Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
October 8, 2019

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
Call to Order The meeting was called to order by President Chris Bonneau.	The meeting commenced at 3:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes (September 10, 2019) were approved with the correction requested by Abbe de Vallejo	Approved
Items of New Business	No items

President's Report
 	
     We have a full agenda today, so I will keep this report brief. Let me say at the outset that if anyone does anything that I, in my great and unmatched wisdom, consider to be off limits, I will totally destroy and obliterate the Economy of Turkey. Now, on to my report.
  • Gosia, Lori, and I traveled to Pitt-Johnstown for the Board of Trustees Meeting at the end of September. Besides the disruption from students representing Fossil Free Pitt, there was nothing of interest to report.
  • All of the officers are planning to visit with our colleagues at the Bradford campus at the end of the month. We made this trip last year and found it very beneficial. As you know, Bradford has a new President and we are hoping to meet with her as well.
  • The group tasked with coming up with an interim Extreme Weather Policy is finishing up its work. Our task was to come up with something that is an improvement over the current policy in time for the upcoming winter weather season. A committee to come up with a permanent policy will be chartered in the next few months.
	Report and Discussion

- Next month, we will be voting on at least 3 new policies: one on Pennsylvania residency, one on nondiscrimination, and one of electronic accessibility. When these are sent around, I urge you to read and think carefully about them and their implications.
- As expected, the University today filed exceptions to the PLRB Hearing Examiner's proposed ruling finding that Pitt committed unfair labor practices during last spring's election for the graduate student union. The PLRB will rule on these objections and will either confirm the findings of the hearing officer and a new election will be held or they will agree with the University's argument and the results of the students' vote against the union will be finalized.
- Earlier this morning, the Faculty Affairs Committee met with the Provost about changing the titles of "non tenure stream" faculty. I think it was a good discussion and we should have something for the Faculty Assembly to discuss and vote on in the next few months. As we all know, faculty outside the tenure stream make valuable contributions to the University in many ways, and I am hopeful we can provide job titles that appropriately recognize this contribution. The Faculty Affairs Committee will present a resolution for our consideration on this topic at the November meeting.
- As many of you know, serving as a Senate Officer is both incredibly time consuming and not always recognized by those who conduct our annual evaluations. When I was first approached about running for office, I was shocked that none of the Senate officers received any compensation for their efforts. This fact almost discouraged me from running, and I am sure it has deterred several others over the years. Last year, I began a conversation with the administration about Senate officers being compensated for their service. We were asked to benchmark officer compensation against our peer group—other AAU publics. Not surprisingly, we were at the bottom; compensation for Senate Officers was the rule, not the exception. Based on this data and in recognition of the important role the Senate plays in the operation of the University, I am pleased to

announce that going forward Officers will be compensated. I want to thank Provost Cudd for her work on this and recognizing that the nature of this service is above and beyond what we are normally expected to do. *Frieze* asked about the form of compensation *Bonneau* explained that was a financial compensation (a pot of money to be distributed among officers in variety of forms), but it can also be time compensation depending on the department.	
Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate	No Reports No Discussion
Unfinished Business and/or New Business ***OHR Updates*** Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, *Dave DeJong* presented an update on what they were working in Human Resources centered around two areas: improvements in service delivery and revisiting certain projects started under the previous HR leader. These include: 1. Internal organization to improve the structure including a new shared service center incorporating payroll *Bonneau* interjected with a question where payroll is now. *DeJong* answered that it was in CFO's office and continued with his presentation. 2. Looking at traditional university partners (CSSD, University Council, Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Payroll, HR liaisons and Staff Council) and trying to strengthen the collaboration. Currently they are working on building a list of frequently raised HR issues that could be handled by administrators at the unit level before bringing it up to HR	Presentations and Discussion

3. Building a better staff evaluation tool to remedy displeasure with the existing system

4. Looking at our classification and compensation system for staff

De Vallejo raised the issue of generic descriptions for different types of jobs which do not really reflect the actual jobs. He suggested the faculty input when working on reclassifying jobs. He also asked why it takes so long (3 months) to hire someone. Hiring process at the university is too long and too bureaucratic.

Salcido added that it was very difficult to promote technicians to supervisory positions to accommodate the needs of a growing lab.

Bonneau: Where are we with clearances?

DeJong: We had a surge of people who needed to be recertified according to state law, we working with a third party vendor, fairly new to the process, we had a poor response from staff, but it was followed up with a email from HR. Tough getting clearance through a vendor is going slower, we are approaching 100%

Kovacs mentioned that at SOM there was a cost associated with getting clearances. She described difficulties she had to reach the vendor, and how lengthy and troublesome the process was and how incompetent were people dealing with clearances for Pitt.

