Faculty Assembly Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
January 13, 2015

Topic/Discussion	Action
Call to Order The meeting was called to order by President Michael Spring at 3:03 PM.	The meeting commenced at 3:03 PM.
Approval of the Minutes President Spring asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of December 2, 2014.	The minutes were approved as written.
Introduction of Items of New Business No items of new business were identified.	N/A
Report of Senate President, Michael Spring (January 2015) President Spring shared his monthly report: 1. **I would like to again note the Chancellor's** timely memo of December 4th to the University Community related to marches and protests related to the police actions in Missouri and New York. His restatement of the lofty goals we have articulated in the Pitt Promise was most appropriate related to protests and unrest. In a similar vein, I would like to acknowledge the deaths of seventeen French citizens last week and ask for a moment of silence. 2. **Regarding the 2015 Senate Elections** – A reminder that a Read Green reminder about the Senate Elections was sent out. While we have gotten a good response, please remember to consider the potential of running for an office or a Senate Standing Committee. Nominations, including self-nominations should be in by the end of February. 3. **Regarding Research Data Management** – (the subject of our Fall Senate Plenary) I am pleased to report that Vice Provost Redfern called together a group of people to talk about what the next steps should be and how we can move forward on the issues raised at the Fall Senate Plenary. I suspect that research data management will be one of the areas that will also be of concern for the group looking at possible collaborative efforts between Pitt and CMU on library-related issues. I believe that the outcomes of these early discussions with Vice Provost Redfern will provide one of the inputs to this group. 4. **Regarding Official University Travel Abroad** – The Chancellor and Provost have indicated that recent events highlight the importance of being able to get a handle on official University travel abroad by faculty. The matter was initially raised related to the Ebola crisis is West Africa. The Provost is currently working on the matter. I have suggested that we bring together a clear package of the benefits provided to Pitt faculty for University, professional, and personal travel abroad. These range from emergency medical services to consultation related to care of electronic devices. While the requirement that faculty register foreign travel plans will be restricted to University-sponsored travel, I believe there are potentially significant benefits to alerting the appropriate offices at Pitt to all your travel plans, University, professional, and personal. As always, I suspect some of you may have different opinions and I	See comments and questions raised.

would like to hear from faculty about any concerns they might have about such a change.

5. **Regarding Amendments to the Pennsylvania Child Protection Law** – The Commonwealth made changes to the law which became active December 31, 2014. The University is currently working to determine exactly how this will impact Pitt employees, but it is likely that sometime in the not too distant future all employees will be required to obtain clearances, although the immediate impact is only spelled out for new employees. It is my understanding that many people whose research involves children have already been through this three-part background check and have found compliance with the laws to be a minimum intrusion. The University administration is in contact with the DHHS about requirements and expectations.

6. **Regarding the recently announced changes in how TIAA-CREF and Vanguard accounts will be managed** – This matter was discussed with Benefits and Welfare on November 18 and reported in the University Times on December 4th with subsequent communications to all faculty and staff from Human Resources. Basically, the matter is one of increased efficiencies and simplified processes which will make the current array of options more manageable for faculty and more cost effective – i.e. expenses associated with many funds, both TIAA-CREF and Vanguard will be lower. There will be no changes as to which funds are available to faculty.

7. **Regarding some links on CourseWeb**, an issue was raised by a faculty member about seeing links to what looked like publisher advertising. We contacted Cynthia Golden about the matter, and she reported: "In following up with our staff I learned that a message controlled by Blackboard appeared to some, but not all, Blackboard users after some routine upgrades we did over the weekend, directing users to publishers' sites if they clicked on a link. The link only appears upon login and only for some people. We (CIDDE) have asked Blackboard to turn off this type of message in the future."

8. *Regarding Pitt's Optional Phase-Out Retirement Agreement*, we met yesterday with Vice Provost Carey Balaban to talk about the wording of agreements related to phase-out retirements and to suggest some changes that would make the wording of the agreement more like the general tone of the policy. As a reminder, the origin of this policy can be found in a memo from Provost Maher to the faculty and staff of the Provost-area schools. It was dated April 12, 2001 and read in part:

