

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
April 10, 2018

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
<p><u>Call to Order</u> The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00 pm.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting</u> Minutes (March 13, 2018) were approved as written.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
<p><u>Items of New Business</u></p>	<p>No Business</p>
<p>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson Election – officers for Senate open through April 19th. Second phase of elections to fill standing committees will begin on April 25th. Committee positions are still open; notify Michael Spring or Lori Molinaro to get on the ballot.</p> <p>Internal changes at Pitt have included 11 new Deans (or positions), Library, LRDC, UCSUR Directors, Provost search, searches for CFO, Chief Investment Officer. Dramatic organizational changes across the University. Senate and Committee elections will be very important.</p> <p>Governmental Relations luncheon with representatives on March 30th with Austin Davis in special election for the region. Graduate of Pitt-Greensburg. A friend in Harrisburg.</p> <p>Pitt Day in Harrisburg was rescheduled due to bad weather; now on May 23rd. Downside, campus is not in regular session, so we will likely have fewer students. Upside, the date is further along in the budget cycle and so we might have more influence. Please consider going.</p> <p>Senate Budget Policy Committee (Wes Rohrer, chair) has really planned ahead and doing a lot of hard work in coordination with the University administration. This has helped to produce timely reports and additional information. Discussions have been open and productive. Survey to various units to monitor budget access and planning issues to inform the process.</p> <p>University Planning and Budget Committee has met more often than typical this year; additional meeting in the next two weeks to consider recommendations to the Provost and Chancellor.</p> <p>Titusville campus challenges: conversion into a professional development hub for the region. Dr. Larry Feick as leader of this effort. Faculty and staff have been living through a stressful time. The University is trying to develop severance</p>	<p>Discussion below</p>

<p>packages for those who may not have continued employment. We hope for continued openness of the process by the University to help our colleagues deal with these stressors.</p> <p>Plenary on March 27th. It was a well-attended and successful meeting with speakers and discussion on teaching. All of the topics were of interest in how we need to and are changing our teaching effectiveness for undergraduates and graduates. Center for Teaching and Learning will be continuing to play off of these topics/issues to press forward in considering how to best impact teaching for the future. Video of the plenary is available via the Senate site.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: STONER: Any estimate of Titusville impact in terms of percentage of faculty and staff? WILSON: Not yet clear. Whole programs will be terminated. Staff will be impacted, as well.</p> <p>LANDSITTEL: In addition to Plenary, Landsittel wrote a Senate Matters piece that has also generated discussion in email. The discussion was interesting: evaluation of teaching, incentives for teaching and innovation in teaching.</p>		
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></p>	<p><u>Research Committee</u> <i>Penny Morel, chair</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Proposed Changes to Policy 11-01-03 Conflict of Interest Policy for Research</p> <p>The following are some of the important elements of the proposed new policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the policy were made with respect to faculty and inventor equity ownership in companies licensing University owned inventions. Under current policy the maximum equity that a faculty member can hold in a licensed start-up company is 49%. The new policy places no limit on equity ownership by faculty. • Faculty members will be allowed to have management positions in start-ups, provided they have the prior approval of their supervisors and agree to a Conflict of Interest (COI) management plan. This significantly broadens the current policy which allows Principal Investigators (PIs) to have management positions in start-ups only for two years or until there is \$500,000 in product sales and only for companies with options to license, and not an active license to University Intellectual Property (IP). Except in cases of human subject research, holding a management position would 	<p>Discussion and Vote noted within report section</p>

