### Topic/Discussion

| Call to Order. President Michael R. Pinsky called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. | The meeting commenced. |
| Approval of the Minutes of the April 5th, 2011 Faculty Assembly Meeting. President Pinsky asked for approval of the minutes of the April 5th, 2011 Faculty Assembly meeting. | The minutes were approved as written. |
| Introduction of Items of New Business. President Pinsky asked if there were any new items of business to be brought forward. A Faculty Assembly member suggested that the Computer Usage Committee could help with pressuring the university to create space where a department could store data such as scanned papers, recorded oral production from students, and other documents. President Pinsky responded that this storage of data will be discussed by the Library Committee. |  |
| Report of the President. President Pinsky gave the following report: |  |

This month marks the end of the academic year, the continuation of the budget negotiation process and a hope that summer recess will soon be here.

As the President of the University Senate, I have the honor of being the Grand Marshall for the University’s three formal Convocations. In the fall we have the Freshman Convocation, mid-winter the Honors Convocation, and last Sunday the Graduation Convocation. As the Grand Marshall I open these convocations by walking in carrying the University of Pittsburgh seal on a rather impressive mace. This last Sunday I went to the podium and officially opened the convocation and watched as a completely empty Peterson Event Center floor filled to capacity with our students in cap and gown waiting to receive their degrees. This was followed by a procession of some faculty and then the podium participants including the Chancellor, Provost, Deans and honored guests. As the music played and I stood there at the podium for about 20 minutes I was enthralled at the sheer number and enthusiasm of our graduating students. I am honored with having the best seat in the house to display why we are here and why it is important.

This spring’s University Senate Plenary Session entitled “Teaching Excellence as a Criterion for Promotion and Tenure” took place at the William Pitt Union’s Assembly Room on Thursday April 14. The program highlighted the importance of teaching and teaching mentorship on faculty development and promotion. I am pleased to report that for the third time in a row the session was well attended.
with late comers having to find seats on the side rows. I wish to congratulate Professors Linda Frank and Carey Balaban for co-chairing this excellent program.

We are at the present time planning the Fall plenary on Community Health Outreach Programs and the University and hope to have an update on this next month.

As you may recall, the Community Relations Committee served as a pilot discussion group for the Oakland 2025 Project. Specifically, the Community Relations Committee supported the Oakland 2025 Kick-Off Event held on March 24th. Out of that Kick-Off Event, 11 dialogue circles were established. Each dialogue circle is comprised of 8 to 13 participants. These groups will meet 5 times over the next month to identify and discuss current issues and to develop a vision of what Oakland can become over the next 10 years. The next step in the process will be the Action Forum on Thursday, May 12th at St. Nicholas’ Greek Orthodox Cathedral. During the Action Forum the outcomes of the dialogues circles will be presented and Community Action Teams will be formed around the topics and the real work of transforming Oakland will begin. As a University situated in the center of Oakland, our engagement in this process is essential.

We continue to work with the administration through our Senate and University-based committees on the State appropriations issues and their potential impact. When something tangible and open for discussion has happened I will report it here. But I can say that we are preparing for multiple funding scenarios. You all should have received by e-mail a copy of my open letter to the faculty asking that you contact your local legislators and the governor arguing for why Pitt’s state allocation should not be cut. A copy of my letter is on the table at the entry if you did not receive one. Please write your legislators. Effective democracy is participatory. Your legislators need to know your thoughts.

Since we have reports from three committees for today’s meeting I will stop here so as to allow time for their reports and the discussion that will follow.
Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.

Computer Usage Committee, Professor Vincent Arena, Co-Chair
Professor Vincent Arena, Co-Chair, gave the following report:
The Computer Usage Committee met 5 times during the academic year. Several highlights follow. In a carry-over from last year, the committee noted that paper mail announcements are not found to be useful to many faculty and staff. They wanted to see if Pitt could develop an alternative mechanism to the paper-based announcements. So at the recommendation of SCUC, and with appropriate University approvals, CSSD is working with Mailing Services to implement an option to read general University mailings through a link provided in an email message. This option, Electronic Delivery of Mass Mailings / Read Green, will be available before July 2011.

