### Faculty Assembly Minutes
#### 2700 Posvar Hall
#### April 9 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call to Order</strong></td>
<td>The meeting was called to order by President Chris Bonneau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items of New Business</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report of Senate President</strong></td>
<td>Report No Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chris Bonneau*

As the great poet Paul Simon once wrote, “April come she will When streams are ripe and swelled with rain.” And so here we are.

The topics we are discussing today are extraordinarily important: Operation Varsity Blues, legalized sports gambling, and extension of the tenure clock for the School of Medicine. So, I’ll keep it brief here.

We have heard lots of positive feedback about our plenary session on free speech in the modern university. Our keynote speaker, Sigal Ben-Porath, gave an excellent presentation and the panel discussion afterwards focused on ways the university can both protect speech and promote inclusivity. Special thanks to Lori Molinaro and Linda Santa Casa for coordinating all of the logistics; the event would not have been possible without them.

Next week, the graduate students will vote on whether to unionize. It is important for all graduate students to vote in the election; this is an important decision and it would be a shame if it was made by only a small percentage of students. So, please encourage your graduate students to vote. Also, there are two forums being held this week, and I have agreed to moderate both of them. Tonight, the Graduate Student and Professional Group is having an event with representative from the United Steel Workers. They had hoped to have members of the administration participate as well, but they declined. Tomorrow evening, Provost Cudd and Vice Provost Urban are hosting a forum. I am hopeful both will be well attended and informative.

The Faculty Affairs Committee held a listening session for NTS faculty last week. Unfortunately, I was traveling and unable to attend. However, Robin was able to go, and has some information to share......

*Robin Kear, Vice President*

I attended the NTS listening session hosted by our Senate Faculty Affairs Committee last Thursday afternoon. There were approximately 25-30 NTS faculty in attendance. I was disheartened to hear that many of the same issues addressed by recommendations in our Senate’s NTS reports have not been resolved or are being resolved unevenly. The first report regarding NTS concerns was made in February of 2015 to FA. The report concerning NTS part-time faculty report came in March 2017. These good faith recommendations agreed to then in principle by the
Provost’s office have not trickled down evenly to where our colleagues are impacted the most.
Small groups at the session worked on answering two questions in the realm of the NTS experience, what is working at the university, and what needs improvement. The list of what is working was encouraging: health and educational benefits are greatly appreciated; some improvement in some areas through the movement of part-time positions to full-time; the caliber and quality of the interactions with students; in some units promotion requirements have been clarified; and the collegial, supportive environment in some units/departments.

However, as evidenced by what I heard, there is still great room for improvement. For part-time faculty there are still contract date issues and access to resources in some units. A recommendation of $4,000 per course has not been met in some areas, or was an unfunded mandate. Some units/schools still have unclear promotion guidelines for NTS and/or are bound by policies in place that apply to tenurable faculty. There were calls for transparency and communication related to rank, promotion, salary, role of NTS, contract renewal dates, timely notifications, and any non-teaching expectations. The voting expectations of NTS within departments/schools is not clear or unequal (example, NTS votes count for a portion of a vote). NTS are vulnerable to personalities of chairs/deans rather than protected by policy.

These are the people who teach in support of our tenure process (when course releases are required or in other instances) and who are entrusted to be a large part of providing the best possible on-campus undergraduate experience.

Arguments that these NTS professors should find better positions elsewhere if it is so terrible here is disrespectful and disingenuous of their important role on campus.

As your officers, we will be discussing this further with senior administration at our regular meeting next Wednesday. We are seeking evidence of the broad implementation of the various report recommendations and how this can be done better, quicker, and in an equal way.

President Bonneau: Finally, elections are currently underway for Faculty Assembly and Senate Officers. Please be sure to participate and encourage your colleagues to do the same.

### Athletics & Recreation Committee

**Professor Sheila Velez Martinez, Faculty Athletics Representative**

**PRESENTATION:**

Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR): liaison between academics and athletics, academic performance and well being of athletes, “eyes” of the Chancellor in athletic matters. In the ACC, the FARS are part of the governance structure. Also serves as a consultant to the SARC.

