

**Faculty Assembly Minutes**  
**2700 Posvar Hall**  
**February 14, 2017**

Topic/Discussion	Action
<p><b><u>Call to Order</u></b></p> <p>The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00pm.</p>
<p><b><u>Approval of the Minutes</u></b></p> <p>President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly (FA) meeting of January 17, 2017.</p>	<p>Minutes were approved as written.</p>
<p><b><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u></b></p> <p>No new business were brought up at the meeting. President Wilson noted that Kacey Marra will be speaking later with a new business issue that was brought up prior to the Feb 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p>	<p>See below.</p>
<p><b><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u></b></p> <p>President Wilson noted that there is much going on as the academic year is finishing up. The March FA meeting will hear the final report from the NTS faculty Ad hoc Committee. Their final draft on part-time NTS faculty is being reviewed for final comment and will be send to FA ahead of next month’s meeting. Vice-President Kear was not at the FA meeting. She is in Jamaica, as she was selected for the International Advocacy Program from the International Federation of Library Associations, to define and expand roles of libraries and development programs. President Wilson updated on the Plenary Session coming in later March. Materials are coming together related to the topic of the role of metrics in faculty research evaluation. There is an open spot on the Pitt expert panel, and that is being recruited for.</p> <p>President Wilson updated that in March, after our Faculty Assembly meeting, there will be a special presentation in the adjoining room that is a prelude to the Plenary on the topic of bibliometrics, and what that tells us about the research enterprise.” This will be background information for the upcoming Plenary.</p> <p>President Wilson noted that he has been getting questions from faculty about where lines are drawn at times like this with what we can say in the classroom. He will be reaching out to the Provost about coming up with more detailed statements about this topic.</p>	<p>No further discussion.</p>
<p><b><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></b></p> <p><i>Alex Jones, Chair, Ad hoc Committee on OMET Teaching and Evaluation</i></p> <p>This group did much of its work over email, via Box, and in person. Their work will formally go through the Senate Educational Policies Committee. This effort started as a working group and has graduated into an Ad hoc committee. It started years ago with discussion of OMET paper-based evaluations transitioning into electronic forms. This formalized into a committee to address three topics: 1) efforts to make student OMET</p>	<p>Discussion noted below.</p>

results public (so information could be used by students for course selection); 2) use of OMET evaluations in faculty promotion and/or reviews; and 3) the on-line evaluation process itself.

The report from the Ad hoc Committee that will be coming forward addresses item #2, as there has been growing national discussion about how the surveys can be used in the university environment. This discussion has taken the majority of the Ad hoc committee's attention, and a draft resolution will be presented next month discussing the role of student surveys in the process of annual evaluations and promotion/tenure for faculty. Literature exists on the topic of teaching effectiveness, student learning, and student satisfaction. The document will contain suggestions about how we can move forward as a community regarding student satisfaction and evaluation of teaching at our university. The report will be circulated in the near future for review, and will be discussed at Educational Policies Committee on Monday, Feb 20<sup>th</sup>. President Wilson noted that the finalized resolution will hopefully come at the next FA meeting.

Discussion:

Czerwinski: What is the committee's position on making OMET's public?

Jones: We are actively discussing this. It is not part of our recommendation coming to FA next month. The OMET surveys are not designed for course decisions, they are designed for faculty teaching improvement. There was a previous resolution for that (public sharing), and cited that units are ultimately responsible to decide if survey information should be released to students, and to decide and update the information that is provided for their students for course selection.

Wilson: I have heard that there are ways to deal with this within different schools, and they vary. Schools are thinking about the teaching evaluation piece. I hope that through this effort, we will be in a position of see best practices in evaluation of teaching. The Senate can help to bring those pieces together.

Stoner: A meeting was held to change OMET questions (questions had not changed in 35 years). The OMET will have better questions, and will be a shorter evaluation. The opinions were mixed on this, as there was opposition to questions on teaching effectiveness, but some faculty members wanted to see student perception of their teaching. Student leaders at that meeting noted that they would like a metric completely divorced from promotion and tenure so they can see course information.

Spring: There seem to be three questions that were focused on: what data do students have to make course decisions, what student opinion mechanism exists, and how are faculty evaluated on an annual basis? Each schools seems to evaluate teaching in their own way. Each school makes information available to students about courses (descriptions, syllabi), and how can students express themselves (OMET, or RateMyProfessors.com). The OMETs can be tailored – do we know if there are school-by-school differences? Will the committee be presenting data on each of these 3 issues?