An individual can elect to receive electronic mailings by going to the profile page on the Pitt Portal and select that they want to receive University mail electronically instead of on paper. Once selected, the individual will receive general University mailings via email whenever possible. These emails will be text-only mailings and if the paper mailing included graphics or special formatting, the email will contain a link to a PDF version of the mailing. PDF files will not be sent as an attachment.

Benefits
- Save paper and reduce waste (Last fiscal year more than 1.2 million pieces of bulk mail were delivered to faculty & staff)
- No email attachments will clutter your inbox
- Read your mail from almost anywhere.
- Your mail will be sent to your official University email address as well as any other email forwarding addresses you have set at accounts.pitt.edu

Several notes
- Not all University mailings can be sent electronically. So you will receive some paper mail.
- Interoffice mail will still be delivered on paper, as well as US Postal mail
- You may also receive some paper mail, if a University unit specifies that its bulk mailing must be delivered on paper
- Currently it is not available to students but may be expanded to them in the future.

Faculty Dashboard: In response to interest from the Council of Deans, CSSD is exploring a project to provide administrators and
faculty with a ‘Faculty Dashboard.’ This ‘dashboard’ would provide a single site to view and update information relevant to the professional lives of faculty. Information would be securely stored in the University Data Warehouse and presented in a user-friendly web interface.

At the present time, faculty are being asked to provide input into the design of such a system and members of the SCUC will help identify the kinds of information the faculty would like to have access to, and the information that they are routinely asked to supply to the academic administration, granting agencies, and other audiences.

Dr. Anne Fay, Executive Data Assessment Liaison, is conducting interviews with faculty regarding their needs and preferences. She can be contacted at 624-1072 or alf96@pitt.edu.

Our committee also advised CSSD that some units or schools may have already implemented a system collecting similar information. An example of such a system is the digital vita in the Schools of the Health Sciences. We recommended that these systems should be taken into account when CSSD is at the exploratory stage of the project. Some type of integration should be considered so faculty are not doing double work by supplying redundant information into multiple systems.

**CourseWeb:** Blackboard / CourseWeb is being upgraded to version 9.1 on May 6. The new version will be more interactive, have a more organized look and feel; improved grading tools, new blogs and personal journals; group interaction capabilities; and new notification features. New with this version, is the accessibility to CourseWeb from mobile devices, such as PDAs, and cell phones.

**PeopleSoft:** Available by the Fall 2011 term, student ID Center photos will be incorporated into the PeopleSoft class rosters that are provided to the course instructors. This is in response to requests by the teaching faculty and SCUC.

All items generated good interactive discussion and were very favorably received. President Pinsky complemented the committee for their work.

**Remarks:**
President Pinsky stated that he applauded the committee for this initiative for going to electronic mailings as well as not putting attachments on the email.

Paul Munro asked which types of mail are not possible to send electronically.
Arena responded that the individual unit sending the mailing decides if it will be sent in a paper format.

Vice-President Weiss asked who will be sending the mailings out.

Arena responded that everything that is currently in place for the paper system will remain in place, just the delivery will change. The administrators who currently make the decisions of what can and can’t be sent to various units and individuals within the university will still do so.

Discussion continued on the merits of a dashboard system that would allow faculty to access documents such as your CV so that you could easily retrieve information when requested by the university. The system was supported by several members of Faculty Assembly.

President Pinsky and Vice-President Weiss requested that Arena write a column for the University Times Senate Matters column to get the word out on this program. Arena responded that he would do that.

On a separate issue, a faculty member asked if faculty can get the email quota increased and Arena responded that if you ask the helpdesk, you can get this quota increased.

Elections Update, Professor John Baker, Elections Chair
The results of the recent elections for officers and Faculty Assembly were reported in the University Times. The elections for Senate Committees have commenced as well. For Faculty Assembly, 3,248 faculty had access to vote online, 661 voted, which is 20%. That is consistent with most years. We had unusually low voting last year for electronic elections, but it did rebound this year. For the officer elections, 3,840 faculty had access to vote and 11% voted for officers, which is consistent with previous years. Even though two or our candidates were running unopposed, it did not seem to affect our voting.

Remarks:
President Pinsky remarked that next June will be his last meeting, so we need to identify a person who wants to work with the university administration. We have a material impact on what they do. To be the President, Vice-President, or Secretary, you really have to have your heart in it. We need to identify candidates for the two positions next year.