   Part-Time Conversion of Tenured Faculty: The University Senate leadership has asked me to alert all of the faculty to the existence of this possibility for change of status. The University By-laws enable a dean, with the approval of the Provost, to allow a tenured faculty member to reduce the terms of the faculty member's appointment from full- to half-time. Such a change must be mutually beneficial, and the By-laws appropriately leave the conditions for such an agreement open to the judgment of the agreeing parties. We have expended so much effort to analyze the mission of each School and to deploy our resources to have the right number of tenure stream positions, that each decision to allow a faculty member to hold a tenure line with less than full commitment must be taken with great care. On the other hand, there are sometimes good reasons to allow such a change, and we do try to accommodate faculty requests to go temporarily to half-time status when we can. One commonly

occurring reason advanced for a transition to part time status is a desire on the part of the faculty member to ease a transition to retirement. We respond to those requests sympathetically but decide them on a case-by-case basis, with careful attention to the needs of the School or Department during the transition. In general, such requests should not involve holding a position partially filled for more than two years. Faculty wishing to convert to part-time status as a transition to retirement should understand that the University will not raise retirement as an item of discussion with them until after they have voluntarily introduced retirement into the discussion.

9. **The Mental Wellness Task Force of the University Senate's Committee on Benefits and Welfare** will host for Pitt faculty and staff a series of three lunch-and-learn sessions about managing stress to improve mental *and* physical wellness. These sessions will be in the Kurtzman Room at the William Pitt Union from Noon – 1:00 on Wednesday January 21, Wednesday February 11, and Wednesday March 4, 2015. The first session will provide an understanding of how the brain responds to stress, the effects on mental and physical health caused by stress, and behaviors that can reduce the response of the brain to stress. The second and third sessions will teach techniques that you can use to reduce the response of the brain to acute and chronic stress and reduce the risk of disease as you go through the aging process. The programs will be led by Dr. Bruce Rabin, Professor of Pathology and Psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh and Medical Director of the Division of Clinical Immunopathology and the Healthy Lifestyle Program for the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

10. **The Plant Utilization and Planning Committee** will be meeting with the Registrar at their March 19th meeting. Pat Weiss and Tracey Olanyk asked me to remind members of Assembly to submit questions regarding rooms and scheduling or anything else pertaining to the registrar's domain to them or Lori Molinaro before March 19th.

11. **New Initiatives** -- The Provost has indicated that she will be working on a number of administrative initiatives in the coming months and wants to make sure the Senate is involved through appointed representatives. She has also indicated that if the work of any of these committees results in recommendations to change University policies, the Senate would have the opportunity to review and comment on those changes as part of the standard review process for changes to University policies. I have expressed our readiness to be involved as appropriate and suggested that this may be an opportunity to begin to think about some new approaches to shared governance that are responsive to those aspects of our environment that can change rapidly. I suggest for your consideration several items that have come up recently – research data management policies mandated by some federal funding sources, child protection laws being broadened to include higher education, intellectual property assignment issues, federal mandates related to sexual harassment and reporting, etc.

Along these same lines, the executive committee continues to engage in discussions about whether new committees or realignment of existing committees might help us to better meet our responsibilities in shared governance. We are beginning what I believe will be a long-term process of consideration about what our priorities should be. Our university has changed in its size, scope, and research funding, and we will talk with the Administration about how we can work to meet our responsibilities. This

will involve extensive discussions with various standing committees to get their input and suggestions.

12. **Regarding Standing and Ad Hoc Committees –** We have reports this month from Athletics, Educational Policies and the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-tenure Stream Faculty. Athletics and Educational Policies have been extremely busy this year as has been the Ad Hoc committee charged with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream faculty. I look forward to all of these reports.

Sukits: I have had students working on a project with Boys and Girls Club. They had to have the background check; it was simple and inexpensive.

Spring: Ours will most likely be three fold: DHHS (on-line), Pittsburgh ; and FBI (processed at UPS store). It is a $47 total to process this.

Kovacs: Is there a policy about who pays for this (regarding students)?

Spring: The requirement for these checks today only applies to new employees starting after Jan 1, 2015. The Provost and Chancellor, and other national administrators are discussing about how it will impact the faculty and student body as a whole and also volunteers. Details of compliance were not fully worked out yet. The law was just signed on Dec 31, 2014. There may be a renewal component also (three –years). There will most likely be a grace period throughout 2015 to get rest of faculty involved. Adjuncts, fee payment, and implications of a negative result of a background check must also be delineated. This is another externally imposed regulation that we will struggle with.

Balaban: You (Spring) have this well-summarized. It is being worked on with the legislator and administrators.

Smitherman: The law also requires in health care that licensed professionals have to have approved continuing education on this manner. Barbara Barnes (CCEHS) is working on an educational module for us. This affects all licensed professionals.