Labrinidis commented on the plans to look at staff reclassification and suggested to allow more flexibility how the jobs are defined and to revise whether the salary rates are comparative to the job.

Weinberg: Why are we using a vendor?

DeJong: Vendor helps document our effort in compliance to the state

Bickford: Is staff reclassification project starting from scratch?

DeJong: It is not starting from scratch. We are gathering market data to make sure it is up-to-date, but we have a basic road map

and the ground work is done (about 70%) so taking what we have done in the past we are at good point to restart the project.

Weinberg added that couple years ago there was a big push to make every staff member to write down what they do. It is on the radar of our staff who want to know what came out of the data they provided. It's a pity there was no interim communication about it.

IT at Pitt

CIO and Vice Chancellor, *Mark Henderson*

I want to talk about IT in general terms. We are going through a planning process how to understand IT (wider than just CSSD). We want to focus on:

- How to enhance student experience (not only academic experience)

- How to work with faculty and help them to use technology in a class room and how to enhance support for them

- How to create more responsive campus? Want to work with facilities and improve the system of delivering technology and create more intelligent campus

- How to contribute to the University so the impact of University is visible in the community and the region.

We want to establish campus wide IT governance with strong representation

Strive for simplicity and reducing costs to University (incorporate Deloitte report's recommendations)

No centralization in plans but a strong focus on security

Once the plan is formalized it will be taken on the road, we will have town hall meetings

Goundappa: What is organic innovation?

Henderson: the things that could happen here but they would be more successful if we had here the right support for them (example: a company wants to move in and do something is robotics, do we have enough people for them to go to scale?) We want to build skill sets to attract opportunities like this

Yates applauded the effort for making Pitt resources available in UPMC buildings but stated that we are overloaded with email information coming from both sides. Is there a plan to streamline communication?

Henderson: I have to take this back to the team. More to come.

Becker: Great to hear what you have said but it is completely irrelevant to SOM, where even the purchased software could be taken of the computer by ISD.

Henderson: Software license should help all Pitt faculty working in UPMC space.

Becker: But it will not help that PittBox is not accessible through UPMC and UPMCBox not accessible on Pitt side. It is a hindrance in sharing data. My work around networking problems is to use wireless, which is not controlled. The Pitt-UPMC relations need to be addressed.

Yates: those of us in medical education and working with residents who are not Pitt employees have problems because we cannot share data with them

Hall mentioned that she had to hire research project coordinator through UPMC, and the person cannot have the software needed to work with her on this federally funded project, because she is not Pitt.

Kovacs: At WPIC the IT started to work on purchasing some software that your staff could use it.

Hall [to Henderson]: Is your position un umbrella position also for UPMC?

Henderson: No, but I am working with Rutenbar and my counterpart at UPMC on this software issue. We achieved agreement with all but 2 vendors (SPSS and MatLab)

De Vallejo: We need to distinguish two different issues we are discussing; sharing data and networking issues. You can share data through Pittbox, all you need to do is to put email addresses

of the people with whom you want to share data. The networking issue is a real problem, because if you are plagued to the UPMC network and your computer is recognized you cannot download any faculty software from the Pitt website. The UPMC buildings (like Rangos) with predominantly Pitt faculty are connected to Pitt network, but you still need UPMC to connect to the clinical data.

Spring: I want to assure Assembly that this was a problem on top of Mark's list before he came here. It is an old problem and not trivial. The SCITC will monitor the issues. This is the issue that disrupts faculty for many years but it is a priority now and we are working hard towards a solution.

Salcido: My department is investing in 2 wire solution to solve this problem. Should we stop?

Henderson: I would take a pause.

Weinberg: Can the University do a better job supporting re searchers with computing infrastructure? I have to cover network operating center charges from the NIH grant money, but my colleagues at other universities do not have to and they believe it should be covered by indirect costs.

Kovacs: I don't think it is legal, it should be indirect costs

Henderson: I will have to look into it.

Hall: It is important issue. It would be unfair if other schools charge it differently and you are "penalized" for being in SDM.

External Funding Discussion

Professor *Mazviita Chirimuuta* brought the issue causing some concern among faculty and students. GSPH is going to accept large funds from the Charles Koch Foundation, the institution who has a record of violation academic freedom. Will the research be tainted with the money? What safe guards are being put in place to ensure integrity of the research supported with that money? Is the reputation of our university at risk?

Bonneau provided some contest and added that the grant has been in works for 18 months and is still under consideration. It went through University procedures as any other funding. It does not mean that it should not be monitored, but SVC and Provost looked at it and it is meeting University criteria for money. It was not discussed because it is a grant and it has not been announced yet.

De Vallejo: I think that legal office and compliance office will put

some legal language, which will have to be approved. There is no concern until the agreement is drawn.

