Faculty Assembly Minutes 2700 Posvar Hall December 2, 2014

Topic/[Discussion	Action
Call to Order		The meeting
The meeting was called to order by President Michael Spring at 3:00 PM.		commenced at 3:00 PM.
Approval of the Minutes		The minutes were
		approved as written.
Novem	ent Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of ber 5, 2014.	
<u>Introdu</u>	action of Items of New Business	
	ns of new business were introduced.	
Report of Senate President, Michael Spring (December 2014)		No questions or
Report	t of the President of the Senate – December 2014	comments were raised.
1.	We have a report today from Admissions and Student Aid. Following their	
	report we will devote the remainder of our discussion time to the videos and your	
	thoughts on the challenges and opportunities facing Pitt over the coming years.	
2.	The expanded executive committee met with the Chancellor on Friday,	
	November 7 th . The conversation with the Chancellor was lively and broad	
	ranging. Your feedback from the last Assembly meeting played a prominent role	
	in the discussion in a couple ways. First, one of the responsibilities that the	
	Senate takes seriously is advising the administration on matters of University	
	wide concern. Sometimes, matters don't reach the executive committee or the	
	relevant standing committee soon enough for us to provide feedback. We	
	discussed ways to make sure we get the appropriate faculty involved in issues at a	
	stage where we can provide appropriate formative feedback. Second, as we	
	focus on particular issues, it is sometimes more convenient to form special	
	committees to focus on a given task. This can lead to less than optimal	
	communication between all the involved parties. We will be thinking about how	
	we can embrace such structures without losing track of the need to communicate	
	with the involved Senate committees.	
3.	Speaking of special committees Chancellor Gallagher and President Suresh of	
	CMU announced today the formation of a new group to explore how Pitt and	
	CMU might collaborate on the provision of library services. I have spoken with	
	Provost Beeson about the effort, which will temporarily suspend the search for a	
	new Director of ULS, and she has assured me that there will be a Senate	
	appointment to the working group which will be led by Ronald Larsen, Dean of	
	our School of Information Sciences and Keith Webster, Dean of Libraries at CMU.	
4.	Regarding the Plenary on Research Data Management – I am pleased to report	
	to you the Vice Provost Redfern has called together a group of people to talk	
	about what the next steps (short and long-range) should be and how we can	
	move forward on this issue.	

- 5. Regarding the active Ad hoc committees We were planning on an update this month from the ad hoc committee charged with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream faculty, but have put it off until January to leave time for a discussion today on challenges and opportunities. The second Ad hoc Committee formed to address the guidelines in current use for performance evaluation and salary reduction of tenured faculty has begun meeting.
- 6. **Regarding Standing Committees** The Executive committee has also been talking about possible realignments of committees to better meet our responsibilities in shared governance.
- 7. As this is the last meeting of this calendar year, I would like to wish you and yours the blessings of any religious observances in which you participate. For those who do not participate in any religious celebrations, I wish you a peaceful and appropriately snowy break depending on your preferences. One of the things that occur this time of year is the winter Solstice. I suspect that there are many of you, like me, who tire of leaving home in the dark and returning home after the sun has set and look forward to the return of a longer day and the promise of Spring to come with its warmth and light both of which I wish for you in abundance this coming year. Finally, I wish each of you the best as a new year begins.

Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate

No vote needed.

Admissions and Student Aid Committee

Robin Kear, Chair; Lauren Terhorst, Secretary

Mission Statement of the Committee

The primary mission of the Committee is to and review make recommendations to the Senate on matters pertaining to Student Admissions and Financial Aid bearing on Admission.

In order to carry out the above mission this Committee shall review and make recommendations regarding:

- 1. admission's criteria for the purpose of identifying concerns and possible issues;
- 2. admission's trends and their impact on the University;
- 3. recruitment activities and factors that impede this process;
- 4. retention efforts and their impact on admissions;
- 5. student financial aid policies and procedures and their impact on the student body.

While these activities are necessary in order to make recommendation and identify potential problems/issues that need further investigation and/or action, it is not necessary for all these activities to be done yearly. It is the responsibility of the Committee members to identify areas to be dealt with each year.

Major Accomplishments from AY 2013-2014

Our committee met three times, starting in the spring semester. At the first meeting, Marc Harding, Chief Enrollment Officer, presented an overview of the freshman class of

2013-14. At the second meeting, Marc Harding, Chief Enrollment Officer in the Office of Admissions & Financial Aid (OAFA), presented an overview of transfer students. At the third meeting, Kenyon Bonner, Director of Student Life and Associate Dean of Students in Student Affairs, presented on student affairs and their programs to increase retention. This is a continuation of the previous year's focus on retention.