Paul Munro asked if there was a breakdown by upper and lower campus for voting. Baker responded that the percent varies from unit...
to unit. We had a high participation, 58% in one of the units. There is variation from unit to unit and one of the reasons you do see variation is because in a few units, someone was running unopposed.

Close asked if it was a rule that Faculty Assembly members could not run unopposed. Baker responded that you should have two candidates for each position and that he and the committee did make an effort to find candidates.

Smitherman followed up with the discussions about getting the word out about voting at the last meeting. He reported that he had attempted to get permission to use the all faculty email list that the (SOM) dean’s office maintains. After consideration by the administration, he was told that he would not be able to use it. The reason given was because the vice-dean’s efforts and the faculty senate’s efforts are different and if we started sending out faculty senate announcements through the dean’s office, we might start to blur the difference between the university senate and the administration. Smitherman was able to get the list for all of the department chairs and ask them to forward that email to their entire faculty. He does not think that this is a viable option because we would have no way of knowing if the chair had actually sent the email out to faculty. He suggested that we get rid of the big mailing at the beginning of elections and to simply send something postcard size through the university mail that is eye catching that tells faculty to vote. We are only permitted to send one email for the elections, so we could then also send another reminder in postcard form when elections are about to close. Because there is a bump seen in voting when the mailings are sent out, this option may increase the number of faculty who vote.

Kovacs asked if we have ever done a survey to find out why faculty aren’t involved and why they don’t want to vote or read the emails. President Pinsky responded that this is one of the reasons behind the faculty outreach program.

Bircher responded that to his knowledge, no survey had been done, but these are two examples of how the Faculty Outreach Program could be used. The first is at a faculty meeting, to get the 5 minutes to briefly explain the senate and to ask people why they don’t feel the motivation to participate. Secondly, with respect to professor Arena’s report, we have right now a very important issue of how faculty report their productivity which could reasonably be improved. That is something that you could take either at a faculty meeting or by email to let them know that they have a voice in the design of this particular system. Now is the time to get back to Professor Arena with this information.

Weiss commented that we may need some sort of leadership
development program by the elections committee. Most people when they get involved don’t really know what is involved. It might help to have some event or events for people to get basic orientation to what the different ways of participating are.

Baker agrees and says that one possibility is for the new faculty orientation. President Pinsky responded that we bring this to the chancellor.

Library Committee, Professor Lou Berry, Chair

Professor Lou Berry discussed the issue of open access through the role of the university as a producer and disseminator of knowledge and scholarship, the role of individual members of the academic community in the dissemination of their own scholarship and the long term implications of new technology for the consumption of scholarship and production of new knowledge. For these reasons, the committee created a proposal to establish a task force whose charge would be to develop policies and procedures on open access publishing and faculty use of Pitt’s institutional repository. This proposal was approved by the University Senate and subsequently the task force was established. The work of this group has progressed through this past year and a report has recently been released. The academic community will be privy to that shortly. Additionally, this year, the committee has addressed issues related to the loss of study space with the closing of the GSPIA library, the reopening of the Cup and Chaucer and the renovation of that area.

Remarks:
President Pinsky remarked that we are trying to establish a way so that every scholarly piece of work and data that is not confidential will be open access to the world through Pitt’s library portal. The structure for which this would work, the administrative organization that would do this and the legal issue of copyright all have to be addressed. The reality is that open access is going to be here whether we like it or not. Journals that have open access have much higher impact factors and papers written in them do better. The question is that we cannot go in retrospect and get published work from before because copyright has occurred. The question is how do we craft such a policy which does not put an excessive burden on the faculty or their administrative staff as an unfunded mandate? In this regard one of the things that have come up is an interface with the Computer Usage Committee that the structure for which this data base would be present would also serve as a foundation for your annual reports data. We are far from presenting to you a product to discuss. I hope next month to do so.
Remarks:
Comments from Faculty Assembly members opened a discussion about the issue of something being widely disseminated and the issue of master’s thesis and doctoral dissertations for open access.

Announcements. Senate Council will be held in 2700 Posvar Hall at 3:00pm on Wednesday, May 11th.
Faculty Assembly will be held at the University Club at 3:00pm on Tuesday, June 7th.

Adjournment. Meeting was adjourned at 4:24pm.
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