Faculty Assembly Minutes 2700 Posvar Hall April 12, 2016

Topic/Discussion	Action
Call to Order	The meeting
The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.	commenced at 3:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	
President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of	Minutes were approved
March 15, 2016.	as written.
Introduction of Items of New Business	
There were no items of new business raised.	None
Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson	None
neport of Senate Fresident, Frank Wilson	
President Wilson made brief remarks to open the meeting. The Senate Council in March was an experiment of an open discussion about diversity and inclusion, and institutional values statements. After that meeting, we had the Senate Plenary, which was an extremely interesting session with though-provoking keynote speaker and panel discussion. It was serious content connected to our work this semester and into next year. He thanked the planning committee and Seth Weinberg especially for organizing the event. The keynote presentation is on the AAUP blog and there will be a link on the Senate webpage. The Provost announced that next year will be the Year of Diversity, so planning will be underway for that. This was a recommendation from the "group" that was charged by the Chancellor to bring this topic to the forefront of discussion and action. President Wilson will be expanding the group to address the idea of institutional values statements and connections to diversity and inclusion. He is in the process of doing that currently, including more faculty involvement, and transition of student members. He would like EIADAC and TAFC represented. Everyone was reminded to vote for Senate elections and officers (voting is open now), and also, Committee positions will have elections starting next week. Let Lori Molinaro know if you are	No further discussion.
interested in Committee positions (deadline 4/13/16).	
Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the	
<u>Senate</u>	
Student Admissions, Aid & Affairs Committee (SAAAC): Professor Cho Cho Lin and Ms. Robin Kear, Co-Chairs	
Robin Kear presented this update from SAAC. The SAAC reported in mid-Fall about what their plans were. An update was presented as noted below.	Discussion notes are recorded below.
BACKGROUND At a Senate Council meeting in October of 2015, the past-president, David Gau, and current president, Joseph Kozak, of the Graduate & Professional Student Government (GPSG) reported that some graduate students felt disconnected from Pitt. While they may identify closely with their school or department, they do not feel a part of 'Pitt.' Joseph Kozak also reported that GPSG was conducting a climate survey to try to investigate the depth of this issue. In the November 2015, January and February 2016 meetings of the Student Admissions,	
Aid, and Affairs (SAAA) Committee, this issue was examined from a variety of angles:	

the GPSG student climate survey, interviews by Office of the Provost (OTP) staff with Associate Deans and school administrators about graduate student services in all schools, addressing differences between master's, doctoral, and professional programs, and graduate student usage of programs and services from the Dean of Students. Discussions were held on what kind of experience that graduate students expect, need, or might want from the University. From these meetings, the SAAA Committee agreed that they want to take care of all of our students and work toward a better experience for all graduate students.

POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS

The Provost's Office has taken these concerns very seriously and action has been taken already. For example, almost immediately, Alberta Sbragia, Vice-Provost for Graduate Studies, was appointed as a chancellor liaison to SAAAC. This will continue so that any future graduate concerns brought to SAAAC will be heard right away. Much movement has occurred already including:

- University-wide Graduate Student Orientation; including how the OTP can provide more support.
- Minority Recruiting Graduate Associate Dean Group chaired by Dr. Sbragia
- Looking at gaps in technology to address information needs
- Investigating a new graduate and professional student satisfaction survey (gradSERU) that is being piloted at 2 other universities
- Interested in providing increased support to staff, such as sharing of best practices and increasing opportunities to efficiently answer questions
- Inform faculty of existing resources so that they can better advise their students
- Improve graduate studies website to better communicate available resources
- University-wide resources that will be better promoted:
 - Off-Campus Living and Cool Pittsburgh websites
 - Graduate and Professional Student Funding Opportunities Portal
 - Career services
 - Teaching improvements and opportunities
 - Office of International Services (OIS)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The SAAAC is asking for endorsement from Faculty Assembly on the recommendations:

We recommend that the Provost consider the following recommendations and provide progress or action on these items 12 months upon receiving the SAAAC report and recommendations:

1. Improved Communication

The number one request of the GPSG was the ability to communicate directly and efficiently with all graduate students. For example, sending an email newsletter once a semester to all graduate students can improve awareness of available resources and services. Other examples are suggested best practices from the OTP and a gathering of relevant staff across schools in a half-day retreat to share best practices.

2. Institutional Support of GPSG Activities

There has been some movement to do so, but we recommend more institutional support for graduate students. This includes support for broad activities that GPSG has

<u>SAAAC</u>

Recommendations: Voting showed all in favor; none opposed; one (1) abstention. initiated such as a fall orientation for graduate students (GPSG University-wide Graduate Student Orientation started in 2014) and general campus tours/orientation for graduate students ('Trailblazers' started in 2014.) This could also include appointing a graduate student life coordinator that works across schools and is a bridge between academics and other parts of student life.