Major Goals for AY 2014-2015

Barring any directives from the University Senate, the Admissions & Financial Aid Committee will continue to gather information relating to our mission. At the first meeting, Marc Harding, Chief Enrollment Officer, presented an overview of the freshman class of 2014-15. This information was covered by the University Times for an article on our freshman class. At the remaining fall meetings, we heard from the new Financial Aid Officer in OAFA, Randall McCready, on the state of student aid (also covered by an article in the University Times) and Kellie Kane, Director of Operations & Strategic Planning in OAFA, on changing testing standards, including changes to the SAT. The SAT will become more like the ACT in the Spring of 2016. This is early stages of comparing test scores and concordance tables. In the first spring meeting in January, Lauren Panetti, Senior Assistant Director, OAFA, will speak about the recruitment and admissions process for our international students.

Munro: What do you mean about that the SAT is becoming more like the ACT?

<u>Kear</u>: The current SAT test has 3 sections of 800 points. The new test will have 2 sections of 800 points and also a separate essay score. There is no penalty for getting something wrong (wrong answers). One of the drivers is that the ACT continues to take over market share versus SAT in the testing market. In 2013-14 at PITT, 43% of the applying students took the ACT versus 87% taking the SAT. This is much down from 2005-06, where 20% took the ACT and 99% took the SAT. At PITT the SAT or ACT score never itself makes-orbreaks an admission. It is part of the holistic admissions process.

<u>Stone</u>r: Since PITT is becoming increasingly tuition-driven, did they tell you know they are handling this from an admissions perspective? (e.g., increasing out-of-state students who can pay fully)

<u>Kear</u>: High school graduate numbers in PA is declining. In our 2014 incoming class, non-resident students comprised 34% of the incoming freshman class. So, a majority of students still do come from within the state.

Stoner: Do we know if these non-PA students get financial aid?

Kear: No, we do not know that.

<u>Spring</u>: I would to recognize the efforts of this Committee. The meeting has really increased in attendance and content over the last year. He commended the group on its work.

Unfinished Business and/or New Business

<u>Opportunities and Challenges Facing Higher Education</u> *Vice-Provost David DeJong*

President Spring commented on the open or closed nature of the meeting at this point.

Spring's preference is to keep the meeting open. As an overview, David DeJong will present a helicopter view of our future, and then we will break the Faculty Assembly into discussion groups. David DeJong added that he would like to break into groups of 7-8, and then share findings with the larger group after about 20 minutes of small group discussion

Background:

As part of the planning process for FY15, the University is soliciting the input of constituencies across campus. The focus of the effort will be a discussion of opportunities and challenges facing higher education. The goal is to learn which of these opportunities and challenges you think the university needs to be particularly alert to moving forward. The Provost has asked for an opportunity to have members of the Faculty Assembly involved early in this process. This discussion has been scheduled for that purpose. To focus the discussions, four videos were produced that provide overviews of the higher education landscape from four distinct perspectives: the public sector, students, partners and employers, and technology. (links below)

Links to the videos are provided below. The password for each is "University". (Note that the U is capital):

Public and Government: https://vimeo.com/109967927

Students: https://vimeo.com/108611316

Technology and Information: https://vimeo.com/109507970
Partners and Employers: https://vimeo.com/110201127

Introduction to small group activity on 12/3 Faculty Assembly:

DeJong reported that he appreciates being at FA today. He reiterated that that within this leadership transition, they are doing a broad assessment to hear from faculty on challenges and opportunities moving forward. The leadership team is working with the Council of Deans, Alumni, Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, students, and leaders in the community to identify opportunities and challenges. The videos that you hopefully viewed give a landscape of PITT higher education, to frame the major challenges and opportunities for us in the future. We wanted to do the same with Faculty Assembly today. We have recorders and notepads, for your groups of 7-8. We want each small group to identify the top 2 opportunities and threats that they see. The time for the discussion will be approximately 20 minutes . At the end of this time, we want to hear from each group with alacrity as to what their top issues are. If we hear the same issues repeat, that is perfectly fine. Once we hear what all issues are in the small group reports, we will open it up to the full group for a full discussion.

Results of small group breakout session: (3:38pm)

The breakout groups returned and reported to the Assembly what their groups discussed:

Munro: the importance of fostering collaboration, including CMU; seeking industrial partnerships

Cauley: the need to get ahead of the public policy debate; need to cater to several markets, define skills in a broad way. Threat – the perception of the value of an education

Labrinidis: mentioned the video from CNN: The Ivory Tower; incorporate technology in the classroom; plan for the long term strategically; how to make sure the curriculum can guarantee that students get jobs

Helbig: reacting too strongly to change; the university's identification, what does that mean? Technology - put emphasis on teachers; corporate collaboration – in regards to the Humanities; incorporate Humanities into the vision

Nelson: Higher education needs a lobby, needs more money coming into research programs/labs. Pitt has a growing advantage and press that to get more

Spring: Student debt is a reality; students are changing – demographics; global world and global perspective; digital information and technology.

Kearns: worry about creating a dichotomy. Caution about thinking of it as a dichotomy. In the four films presented, I recognize the university is more than that.

Hartman: Collaboration within the university or outside? The answer is yes to both.