Varsity Blues: March 12. FAR, the Chancellor, and the Athletic Director were travelling together when the issues emerged. Over 50 indictments to date. Opportunity for self-examination; met with Dustin Gray, Associate Athletic Director for
Compliance and Exec Assoc Provost Dave DeJong – reviewed admissions processes, especially for candidates who do not come through the normal academic review pathway (students who do not meet higher academic performance). There is good oversight, though not many understand the process.

Three pathways for student athletes to be admitted:
Pathway 1: regular admissions process, several people with oversight inside both athletics and admissions, safeguards to avoid influence
Pathway 2: student athletes that may not be as well academically prepared, close to regular admissions. Coding system through athletics and registrar to act as check and balances. If a student suggests they will be recruited, the admissions people check with athletics compliance. Suggested change --- for all Pathway 2 students tracked --- and reviewed by Pathway 3 process to consider drop outs or poor performance.
Pathway 3: Student athletes on scholarship are admitted, 15-person committee with representation from SARC. Thorough look at each student’s file – transcripts, interviews with sponsoring coaches, international student representative, student support services. Deep individual review by student. Least likely to be vulnerable to fraud because of the level of review. Suggested change --- assistant coach engagement, more intensive tracking especially in first year.
Overall, we think the processes are well in place to protect the University.

DISCUSSION:
Varsity Blues
SMOLINSKI: The cases in the news were more about Pathway 2 students.
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: If those students were adequately reviewed and followed it would have been better. Following team drop offs, also monitoring across teams and years.
MUNRO: Is there any participation requirement in their admissions letter?
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: They have to sign a letter of commitment via the NCAA. The issues were not in the money-making major sports because a student misplaced on a team like that would be identified easily, so the lower tier sports are more vulnerable.
MUNRO: If someone lies on their application, can we revoke their admission later?
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: Not sure of Pitt’s policy on this. It is the policy at many other universities.
D’CUNHA: Is there a way to catch this as they are coming in rather than later?
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: Applications are scrutinized. Pathway 2 and 3 are examined carefully.
SUKITS: This seems complex — but if you state something on an application, it comes down to the coaches being responsible. The coach either verifies or doesn’t.
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: It is but also vetted by committee.
SMOLINSKI: Good searches could reveal details that can be verified.
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: Exactly.

**Sports Gambling**

VELEZ-MARTINEZ: Everything I said about the Varsity Blues situation being good at Pitt --- gambling is equally bad. Pennsylvania policy is not well developed. We know Rivers casino will be hosting gambling and a production.
TANANIS: Insert from Jay Irrgang, the Co-Chair of SARC: “Discussed at the Apr 1st meeting was the effects of legalized sports wagering on intercollegiate athletes, presented by Dustin Gray. The Athletic Department and University are closely monitoring the state regulations related to sports wagering and attempting to influence regulations to maintain the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.”
SMOLINSKI: Online gambling has been happening for a long time.
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: NCAA has rules against this.
BRATMAN: What are the profit making sports at Pitt?
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: She is not the person to disseminate this information. Football, basketball, wrestling and women’s volleyball are all nationally ranked.
BECKER: Predict that years later we may well be investigating student athletes and their families for money making.
VELEZ-MARTINEZ: There is an integrity service that researches a number of algorithms that check these issues. Pitt has been in discussion with one to better learn what they do and how.
**Library Committee**  
*Professor Irene Frieze, Co-Chair & Zach Brodt, Archivist*

**PRESENTATION:**  
**Presentation of the Archives**, Zach Brodt, University Archivist.  
See Handout for information on the Archives, records included and historical value of the Archives.

**Report to Faculty Assembly** – April 9, 2019  
Co-Chairs: Irene Frieze and Elizabeth Mahoney

After not meeting for over a year, the Senate Library Committee has been functioning again since the fall of 2017. Given the many changes in our libraries, this is an important time for the members of the Senate Library Committee to have a way of directly meeting with the heads of our University Library System [Kornelia Tancheva], Health Sciences Library System [Barbara Epstein] and Law Library [Mark Silverman].