3. Graduate Student Support Outside the Provost's area

There are areas in the university that do not directly report to the Provost where graduate students need support, such as off-campus housing and facilities. We recommend that other relevant non-provost units are identified and made aware of graduate student needs.

The members of the SAAAC were thanked for their efforts.

Discussion:

Frieze: It was good that we charged the committee last year with looking at graduate student activities. How do you feel about splitting the committee into two (one for graduate, one for undergraduate)?

Kear: We feel that the committee can do it all and does not need to be split. Frieze: That is good. It was clearly an unmet need.

Weiss: Did you talk at all to the office of academic career development in the health sciences?

Kear: I am not 100% sure if they were contacted. The populations are very different and we looked for common ground across campus life.

Weiss: In the School of medicine, there are PhD's and other types of graduate students.

Kear: Our goal is to make resources to be available to everyone. Which graduate degree will not matter.

Munro: How much of these resources will be available at the School level versus the University level?

Kear: We run into the same problems when looking at these policies, age/expectation differences, full-time versus part time, etc. We were trying to be broad and work with all graduate students.

Wilson: Do we have a formal endorsement from the Faculty Assembly? All those in favor? (all in favor; 1 abstention)

Budget Policies Committee (BPC):

Professor Beverly Gaddy, Chair

The **University's Planning and Budgeting System (PBS)**, in effect since 1992, was intended to provide broader participation by faculty, staff and students in operational and long-range planning through participation on planning and budgeting committees at all levels. The PBS tasks BPC with "reviewing whether the PBS processes are followed

PBS Recommendations: Voting showed all in favor; none opposed; with one (1) abstention and whether all constituencies involved are provided adequate opportunities to participate in the process and to be informed of the outcomes." The document calls for inclusive review process of the document every 5 years. Periodic reviews occurred in 1996 and 2001 (the last was completed and approved in 2003). In its 2012 reaccreditation of the University, the Middle Schools Commission recommended another review.

Nonetheless the BPC, upon request by the Provost's Office, delayed action due to the impending retirement of Chancellor Nordenberg, deciding to wait at least a year after a new Chancellor had taken office before initiating a review. A review of the document was among the top priorities of this year's BPC. The process was initiated in December 2015.

Professor Gaddy noted that she brought a resolution before this body (Faculty Assembly) at the February 2016 meeting that they direct the Senate President to appoint an ad hoc committee, consisting of faculty and members of the Council of Deans, to review the PBS document and propose revisions of it to the University Senate and Council of Deans for action. The resolution was unanimously approved.

Expeditious action was taken by President Wilson and David DeJong to appoint a committee of three faculty members and three members from the Council of Deans, chaired by David. The members were:

Faculty: Frank Wilson, Wes Rohrer, Beverly Gaddy Deans: William Carter, Marc Harding, Gerald Holder

The committee worked quickly in order to get this through and back to this body before the end of the semester, which had been their ambitious goal. They went through several iterations in revising:

- a. An initial meeting of all committee members
- b. David DeJong in concert with Deans Carter, Harding and Holder recommended the first revisions. Then they sent it to the three faculty: Gaddy, Rohrer, and Wilson.
- c. The three faculty commented and suggested further revisions.
- d. Back to the Deans for their comments and further revisions.
- e. Back to the faculty for our review and further revisions, etc.

Suggested revisions were presented to BPC at our March 25 meeting. Further revisions were suggested and incorporated. The BPC voted unanimously to approve and send to Faculty Assembly for this meeting.

As part of our review process we also conducted a survey of the University community regarding their participation in PBS, their familiarity of it, their satisfaction with it, and other comments. The survey was modeled after the survey conducted in 2002 and was conducted by Amanda Brodish, Office of Academic Planning and Resources Management. The BPC was consulted and helped to design the survey in our February meeting. A cross-section of the University was recruited to participate. The survey was open to all and was widely publicized in University Times, Read Green, direct emails to relevant populations, and in other ways. Survey was tested by BPC, then open on Feb 23, 2016 through March 16, 2016. Responses were anonymous, with opportunity to provide open-ended responses. The survey was begun by 1,287 individuals, completed

by 895 (70%). The BPC reviewed the results, which were fully shared and posted to Faculty Assembly members ahead of the meeting, and highlighted the following:

- f. A low response rate among faculty (N=300; 23% of respondents)
- g. Administrators appear to be the most knowledgeable of and the most satisfied with the PBS system (N=106, 8% of respondents)
- h. Faculty appear to be no more knowledgeable of or satisfied with the system than are staff or students.
- i. Faculty appear to be least satisfied with the PBS at the departmental level: only 42% responded that it has improved planning and budgeting at the Department level (as opposed to 64% who responded it has done so in the University as a whole), and only 44% responded that they felt they have the opportunity to influence and provide input into planning and budgeting at the department level (compared with 79% of administrators, 39% of staff, and 38% of students).