	<p>not automatically preclude a faculty member from being the PI on a project at the University that is related to company interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty will continue to be allowed to pursue outside activities (for example, consulting) for 20% of their time (1 day/week). • Faculty members will now be allowed to conduct research benefiting outside entities as part of their 20% outside activity time. This has not been allowed to date. In the new proposed policy, when research benefiting an outside entity is conducted as an outside activity, this research must be performed at an outside facility. • Outside activities still require approval by the faculty member’s supervisor and compliance with the existing policy on outside activities. (Policy 02-06-01) • Faculty members with a Significant Financial Interest (SFI) related to research involving animals will now be permitted to serve as PI on that research project. This must be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and the COI Committee (COIC). The PI must agree to a COIC-approved conflict management plan. Previous policy prohibited a faculty member with a SFI from serving as PI on an animal study when that study was related to their financial interests. • No changes were made from the current policy prohibiting, in almost all cases, faculty members with a SFI from serving as PI on research involving human subjects when the SFI is related to the research. Exceptions are made rarely, and final authority rests with the Institutional Review Board, a component of the Human Research Protection Office. • Research funded by a company will be allowed in designated university facilities when appropriate University agreements are in place. For example, University research, funded by a company and conducted in University space, will be allowed under an executed sponsored research agreement (no change in policy). Research funded by a company and conducted by company personnel in university-owned space may be allowed under a situation-appropriate agreement 	
--	--	--

	<p>that has been approved by the University, department and COIC (change in policy; previously, this situation was not allowed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change was made from current policy regarding faculty members being allowed to conduct sponsored research when the PI has a SFI in the sponsoring company. COIC approval and COI management is required. <p>Under the new policy, an SFI and associated disclosure and oversight requirements arise only if royalty income exceeds \$5,000 (PHS) or \$10,000 (non-PHS) over a 12-month period. Under current policy, simply being an inventor of patented technology constitutes an SFI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversight and enforcement of this new COI policy continues to rest with the academic unit of the primary appointment of the researcher and with the unit where the research is being conducted. • COI training has been modified to be consistent with new less-burdensome training requirements. Re-training in COI will be required every four years and not every three years as presently required by policy. • The draft specifically addresses conflicts of commitments, in addition to COI, in order to capture the full universe of potential outside activity undertaken by faculty. For instance, this broadens COI away from solely addressing equity bearing companies whose outcome is a liquidity event, as not all outside activity by faculty concerns this type of work. • An overarching goal in preparing this draft was to develop a policy that is simple and stresses clarity. The intent is to have the policy be a standalone document, meaning that someone who is not familiar with COI could read it and understand COI and the University's position. • Another overarching goal was to separate the policy components from the procedural components of COI governance to the extent possible. The current policy consists of an intermix of policy and procedure. Accordingly, a significant change found in this version is that many procedural aspects found in the current 	
--	---	--