Calahane: We have developed a free-on-line training module, available at. www.reportabusePA.pitt.edu. It is accessible to all.

It was asked if the phase-out retirement issue can be restated.

Spring: Policy has been in place since April 2, 2001, at the request of the Senate. There is no intended change to the policy. Retirement phase out is not guaranteed, and must be raised by the faculty member. An agreement is signed. Some faculty have issue with the legal language. Provost Maher was eloquent to state as he did (see above) so intent of policy and policy itself does not change.

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

Athletics Committee
Jay Irrgang, Co-Chair and Kevin McLaughlin, Co-Chair

There was a blog article yesterday with the Chancellor and Randy Juhl about the status of the University at-large.

Fall 2014 agenda topics for the Senate Athletic Committee included:
- September:
  - NCAA Governance Update (Daniel Bartholomae)
  - Overview of NCAA Lawsuits
- October:
  - Role of the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) (Susan Albrecht)
  - Athletic Director Update (Steve Pederson)
- November:
  - ACC Collaboration from Undergraduate Perspective (Juan Manfredi)
  - Academic Support Services for Student-Athletes (Jennifer Tuscano) [this runs through the Provost's office]

Key topic covered included: NCAA governance re-design, cost of attendance, NCAA lawsuits, academic progress rate, independent study procedures, and the ACC Consortium update.

NCAA Governance Re-design:
- Structural: New Board of Directors – 24 total Members responsible for strategy and policy oversight, management, and limited legislative action. Included are 20 Presidents/Chancellors, plus others noted. There is now a "Council. The Council has primary responsibility for legislation, with oversight of "sub-structures." It has 40 members (described). Sixty percent of Conference reps must be Athletic Directors (AD Chair).
- Legislation: Shared governance on matters requiring consideration by all 32 conferences. Legislation is sponsored by Conferences, Council & Board. Council voting is determined legislative action (40 "votes"). A simple majority adopts legislation.
  - Voting Weights:
    - ACC, Big 10, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC: 1x4
    - AAC, Con-USA, MAC, MWC, Sun Belt: 1x2
    - Remaining 22 conferences, 2 FARs, & 2 student-athletes: 1x1
- Autonomy
  - "Big 5" (ACC, Big 10, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC) will have autonomy on behalf of their institutions to act independently on legislation for permissive use of expanded resources. Legislation has been introduced by support of three conferences.
  - 1 vote per institution (65) and 3 student-athlete votes per conference for total of 80. Artie Rowell (Pitt FB, Center) is 1 of 3 student athlete representatives for the ACC
  - Proposal adopted with 60% majority support and 3 of 5 conference simple majority OR simple majority and 4 of 5 conference simple majority.

NCAA Cost of Attendance (COA)
- Legislative concept/proposal will provide student-athletes with a miscellaneous expense stipend that would be part of athletic scholarship. The miscellaneous expense amount would be difference between COA and total Grant in Aid for each scholarship student-athlete. The miscellaneous expense stipend would differ from institution to institution.
  - Pitt's published COA is $3,300 – this amount would be added as stipend to full scholarship student-athlete

- – Stipend would be pro-rated to student-athletes on partial scholarship
- COA is different at each school. Some schools are as low as $500, others as high as $8,000. It is a number that can be influenced by state politics, federal guidelines, & institutional factors.
- Increased departmental benefits may lead to decreased federal benefits (i.e. PELL grants could be reduced).

Lawsuits of Note Involving the NCAA
- Ed O'Bannon Case
  - – No monetary damages.
  - – Absent NCAA constraints, athletes could make money off of use of names, images and likenesses.
  - – Wilkins Injunction:
    - Mandated Cost of Attendance
    - $5000 for student-athletes in FB & men's BB to be put into trust fund that is accessible after eligibility completed (only FB and BB have been addressed at this point)
- Kessler Case
  - – Injunction to prevent enforcement of NCAA rules capping scholarship values.
  - – Most direct attempt at pay-for-play model.
- Alston Case
  - – Seeks to prevent NCAA from capping scholarship value and increase to cost of attendance.
  - – Seeks damages for gap between cost of attendance and athletic scholarship value for "Big 5" conference football athletes from February 2010 to the present.