Mission Statement. The purpose of the Senate Library Committee is to discuss and make recommendations related to services, resources and policies of all of the libraries at the University in order to assure that the research and teaching needs of all members of the University community are met and that the highest standards are maintained. The Committee’s mandate extends to future library services and facilities.

**Discussion Topics and Activities of the Committee**

- Open access publishing and ways to facilitate faculty to utilize this type of publishing. [There is some limited funding provided by ULS to assist in paying open-access fees]. ULS also works with faculty who want to archive some of their own papers or other publications.
- Long term trend for books to be moved to our archives on Thomas Blvd in Homewood. [A visit there made the extent of our archived holdings very clear. We also received a detailed report about how the book storage process functions, and about materials handled by Special Collections]. ULS works to make sure that if books in storage are requested, they can be sent to Oakland within a day or two.
- Ongoing renovations in Hillman Library and Health Sciences Library. Increasingly, libraries are places for students to study and work on projects alone or in groups. Spaces to facilitate this are part of the renovations now being done.
- Choice of a new Library Management System to replace PittCat.
- Archival Scholars Research Awards. Awards made to assist students to do original research using our existing library
archives. See: http://www.asundergrad.pitt.edu/research/awards

• Donations to the archives. [See handout on reverse side]. Administrators and faculty are urged to donate appropriate materials to the library.

**Future Agenda Items**

• Roles of ULS Department liaisons and other library services provided to lower campus faculty. Many services are currently being offered to HS faculty that are not available on lower campus.

**DISCUSSION:** None

**Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee**

*Professors Carey Balaban and Abbe de Vallejo, presenters*

See Draft Resolution for Faculty Assembly to Endorse the Provost’s Request to Create a Uniform Tenure Time Clock for the Faculty of the School of Medicine

Motion from Committee
Second from TASHBOOK

**DISCUSSION:**

DE VALLEJO: Provost suggested dissatisfaction with two tiers of tenure. Proposing that the 10yr tenure clock would be available to all faculty, removing the difference between clinical and non-clinical faculty

BALABAN: This has been in discussion for years (about ten years ago) and has been voted on at various times, with strong support. Seen as something to faculty benefit.

BONNEAU: Faculty can still come up early if they chose to.

THOMPSON (Assistant Dean of School of Medicine): Over half of the 7 yr clock have taken the “extension.” This policy change would allow for this extended clock to no longer compel faculty of the added stress in asking for the extension. Timing currently leaves us vulnerable to either extend tenure to people too soon (who do not work out well) or to miss some candidates who would prove to be good faculty.

Aspirational peers/peers: 13 school consortium --- we are at the bottom of time to tenure requirements.

FRIEZE: Why do we not extend to all schools?

BONNEAU: The Provost has a committee seeking information about extending the clock for other schools or departments.
BALABAN: The longer block has become accepted.
MUNRO: Are there different requirements for clinical faculty?
THOMPSON: Difference within the field, dependent on what they work with.
HENKER: Johns-Hopkins has done this, and we’ve been discussing this in the School of Nursing as well.
STONER: A majority of the committee endorsed this --- what was the minority report?
KOVACS: Would like to have a better idea on the implications for the University, how this adds to the separation of the School of Medicine from others in the University. Issues related to requirements for tenure as well, such as whether grantmaking is the same as other metrics for academic input. I would have preferred to have more information, and so I was the person who voted against.
BRATMAN: typographic errors on resolution (correction)
MORRELL: Also voting on bylaws as well? (clarified)
LOUGHLIN: Grandfathers or only new hires? (clarification on some language as well)
THOMPSON: New hires, current will need to ask for extension.

VOTE: Passed unanimously

Unfinished Business and/or New Business

No Business

Announcements
SUKITS: Retirement oversight committee --- won two major awards –
Pension and Investment Magazine Eddy Award for best managed transition program 2018
Planned Sponsor Magazine – Planned Sponsor of the Year

Adjournment

Moved and accepted, 4:15pm

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:
http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly
Respectfully Submitted,

Cindy Tananis, Ed.D.
University Senate Secretary
Associate Professor
Administrative and Policy Studies, Education Leadership
Director
Collaborative for Evaluation and Assessment Capacity

HAIL TO PITT!
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