Professor Gaddy noted that overall, faculty need to participate more, and need to be more knowledgeable about the budgeting process. It is the responsibility of the SPBC to help make faculty more aware of this process. David DeJong noted that the two biggest takeaways from the survey findings were: a) faculty lack of knowledge of the planning and budgeting system; and b) application of PBS is not spreading across business units. It was noted that unit-level administrators should follow the PBS, and move it forward based on granular views of the survey.

Discussion:

Tananis: Could you follow-up a bit? Response rate was low among faculty. Did you feel that practices and policy were varied across units? Were faculty perceptions more accurate in some areas?

DeJong: I cannot judge that. I am concerned that the biggest response was that "I am not aware of processes" for planning and budgeting. This seems to be the biggest impediment to faculty involvement. This is low-hanging fruit.

Morel: Is this because of lack of procedures at unit-level?

DeJong: I think these are quite isolated.

Norris: As School of Medicine members, we are not aware that we have any place in the procedures for planning and budgeting. I am not aware of any process or procedure that involves faculty or staff in department, unit, and school budget and planning. The other item on the agenda will speak to that. Procedures do not exist.

Gaddy: The policy that is in place shows a large lack of awareness.

DeJong: The lack of awareness is not located to one school.

Gaddy: We hope to have this publicized to the Deans and getting awareness out there to faculty, staff, and Council of Deans will include 1:1 meetings, using more granular survey results.

Tananis: The overall return rate is so low, and is one of my concerns. You can have pockets of over-representation or you may have not enough data to conclude. I would be conservative in how we look at this, and consider other data sources. Gaddy: We were concerned as well and tried to broadcast this as much as possible.

Tananis: We do not have a good representation of the faculty, so I would not turn to the survey data as an argument or counter-argument. We need higher level of faculty participation in these types of survey.

Bircher: I served on SOM PBC for 8 years, and was on the SVC Health Sciences BP committee as well. After 1998, these meetings became closed door or no longer exist. We have not had representatives to these committees since 1998. I do not think it is working as designed right now.

Spring: Two things are being presented here: 1) regarding the comments, what were people saying might be better with the PBS?

DeJong: Three things: a) document is too specific and thus hard to follow (e.g. overdetailed strategic planning timeline); b) document has redundancy: c) current practice is not updated. All three of these items were edited to reflect current practice and reduce redundancy.

Spring: On page 7 (Table 4), content is consistent with belief before the survey. The higher you go, the more clear everything is. Items that were surprising: percentage agree/strongly agree with PBS being following was 90% of higher by administrators. How can this be the case if 60% of administrators are unsure, and 18% at department level are unsure?

DeJong: It is conditional logic that explains the numbers. The preamble to the survey explained how the percentages were calculated. If you answered "don't know," your data are thrown out.

Spring: Do you agree that faculty and staff tend to be less confident with things being done correctly with the BPS as it gets more detailed?

DeJong: Yes. The survey is very fresh and we will make plans to move forward to address this.

Weinberg: Did recent events with our state budget change the way you are thinking about long-term planning?

DeJong: Yes. We did have to modify our process and create guiding principles for different scenarios. The Committee has become accustomed to looking at large deltas.

Frieze: What is the expectation (at unit level)? I have never seen any numbers from my department. Should we see those numbers as we are doing our planning?

DeJong: It is fair enough to ask at department/unit level for numbers. The typical action is more centered on planning versus actual budgeting.

Frieze: So, it is not reasonable to see the operating budget of a department?

DeJong: If the chair is seeking input on where money should be directed, then yes, it is a fair question.

Frieze: We do not know what expectations are related to what we are supposed to have access to. This might be why survey results are poor and faculty are unaware of the PBS.

Wilson: At the school level, you do not see data. We can take this information at SPBC to go back to our units and engage in this conversation. It is disturbing that people are totally unaware and care so little. Given the big picture for state funding, it is more critical than ever that we are aware together of this information. As we do our planning, we can be more serious and realistic.

Gaddy: I assumed that these numbers would be available to department/unit PBCs. This is something we need to look at.

Kear: I chair the Library PBC and we have not seen numbers for years. We do gather ideas from everyone and do planning. We assume the directors see those numbers, but not sure if this works.