Academic Progress Rate (APR)
- Team-based metric that accounts for academic eligibility and retention of each student-athlete on team that is reported annually by each institution. There is a 4-year rolling average calculated and released publically by NCAA.
- Teams must meet target APR to be eligible for to participate in championships:
  - – 2014-15 – team must earn 930 4-year average or 940 average over most recent 2-year period
  - – 2015-16 – team must earn 930 4-year average to be eligible
- **All teams at Pitt meet or exceed APR standards**
  http://web1.ncaa.org/maps/aprRelease.jsp

Independent Study Courses
- Independent Study Courses are closely monitored at Pitt. Registration for all Independent Study Courses requires review and approval by the Director of Academic Support Services for Student Athletes & FAR. Relatively few student-athletes take Independent Study Courses (only 3 students approved during Fall semester).

ACC Academic Consortium
- Awards and conferences within the ACC were reviewed, including the Creativity-Innovation Awards, Summer Collaborative Research Awards, Coach for College, Student Leadership Conference (ND will host in 2015), and the Undergraduate Research Conference ("Meeting of Minds" hosted by Pitt in 2014).

- The University of Pittsburgh awarded three ACCIAC Fellowships in Creativity and Innovation. The students and their projects are as follows:
  - Ms. Emily Durham created a chapbook of poetry that documents her experience performing geo-archaeology in Alaska.
  - https://pitt.box.com/s/mly7ym8dqgazq48scv76
  - Ms. Rachel Lehman-Merrick, a double major in physics and studio arts, has completed a sculpture project to study materiality. By receiving this fellowship, she was able to study in Wyoming.
  - https://pitt.box.com/s/mly7ym8dqgazq48scv76
  - Mr. Daniel Peluso created a 3D computer animation to highlight an exoplanet. The video can be seen here:
  - http://youtube/X9GCrtIM7D8
- The University of Pittsburgh awarded the ACCIAC Summer Collaborative Research Award to Gabrielle Pittman from NC State who joined our Medical School Undergraduate Research Program.
- ACC Academic Consortium 2015 activities: (not limited to athletics)
  - ACC Visiting Lecture Series (Boston College, Clemson, Notre Dame, Pittsburgh, and Wake Forest)
  - Debate Competition (Wake Forest)
  - Leadership Development Seminar (UNC)
  - Academic Competition – Innovation (Georgia Tech)
  - Academic Competition – Creativity (Syracuse)

Senate Athletic Committee Spring 2015 Agenda
- January:
  - Women's Basketball Practice and Tour Refurbished Facilities at Peterson Events Center
- February:
  - NCAA Legislative Update
  - Athletic Director Update
- March:
  - Marketing of Pitt Athletics
  - Intramural and Recreational Programs
- April:
  - Football Practice

Irrgang acknowledged Zac Saunders (Asst. Athletic Director, Compliance) and Daniel Bartholomae (Executive Associate Director for Compliance and Administration)

Phantom courses: how is that being addressed? Can athletes identify courses where it is easier to get a good grade and not show much effort? At ACC level, I would like to see clarity of the mission statement and enforcement of the statement. The NCAA is at a tipping point.

Irrgang: Every course that an athlete wants to take is reviewed by two oversight groups, and also the faculty overseeing that independent study. Class attendance is monitored. Academic Support Services for student Athletes also monitor this, along with coaches who may attend classes to check on their athletes.

Spring: The Athletics Committee on the outside appears to be mainly fun, but I wanted to acknowledge the efforts and work of this committee on very tough issues, and to ensure

we maintain the balance of keeping Alumni happy with maintaining a rigorous athletic and academic program.

Educational Policies
Bonnie Falcione and Zsuzsa Horvath, Co-Chairs
Dr. Horvath stated a special thank-you to Kathy Kelly for her guidance of the EP committee over the last 9 years, and with my and Dr. Falcione's transition. A report was distributed listing activities and accomplishments. The committee invites guests on a regular basis with whom we have developed strong working relationships. Their presentation often sparks discussions which lead to initiatives. A summary of accomplishments from last academic year and activity from this Fall were overviewed.

Given that a semester has already gone in this new academic year, Bonnie and I wanted to capture not only what we had accomplished last academic year but also what we have worked on since then. Instead of goals, we added action items, as we have already started to work on our goals that we set for this academic year.