Jones: We will mostly be addressing how student surveys are used in evaluation of faculty. A previous resolution was shared related to making information available to students related to courses.

<p>Spring: Will this be detailed school-by-school?</p> <p>Jones: The resolution does not include that level of detail. We have been relying on faculty on the committee to talk about this on behalf of their school. It is a detailed mix of options. There are some schools that use OMET only, some use a combination of their own survey plus OMET, and some use a completely own process. A concern that comes up is use of OMET exclusively as the sole method for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.</p> <p>Spring: It would be very helpful to have a cross-university picture of how this looks. Promotion and tenure dossiers are used and contain a lot of information, under control of the faculty. Annual reviews are also used and are more centrally administered, involving in some cases, everything from peer evaluations, to nature and size of classes. A regularized picture of the extent of the problem would be helpful.</p> <p>Jones: We do not know how much information is matriculated to advisors, supervisors, etc. and how much information is lost before decisions are made. This is harder to track.</p> <p>Spring: Promotion and tenure dossiers that exist give you extraordinary level of detail by school on this. Does the Provost’s Office randomly collect faculty evaluations annually or do random sampling?</p> <p>Kirsch: There is an evaluation of the annual review process. Each year the Provost’s Office confirms that the annual faculty review process has occurred at each school. In the Provost area schools, a random sample of annual review letters (10% sample) is review them to ensure there is a framework for the review and assessment.</p> <p>Spring: I did a search on the Pitt website for “annual faculty review,” and I found 100 entries related to the School of Medicine. There was a paucity of data from other schools. The Provost office may provide data on a clear picture on current processes at schools. This could be a resource for the Committee.</p> <p>Stoner: At the ANS meeting, we were told that the new software program that OMET will use, to make questions better, and allow departments to create better norms for better comparisons and control for course variables.</p> <p>Wilson: The standing Education Policies Committee will be dealing with the additional issues related to OMET beyond the resolution forthcoming.</p>	
<p><b><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Unfinished business:</i></b>  <b>Policy on Consensual Sexual, Romantic, and Intimate Relationships with Students and Between Employees</b></p> <p>President Wilson noted that the latest update (Feb 7<sup>th</sup> revision) was distributed, and there has been much discussion. This was opened up for discussion to accept or reject this new version. There was a motion (Bircher) and a second (Spring) to open discussion on this new version and we will vote on this. President Wilson noted that each version has become a better policy.</p>	<p>Voting: The revised policy was approved by majority. Two opposed and two abstained.</p>

Kovacs: I wanted to add background. Discussion of this was postponed from last FA meeting due to a T AFC issue that did not allow them to review this. In order to expedite this process, Geovette Washington, Pitt General Council, came to T AFC to facilitate the discussion. She worked with us on this document and talked to us about this, and she was very open to our feedback. This is the third instance where our legal counsel have been incredibly responsive, open, collegial, and available to talk about issues related to academic freedom. This exemplified joint governance.

Loughlin: Laurie and the Committee were thanked for their patience and hard work. I liked the focus is now on employee relationships toward managing working relationships versus consensual relationships. A few wording changes were offered: In the end of Section 1 of Purpose: the statement that these relationships are “ill-advised” is concerning. I would rephrase this to focus on working relationships.

Bircher: Unlike a typical resolution, this is a policy, so we cannot independently amend. Issues you raise are in favor of accepting the policy as-is, or not in favor of accepting as-is.

Loughlin: This has improved, but a few things of focus should be on managing the working relationship, not telling folks that consensual relationships are not advised.

Wilson: Faculty member Doug Lansittel sent similar comments to those just raised. Changes of phrasing is what is suggested. These comments do not say these are fatal edits.

Roher: (to Kovacs) A review of this was made by T AFC and university counsel --- were there issues still in dispute at the end of the meeting? Did the committee feel this is a reasonable result?

Kovacs: Yes. There were some issues of phrasing, but these were not fatal flaws. One of our members Barry Gold questioned by this was needed in the first place, as he thought we have many policies and procedures we already have that would deal with this, but he eventually went along with this. Most of the internal inconsistencies have been corrected. Consequences of the relationship in the work environment is the issue. At a certain point, we decided it is the best we can do under these circumstances.

Bonneau: I still think this is an unwise and unnecessary policy. I am convinced now though that faculty rights are protected in this version. We were successful in getting protections and rights of faculty, procedures, and due process in this policy. Administration can impose this policy on us if they want to. With the cooperation of many, especially Geovette Washington, we achieved the goal of having a policy like this, with faculty protected to greatest extent possible.