Munro: Debt: Students need to justify the debt possibly to the detriment of the liberal arts.

Cauley: Market writing and reading as important skills

A. Jones: CMU is very good at marketing what they accomplish. I think Pitt can do a better job of selling themselves.

Labrinidis: Computer Science tries to give students a broad range of skills to get them through life

Weinberg: The University is not a job training program. Arts & Sciences is key to providing students with skills.

Spring: We need to get better with working with businesses

Goodhart: Theme that emerges educate our students – we do that well. We need to educate our constituency and ourselves. Take a deliberate approach and avoid one size fits all solutions.

Stoner: collaborations can sometimes be dangerous; liability issues, i.e. – Johnson & Johnson hip replacements

Novy: Partnerships with corporation's video missed that there can be problems i.e. corporations paying for research, but the research isn't positive and may never get published

Spring: Big data involves contracts, which we as a university are often unwilling to sign. It is multiple types of partnerships.

A. Jones: We are not viewed as very progressive, we need to explain to our constituents that you can't get everything from MOOCs; provide environment for progressive learning; students need to know they get more from being at a four year institution like the University of Pittsburgh. We provide a progressive learning environment that you can't get from sitting at home taking a MOOC.

Spring: If you could tell the Provost one thing to focus on, what would be your main point as a faculty member?

Flynn: I think we have lost focus on developing the whole person.

Hartman: stress that we are a University; the benefit is the entire person, we are not a trade school, the graduate can work as a team

Nelson: Education needs to speak to relevance; common thread – why education is relevant. It is not enough to say an education get me to be a well-rounded person

Sukits: a suggestion to the Provost's office – have schools here talk to each other.

Kearns: break down the silos in this institution

Labrinidis: University of Michigan offers a program called MCube where faculty from schools across campus collaborate

Munro: break down silos for teaching resources, computing labs, etc.

Bircher: Learning how to learn, there are certain things you will need to learn. Gather the evidence and scrutinize the evidence. Basic focuses on how we can all collaborate.

Spring: This should not be a onetime exercise. It's interesting to me that we have focused more on the students then on the research aspect. Good companies are no longer pushing what they make, but producing what people want. Will our mission survive the change in technology?

Weinberg: Provost should be cognizant of the threats to the faculty. Threats to academic freedom, threats to tenure, threats that undermine the cohesiveness of our faculty like divisions related to rank and compensation. The university is only as good as its faculty.

Stoner: On the macro level there are concerns on institutional identity. Chancellor Nordenberg did a fabulous job of elevating the status of the university during his tenure. We need to adapt to what our students need, but a key question is who are our students? Will the university continue to be a regional nexus of learning that is accessible to students from Western PA, transferring from CCAC or possibly from the regional campuses to Oakland or do we run the risk of getting the best students we possibly can, cease to be that same Pitt?

Novy: I believe a national standard is coming that judges universities on how much their graduates make. This is not a good criteria and would be a mistake. People can have valuable careers that don't give them a lot of money. If we can have some input as a university that would be good.

Frieze: One issue that hasn't been discussed, we need to have other groups at the table to tell us what other groups may be interested in beyond the white population.

Costantino: What is the timeline?

DeJong: Not sure, right now we are just listening and getting input. This was a fabulous	
session and I thank you for your comments.	
Smitherman: to follow up on Marianne's comments and the Obama report card, Pitt has many resources, possibly provide President Obama some ideas/suggestions on how that process might actually work in reality.	
Spring: Thanked the Provost's office for coming and for being open to shared governance.	
<u>Announcements</u>	
Linda Hartman made an announcement for Give A Thread campaign – trying to garner 150,000 items of used clothing.	
<u>Adjournment</u>	Adjourned 4:42 pm.
Meeting was adjourned at 4:42 pm.	

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Skledar, RPh, MPH, FASHP

Senate Secretary

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

Members attending:

Beck, Bircher, Buchanich, Burkoff, Cauley, Clark, Cohen, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Evans, Flynn, Fort, Frieze, Goodhart, Groark, Hartman, Helbig, Horvath, Hughes, A. Jones, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kear, Kearns, Labrinidis, Leers, Mauk, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Munro, Nelson, Novy, Olanyk, Riccelli, Savinov, Savoia, Scott, Shafiq, Skledar, Smitherman, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Triulzi, Vieira, Weinberg, Yarger

Members not attending:

Alarcon, Baker, Caldwell, Erickson, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Guterman, Hravnak, Irrgang, R. Jones, Karp, Lewicka, Lin, McKinney, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, Nisnevich, Poloyac, Ramsey, Schmidhofer, Smolinski, Soska, Weiss

*Excused attendance:

Ataai, Donihi, Fusco, Gaddy, Kovacs, Slimick, Wilson, Withers

Others attending/guests:

Amato, Balaban, Barlow, Becker, DeJong, Fedele, Ledger, Keebler, Tomko, Wisniewski *Notified Senate Office