Committee Activities and Accomplishments in AY 2013-2014
The committee met eight times this past year.
1) Monthly updates from Vice-Provosts Juan Manfredi and Alberta Sbragia: Both routinely attend the SEPC meetings and give the committee relevant updates from their respective areas of responsibility.
2) SEPC is represented on the Provost's Advisory Council on Instructional Excellence (ACIE).
3) Presentations to SEPC this year: (notables in bold)
    a. Marc Harding, Chief Enrollment Officer, gave a presentation on current and future enrollment strategies and challenges. He discussed the profile of the recently admitted freshman class.

    b. Cynthia Golden, Director of CIDDE, provided updates on various CIDDE initiatives, including the OMET awareness campaign, and the renovated Testing Center.

    c. Joe Horne, Director of Instructional Services at CIDDE, spoke about the hybrid/online course structure and best practices; also discussed resources available for plagiarism awareness. There was an interest in creating modules that can be used for digital ethics awareness. Our committee was inspired by this discussion to develop resources for plagiarism awareness especially as it relates to new technologies and media. Related issues were raised by the Subcommittee on Academic Speech and Electronic Media.

    Action Item: To this end, our committee has created a working group to determine the need and topics for modules on digital ethics, electronic communication, and social media for students, faculty and staff. Bonnie offered to lead the group and we are in the process of scheduling meeting times. If anybody is interested joining this group from other committees, please contact Bonnie. We would welcome the opportunity to work across senate committees, and there are still open seats.

d. Lisa Votodian, Assistant to the Director at OMET, discussed the current OMET initiatives to enhance the response rate for classroom surveys.

    Action item: *Due to the ongoing interest in various topics related to student evaluations of teaching that were raised by other Senate subcommittees, a cross-committee working group has been created (SEPC and Subcommittee on Non-tenure Stream Issues) in AY 2014-15. The working group will address the following topics: 1) efforts by the student government to make OMET evaluation results public; 2) using OMET evaluations in faculty promotion decisions; and 3) issues relating to the implementation of the online evaluation.*

e. Chandralekha Singh, Founding Director of discipline-Based Science Education Research Center (dB SERC), attended one meeting to discuss the mission of the dB-SERC and a number of initiatives that the center will be offering to faculty in the STEM fields.

4) Old Business: The committee continued to discuss the initial 2012 student request for access to OMET evaluations for course selection purposes. On the issue of providing more course-related detail to students, the committee agreed that the already existing Course Description postings should be enhanced. The committee agreed to identify common elements that would be useful to include. This work took a significant amount of time. The committee deliberated on this topic for several meetings and talked to different units related to this issue. (CIDDE, OMET, registrar's office, A&S Dean's office/ Manager of Information Systems and individual departments). Ultimately, our committee decided against making a specific recommendation to make OMET results available to students. As it stands, there are several units that already engage in this practice and the committee felt the decision should be at the unit or school level.

Action item: During the AY 2014-15, the committee finalized its recommendation for the enhanced course description form and composed a template. The SEPC is put forth a recommendation at FA on 1/13/15 for individual units to enhance and update course descriptions to meet student needs, prior to their enrollment in the course. A recommendation was reviewed for concept at FA meeting. This includes:

o Course description information should be expanded and enhanced and
o Made publically available, and
o Updated annually so that students have sufficient and consistent information when selecting courses

There are different ways to achieve this, we added some of them to the recommendation and our committee can be consulted during implementation by the units.

Discussion:
Goodhart: I am strongly concerned for expanded course descriptions for several reasons. We often hire adjuncts who are late with syllabi, etc. This might mean syllabi are

outdated, yet posted. I also fear that we are restricting curricular innovation, due to faculty not wanting to update the documents regularly. I also worry that this is anti-intellectual in many respects. I fear students will take the courses with the fewest exams, no text books, etc. We may be fostering this as teachers. This template as a standard will require check boxes and explanations of projects and work will not be able to be accomplished. I am concerned that by honoring the student's request, we may be hurting the university at large.

Slimick: Am I hearing we should keep them in the dark as long as we can?

Goodhart: I am not saying that. I am saying that Departments should keep old syllabi on file, or better yet, encourage students to come and see the professor to talk about the course in person during office hours, rather than scroll through the computer in their dorm rooms.

Poloyac: Students can already go on "ratemyprofessor.com" to rate professors. If students want official university statement and class content, this information should come from the professors.

Horvath: It was also thought of to open the Blackboard course during the first 2 weeks of the term so students can see the class. The template recommendation was not meant across the board. It was meant as a guide for schools that want to do this.