Roher: It is not clear to me why numbers cannot be provided, as long as salary is protected, and numbers are in categories for meaningful discussion of allocations.

Gaddy: The PBS document (Chapter 3) says that this information can be available (other than salary).

Tananis: In the School of Education, the School Council is the PBC of the School. We get the same response – you are a planning "without budget" committee, or "budget-free planning" committee. Certain numbers need to be protected and kept within context, but you can make sure that people in units understand policies around budgeting, tuition credit, and agreements, etc. The frustration is how do you do good planning without good budget information?

Wilson: If no further comments, we hope that this process will continue and get serious discussions taking place at the level called for in the PBS document (schools, units). We have a recommendation on the table to endorse the revision of the university PBS document.

Gaddy: This will go to Council of Deans for final approval, with additional review in 5 years.

Wilson: Do we have support for this recommendation? All in favor. One abstention.

Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee (TAFC):

Professor Nick Bircher

Professor Bircher presented the final resolution from the TAFC related to the moratorium on salary reduction for tenured faculty. The central issue here is the fair treatment of tenured faculty. As you will note in the resolution, the effort to insure fair treatment in performance evaluation throughout the University has been a careful, stepwise, deliberative, and well-documented process. The downside to a lengthy process is that the practice of unfair evaluations continues unabated. For the record, he

TAFC Resolution: Voting showed all in favor; none opposed; two (2) abstentions. noted that the recommendations to hold a policy in abeyance while it is being reconsidered are not unprecedented. Implementation of the Academic and Research Visitors policy and the Intellectual Property Agreement are but two examples of policies held in abeyance while they were being reconsidered.

Faculty Assembly created an Ad Hoc Committee on April 29, 2014, to investigate procedures throughout the University for performance evaluation and subsequent salary reduction. On September 8, 2015, the committee reported that at least one School within the University had chosen to relegate scholarly contributions, teaching, and service to marginal roles in tenured faculty's performance evaluations and instead to base overall evaluations primarily on the ability to obtain external funding. This procedure negates the criteria that are used to grant tenure and is antithetical to the three-fold mission of the University: teaching, research, and service. Further, the evaluation procedure in question is sufficiently vague as to allow a targeted application to an individual, or group of individuals, in an arbitrary, capricious, and unfair fashion. Moreover, it creates a hostile working environment by constant threat of salary reduction, thereby undermining the fundamental protections afforded by tenure.

In collegial response to the Ad Hoc Committee's report, the Provost created a working group produce a document to guide development of University-wide guidelines, which meet the five specific recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee's report, which are also itemized in the resolution. The development of both University-wide guidelines and the subsequent development of school-specific guidelines will be a lengthy process which will require extensive deliberation and multiple iterations (including further feedback from the Faculty Assembly and the standing committees). While a lengthy process in and of itself would not be harmful, the very problem which is intended to be solved, i.e., the unfair treatment of faculty, continues unabated while the guidelines to rectify the problem are being developed. Faculty subjected to salary reduction suffer irreparable harm due to a hostile working environment and are deprived of appropriate due process because the University-wide policy insuring fairness has yet to be developed.

The moratorium specified in the resolution would be in effect until such time as both University-wide and school-specific policies and guidelines are established and finalized. This moratorium is not intended to be confrontational. It is rather to ensure that those developing the relevant policies are given adequate time to deliberate, and to properly engage in shared governance. At the same time, unfair treatment of faculty would be stopped while those deliberations are ongoing. Moreover, the recommended moratorium is to be retroactive to April 29, 2014, the date when Faculty Assembly adopted the relevant resolution presented by TAFC. In that context, salary cuts imposed since that date should be reversed and held in abeyance until both University-wide policy, and related school-specific policies, on faculty evaluation and salary reductions are formalized and adopted. Professor Bircher noted that he has the privilege of presenting this resolution to the Assembly on behalf of TAFC and ask you to vote in favor of the resolution strongly urging a moratorium on reducing the salaries of tenured faculty.

As noted in the resolution, this resolution has been unanimously approved by TAFC. The final document was dated April 5, 2016. The resolution is stated below:

Resolved:

The Faculty Assembly highly recommends to and strongly urges the Provost and the Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh to impose a moratorium on reducing the salaries of tenured faculty secondary to performance evaluations based on questionable criteria;

The moratorium should be in effect until both University-wide and School-specific policies and guidelines are established and finalized in regard to the issues at hand, and in line with the principles of joint governance;

The moratorium should be retroactive to April 29, 2014, the date when Faculty Assembly adopted the relevant resolution presented by TAFC; salary cuts imposed since that date should be reversed and held in abeyance until a University-wide policy, and related School-specific policies, on faculty evaluation and salary reductions are formalized and adopted.

