier, Massanelli, Mauk, McCormick, Melnick, Molinaro, Morel, Newman, Nguyen, Paljug, Parker, Paterson, Pitetti, Reed, Sant, Schmidt, Scott, Shafiq, Shephard, Songer, Stoner, Streeter, Swigonova, Tashbook, Tokowicz, K. Wood, Zack

Members not attending:

Bench, Conley, Dallal, Damiani, Giandomenico-Meaner, Kohanbash, Lewin, Mahboobin, Morris, I. Murtazashvili, J. Murtazashvili, Oyler, Pacella-LaBarbara, Potoski, Salcido, Schuster, Taboas, Triplette, Tudorascu, Wert, Yates, Yearwood

*Excused attendance:

Kovacs, G. Wood

Others attending:

Bedford-Jack, Carney, Collister, Donato, Frieze, Gooden, Harrison, Jones, Juffs, Kiesling, Livingstone, McNaught, Mucklo, O'Neill, Ranson, Schackner, Sciannameo, Stonesifer, Ulus, Wells, Wilson

*Notified Senate Office