Weinberg: It is difficult to discuss if we do not know if there are any stipulations attached to it.

Chirimuuta: The money is for setting up Center for Governance and Markets and Global Affairs which may have degree and program associated with it, so there is a question of curriculum. It seems naïve to take it in good faith given the history of the organization. Similar offer was made to other universities, but it was rejected after consultation with faculty and graduate students.

Bonneau, stating that it is not university approved center, there are no clearly defined rules for such center, but to my knowledge there is no faculty lines to this center; it is a center to support faculty research. Prompted by *Kovacs*, he summarized the concern for the room and finished by stating that the issue is whether we have safe guards in place to protect the research and our faculty's integrity.

According to *Kovacs* the issue is how to balance not being unduly influenced by donors, considering that a segment of society accused academia of being liberal and whether accepting money would be giving opportunities to voices that are not ours.

Chirimuuta: It is not about exposure, but about accepting money from the tainted organization who has the history of using money to further their own political agenda.

Bonneau: I see a couple of different things here: one, what is the notion of academic freedom, and here we traditionally depend on ethical behavior of our colleagues, and two, from the institution point of view, where do we draw the lines when is it acceptable to receive the money and when it is not in order to protect our reputation.

Bickford: Koch Foundation has history of influencing hiring and track record of interfering with faculty autonomy and share governance

Yates suggested to make sure that the proper language is included in the agreement, that cannot happened, and that will return money when they do.

Bonneau: We want to be vigilant about this issue and if the things do not go the right way, that's problematic.

Weinberg: Is there a concern that the language is not sufficient?

Bonneau: There is some concern, I have heard from multiple

faculty, Mazviita is not the only one who expressed her concern, so thank you very much for bringing it to our attention. Once money is given, it is hard to give it back. Are we comfortable enough that procedures would be followed monitoring

Vallejo: University has a good legal team. As far as I know the compliance office has a statement that donor cannot influence the conduct of research.

Weinberg: This goes beyond research and includes curriculum.

De Vallejo: Yes, but the agreement is not between the sponsor and the faculty, it is to the university.

Chirimuuta: The question is about enforcement, it is fine to have a written agreement, but how do we know it will be enforced.

Stoner: More interesting than contractual issue to me is the question how much reputation was considered. Would we take money from anyone?

Bonneau: University considered it as content neutral, with the same terms of compliance as for any other grant. It's an interesting question whether we would take any money. It may be an issue for the Research Committee to consider how we would handle the issue if the money came from tobacco or Epstein. When seeking money from private foundations the question where do we stand is an important consideration.

Weinberg: Where do you want to go with it, Chris? Do you just want to have a conversation?

Bonneau: I propose just to keep thinking about it. I will forward the issue to the Research Committee. Maybe TAFC wants to get involved because of academic freedom issue. It is worth knowing what the terms and conditions are. What happens if there is a concern? Are there mechanisms by which input can be solicited? Even if we feel comfortable with what happened in this case I want us to think about it.

Yates: There are certain grants that University will not accept (export restrictions, classified that cannot be shared)

Bonneau: Yes, like proprietary research, you cannot published.

Labrinidis: We have an excellent general council, but the presumption is that others did not. So it is prudent not to assume that our legal council is just better and be extremely careful going into this.

Announcements CPR demonstration at Senate Council	
Adjournment	Moved and accepted, 4:15 pm

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Gosia Fort, Senate Secretary

Members attending: Almarza, Anderson, Becker, Bickford, Bircher, Bonneau, Bove, Bratman, Brodt, Buchanich, Bunger, Chirimuuta, Cousins, Denman, De Vallejo, Fort, Frieze, Goundappa, Gramm, Hall, Jeong, Judd, Kanthak, Kiesling, Klem, Kovacs, Kucan, Labrinidis, Molinaro, Nelson, Poljak, Popovich, Rauktis, Salcido, Sant, Spring, Swigonova, Triplette, Vento, Weinberg, Wilson, Yates

Members not attending: Adams, Aziz, Bachman, Berenbrok, Cassaro, Danford, Henker, Infanti, Irrgang, Jeffrey, Jones, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kiselyov, Kohanbash, Kory, Kregg-Byers, Long, Loughlin, Martin, McGreevy, Morel, Mulcahy, Munro, Potoski Roberts, Smolinski, Sukits, Taboas

*Excused attendance: Beck, Conley, Dahm, Darnell, Gaddy, Haley, Landsittel, Miller, Mostern, Mulvaney, Murphy, Murtazashvili, Scott

Others attending: DeJong, Dwyer, Golden, Henderson, Jones, Kirsch, Manges, Wood

*Notified Senate Office