	<p>policy are removed and instead there are references to websites or other publications and authorities that provide that type of procedural detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In preparing this draft, other universities’ policies were reviewed and gaps in our existing policy’s coverage were identified. Accordingly, new information, including a fuller set of definitions, is included in this draft to appropriately describe the policy’s coverage. For instance, this draft includes a definition of “incidental use,” based on definitions the Federal government uses, which we believe to be workable and enforceable. <p>Draft Policy #11-01-03</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>FRIEZE: What were the problems you were hoping to solve with these revisions?</p> <p>MOREL: The procedures were rigid; make it easier for people to move innovations forward.</p> <p>BALABAN: Clarification and better definition of various conflicts of interest and removing burdens for faculty. Workable and prudent policy aligned with a more modern view.</p> <p>KEAR: Company-sponsored research --</p> <p>MOREL: Researchers may have company funding</p> <p>RUTENBAR: Most expeditious way to move an idea forward may be from a company to do research here --- this policy allows us to take a more negotiated role in working through roles</p> <p>CONLEY: How does that align with bullet 4 that indicates outside company research must be performed at outside company?</p> <p>RUTENBAR: That only applies to <i>consulting</i> contracts</p> <p>MULVANEY: Were we losing faculty as a result of prior policies?</p> <p>RUTENBAR: Yes, definitely. Rutenbar provided a vignette example. We had lots of input from many stakeholders to inform this policy.</p> <p>STONER: Company use of University space – liability/firewalled in case of lawsuit?</p> <p>RUTENBAR: Indemnification waiver is negotiated</p> <p>ROHRER: 20% time, one day a week consulting limit – is there any monitoring of this restriction?</p> <p>RUTENBAR: Oversight is pushed as far down as possible --- for example, department chair (first line supervisor).</p> <p>FRIEZE: 2nd bullet --- distinction of human subjects’ research?</p> <p>RUTENBAR: These are federal regulations that intersect with</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>this policy – this is an example. Runtenbar provided an example related to drug testing and company ownership. BOROVETZ: question related to human protections issues RUTENBAR: Human Protection Office has the right to weigh in; often in conjunction with other policies BONNEAU: This policy is providing more options and opportunities, call the questions</p> <p>VOTE: unanimously in favor of the new policy</p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p>	<p><u>COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE (ad hoc formation to consider whether we need a standing committee)</u> Frank Wilson</p> <p>This issue surfaced when the University Times changed. A few people have come together (volunteers Beck, Kear, Wilson, Landsittel) to consider the formation of an ad hoc committee:</p> <p>Survey communication apparatuses are in place at Pitt What are other institutions doing? What other options might we consider? Consider other standing committees’ missions/concerns</p> <p>Would like to form the ad hoc committee.</p> <p>DISCUSSION BALABAN: How many people have volunteered? WILSON: Maybe more will be willing to serve as the committee is formed ROHRER: Endorses this committee; surprised by how much is not communicated and what people do not seem to know WILSON: University Times representative? There is now an advisory committee for the Times that is now meeting. There will be a new editor for the Times and a new KOVACS: Has there been any movement for a paper version of the Times? Highly discriminatory and exclusionary. WILSON: This is an example of this potential committee SPRING: There is an Advisory Board to report to the Chancellor regarding University Times. There has been debate about the form, coverage (less substantive of faculty governance), Vice Chancellor that made the decision to go electronic is gone, a new editor is required --- many irons in and out of the fire over this past year. I endorse the idea of this committee to develop a statement for the Chancellor regarding communication needs; would like to see the committee consider whether new channels are needed (with funding) to support Senate communication. I do not support a STANDING committee --- rather a committee to determine if new forms of communication are needed? KOVICS: Why weren’t we told about the reports and issues?</p>	<p>Proposal and Discussion</p>

	<p>SPRING: the Advisory Committee formation was discussed here. Committee formation and initiation has taken more time than we expected. Appropriate reporting was made here.</p> <p>WILSON: Part of the problem is that there have been sputtering starts and stops to the process; we report what has happened; the committee we are proposing</p> <p>TASHBOOK: Benefits and Welfare committee has been very pleased with University Times</p> <p>BALABAN: Call the question</p> <p>VOTE: 1 abstention, motion carries.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements</u></p>		
<p><u>Adjournment</u></p>		<p>Moved and accepted, 4:07p</p>

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

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



HAIL TO PITT!

Respectfully Submitted,

Cindy Tananis, Ed.D.

University Senate Secretary

Associate Professor

Administrative and Policy Studies, Education Leadership

Director

Collaborative for Evaluation and Assessment Capacity

Members attending:

Bachman, Balaban, Becker, Bircher, Bonneau, Borovetz, Brodt, Bromberg, Buchanich, Cassaro, Conley, Cook, Dahm, Danford, Fort, Frieze, Gold, Goldberg, Kaufman, Kear, Kiselyov, Kovacs, Landsittel, Loughlin, Molinaro, Morel, Mulvaney, Munro, Nelson, Phillippi, Roberts, Rohrer, Salcido, Sereika, Smolinski, Soska, Spring, Stoner, Tananis, Tashbook, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

Members not attending:

Adams, Betru, Bilodeau, Bratman, Clark, Deitrick, De Vallejo, Gaddy, Harper, Harries, Horne, Infanti, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthak, Kaynar, Kelly, Landrigan, Long, Martin, McGreevy, Mendeloff, Muenzer, Mulcahy, Olanyk, Rigotti, Sant, Sukits, Swanson, Taboas, Thorpe, Van Nostrand, Weikle-Mills

*Excused attendance:

Czerwinski, Guterman, Henker, Kubis, Labrinidis, Lyon, Perry, Weinberg

Others attending:

Hitter, Huber, Kirsch, Lancaster, McCarthy, Rubio, Rutenbar, Tuttle, Wilcox

*Notified Senate Office