Discussion:

Roher: On the 2nd page – is this a theoretical concern or have SOM faculty had salary reductions?

Bircher: We have had cases of this salary reduction.

Hravnak: This looks open-ended in terms of timeline. Is there a timeline?

Bircher: No timeline on this. This is to protect faculty from unfair treatment until the guidelines are completed. The University-wide guidelines and school-specific guidelines need to be aligned. This will be a lengthy process.

Munro: I am surprised the affected faculty have not been interviewed.

Bircher: they have been interviewed related to grieveances by TAFC. They have not been interviewed related to

Loughlin: I support the moratorium. Is this university-wide? Who decides the "reasonable" ("questionable") criteria? [statement in first part of resolution]

Bircher: University-wide criteria will stipulate what has to be met. The absent piece of protection is the existence of university-wide guidelines. Schools now are essentially at liberty to create whatever criteria they want.

Loughlin: Stating reasonable criteria in the resolution opens it up for school/unit to create their own. This might increase use of salary reductions. I suggest that this sentence be removed.

Bircher: Percentages can be unfair.

Goodhart: The issue is not whether the reduction is unreasonable, it is whether the criteria are reasonable for salary reduction. When you say (as written), the "questionable criteria" this raised question.

Wilson: This is a friendly amendment to the resolution to remove the "questionable	
criteria" phrase.	
Frieze: Do we know when the Provost's committee will have recommendations?	
Redfern: I do not know, but will be glad to go back and ask the office.	
Sukits: I have always wondered, do any of the faculty that this affects, understand this is a criteria for compensation?	
Bircher: Those hired after 2009 may know of this. This policy was created in 1999 in the School of Medicine but was not used or disclosed. It was known as of 2009, as it began to be enforced.	
Sukits: That occurrence should be a reason to put in the moratorium in place.	
Bircher: Non-disclosure of a policy, yes, would be a reason.	
Gaddy: We interviewed several deans in this process, and we found that, outside of the School of Medicine, the only concern is that if we make this a university policy, it may be used more often.	
Bircher: The primary objective is to get a university-wide guideline to have a uniform approach. We need a fair set of rules so faculty salaries are not arbitrarily reduced.	
Gaddy: One interviewed dean stated that because of the lack of guidance, salary reduction is used rarely. Would the university-wide guideline make this done more often?	
Bircher; Preservation of academic freedom is up to us. The objective is to set a fair set of rules and move on from there. I do not think there will be a widespread rush by deans to engage in this practice.	
Fort: I am concerned with last statement that this will be retroactive to April. The Committee was to investigate, and it was not until Sept 2015 that we saw the work of the Committee to create new guidelines. Do we need to go back to April 2014?	
Bircher: We need to go back to when Faculty Assembly realized there was a problem.	
Wilson: The committee's recommendation was presented, with a small friendly amendment to remove "based on questionable criteria" from the resolution. Can we have a vote? All in favor: yes; no opposed; 2 abstentions.	
<u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u>	
Professor Frieze brought up that procedures to deal with sexual misconduct will be brought to Faculty Assembly soon and members were encouraged to review and comment ahead of next Faculty Assembly.	None
<u>Announcements</u>	
	None
	I

President Wilson thanked the Committees working on these key resolutions and this is	
all serious and worth reading.	
<u>Adjournment</u>	
The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.	Adjournment at 4:14pm.

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, Beck, Bircher, Cohen, Corrall, Costantino, Czerwinski, Dahm, Donihi, Fort, Frieze, Gaddy, Goodhart, Guterman, Hravnak, Jacob, Kaufman, Kear, Landrigan, Leers, Loughlin, Marra, Molinaro, Morel, Muenzer, Mulvaney, Munro, L. Nelson, Norris, Ramsey, Rigotti, Rohrer, Skledar, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Triulzi, Weinberg, Weiss, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

Members not attending:

Bratman, Clark, Dewar, Frank, Fusco, Gleason, Gold, Helbig, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthak, Kaynar, Kearns, C. Lin, J. Lin, Mauk, McLaughlin, Miller, Mulcahy, S. Nelson, Olanyk, Savinov, Schmidhofer, Scott, Smolinski, Swanson, Toto, Velankar, Vieira,

*Excused attendance:

Ataai, Buchanich, Cole, Falcione, Flynn, Groark, Hartman, Horvath, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Novy, Poloyac, Savoia

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Bonner, DeJong, Devor, Fedele, Gau, Landsittel, Redfern

*Notified Senate Office