Guterman: I am in favor of this document. The committee have bent over backward to make adjustments. They looked into level of detail where things could come up, such as students in same schools, spouses, etc., that many never would have thought of. This is very different than the original version. It is concise, well-done, and well-thought out. We need to protect students, faculty and staff.

Stoner: For the last draft we started to see, I thought that that phrase that Pat mentioned that is troubled in tone (“ill-advised”) was changed to “new” relations.

de Vallejo: In Section D, last page, the main concern was in the policy violation section.

Stoner: I thought preexisting relationships were not going to be disapproved of as much. People hired as couples are still thought of as a bad idea in this policy.

Bonneau: “Ill-advised” makes it sound like we are not in favor. There is language that says usually “ill-advised” in the policy, so the language gives us the wiggle room we need. It is in the policy purpose, so it gives us flexibility.

Loughlin: I think it is a problem with the working relationship, but the document does not make it that clear. I still think the document is unclear on this.

Wilson: Time to vote -- do we accept this version of the policy? All in favor? (majority XX) All opposed? (2) Abstentions? (2) The motion is approved. He thanked the T AFC especially for looking for issues of due process to protect the faculty. We can do shared governance and we all learned from this. We now have a legislative record for this.

***New Business:***

Kacey Marra, Co-Chair EIADAC

EIADAC has had a very busy year so far. In EIDAC, we have 4 working groups, one of which is related to international populations. This group devised a statement that Co-Chair Maura read, that they would like FA to hear:

“EIADAC fully supports the January 28, 2017 statement by Chancellor Gallagher on the US immigration decisions regarding restraining immigrants from seven countries from entering the US. We recognize that this is harmful to the University of Pittsburgh, its mission, and core values. As a university that values diversity and inclusion we advocate for an environment that enriches learning, scholarship and service for all, regardless of race, ethnicity, or religion. Our international communities bring an important global perspective to the Pitt environment. EIADAC advocates for the University of Pittsburgh in its mission to continue standing up for the rights of our students, faculty, and administration, both domestic and international. The situation may be constantly changing, but our values remain the same.”

Another working group, the Year of Sustainability and Diversity Working Group, wanted to make this announcement (read by Maura):

“EIADAC will be organizing a Poster Session highlighting many of the events that occurred during the Year of Diversity. This event is sponsored by the Provost’s office and co-sponsored with matching funds by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and also the University Senate. Please mark your calendars for Thursday April 13<sup>th</sup>, in the William Pitt Union. Stop by between 12 and 5 to visit the posters, participate in roundtable discussions moderated by members of EIADAC and the Year of Diversity committee. More details will be forthcoming.”

No further discussion.

Update from the University Research Council:  “The URC, along with the Provost’s office, is sponsoring a one year funding opportunity that supports diversity-related research. Applications are being accepted until March 31 <sup>st</sup> , and faculty, post-docs and graduate students are eligible to apply. It is anticipated that 15-20 awards ranging from \$1K-5K will be funded. Please see the URC website for more information.”	
<b><u>Announcements</u></b>  No further announcements.	
<b><u>Adjournment</u></b>  The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.	Adjournment at 3:53 pm.

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*  
Professor, School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy and Therapeutics

Members attending:

Bircher, Bonneau, Borovetz, Bratman, Cassaro, Cohen, Cole, Costantino, Czerwinski, Dahm, Danford, De Vallejo, Dewar, Donihi, Falcione, Fort, Gaddy, Guterman, Henker, Jones, Kanthak, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kovacs, Leers, Loughlin, Lyon, Marra, Molinaro, Morel, Mulvaney, Nelson, Olanyk, Phillippi, Rohrer, Skledar, Spring, Stoner, Tananis, Wilson, Withers

Members not attending:

Adams, Betru, Bilodeau, Cark, Deitrick, Frank, Gleason, Gold, Goldberg, Harries, Hartman, Helbig, Jacob, Kelly, McLaughlin, Muenzer, Mulcahy, Munro, Schmidhofer, Scott, Smolinski, Swanson, Thorpe, Velankar, Vieira, Weikle-Mills

\*Excused attendance:

Beck, Becker, Flynn, Horne, Irrgang, Kear, Kiselyov, Labrinidis, Landrigan, Landsittel, Nardone, Rigotti, Sukits, Taboas, Triulzi, Van Nostrand, Yarger

Others attending/guests:

Connelly, Fike, Frieze, Gentz, Kirsch, Manfredi, Pischke

\*Notified Senate Office