Spring: I am going to ask that we change the questionnaire on the website to ask for FA input on this. I am going to work with Zsuzsa and Bonnie separately, based on feedback, to modify the motion for the upcoming SC. I am torn about this. I am a believer in sharing information. I do understand that we have issues with adjuncts, standard syllabi, and we need contingencies for this. There are many perspectives. For this particular recommendation/motion, let's get 15 days of feedback, and bring back in with additional conditions. We need time to discuss this before Senate Council. We need to think this through more. Everyone, please comment on the on-line form. Lori will post it by Friday.

Non-Tenure Stream (NTS) Faculty Issues Ad hoc Committee
Irene Frieze, Chair

Irene began by saying this has been a very collaborative process w/the Provost's Office. Carey Balaban is an active member and the Provost herself is very interested in this topic. Every unit is different.

Both full-time and part-time faculty hired outside of the tenure stream (NTS) are a growing group at the University of Pittsburgh. They can be found in every school. Faculty, both full-time and part-time, working outside of the tenure stream have been and continue to be essential to the growth and successful operation of the University of Pittsburgh. The percentage of full-time NTS faculty has increased in all but two of Pitt's schools over the past decade. NTS faculty now represent more than half of the full-time faculty in 8 of the University's 16 schools, and comprise almost 61% of the overall full-time faculty total.

NTS faculty perform essential tasks. These duties vary from teaching introductory level to highly specialized classes, conducting research as a PI or other support role, performing

clinical duties, engaging in administration at all levels, and providing service at the departmental, school and national levels. Many NTS members are active in the Senate, serving as Senate Officers, members of Faculty Assembly, or chairs or members of Senate Committees. NTS faculty, including part time NTS faculty, often provide special expertise that enhances programs throughout the University.

In the process of our discussions, we have learned that much of the decision-making related to NTS faculty occurs in the individual schools or units at the University.   This leads to wide variation and inconsistency in practices. For example, with the approval of the Provost and/or senior administration in the Health Sciences, school/unit-level decisions can be made about:

1. Titles used to designate different types of NTS faculty and the privileges, benefits and responsibilities associated with these titles.
2. Contract lengths.
3. Job duties
4. Salaries paid
5. Annual review process for full and part-time NTS faculty
6. Requirements and incentives for promotion.
7. Procedures for determining who should be promoted
8. Criteria for being designated as Emeritus when retiring.

In the fall of 2012, the Ad Hoc Committee was charged to discuss and identify issues related to NTS faculty, for further discussion/action at the existing Senate Committee and/or Provost levels. The interim recommendations of the work of the Committee were presented to FA. Discussion on each point is provided after each recommendation.(Due to time constraints, this topic will continue at a the February FA meeting.)

Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations (Jan 2015)

1. **Clearly explained and accessible policies within the unit.** The Provost's Office requires that each school or unit have a clear policy and/or guidelines on NTS faculty appointment, review, and promotion. Each unit's documents are reviewed regularly by the Provost's Office for compliance and consistency with University bylaws, policies and procedures. These unit policies are reflected in content of the annual review of the faculty performance.   We recommend that units make these documents readily accessible on their website to all faculty members in the unit, as well as to those considering a position in the unit.

Discussion:
Smitherman: Many of these duties fall under the Senior Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences. Should be listed as "or" in the document?

Bircher: In my perspective, if a policy arises from the Senior Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences that differs from a broader University policy, it would be up to the Provost to rectify the situation.

Savoia: Departments are not allowed to post any documents unless they are approved by their Dean.

Frieze: It is my understanding that all units have been asked to give these documents to the Provost's office and they've needed to be approved.

Balaban: The Dean has authority and responsibility to disseminate these documents within their School.

Frieze: At Arts and Sciences, it is department-by-department, but the Dean has to approve those.

Weinberg: These are all approved now by the Deans and the Provost's Office. SOM has their policies on-line for anyone to see.

Spring: The first point deals with transparency. The Ad Hoc Committee is requesting transparency.

2. **Career tracks.** Many schools provide one or more promotion tracks for NTS faculty. These tracks generally reflect different areas of emphasis, such as teaching, administration, or research. Each unit should have clearly defined tracks for promotion and career development for NTS faculty. These will vary for those with different duties within the unit and should reflect those duties.

3. **Annual reviews**. The Provost's 1999 Memorandum on Annual Review of the Faculty (http://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-affairs/annual-review.html) indicates that annual letters should explain in clear and specific terms the expectations for the coming year and how these relate to earlier agreed-on job duties. This is especially important for NTS faculty. Job duties and specific expectations for the coming year need to be clearly outlined in writing. Salary and promotion decisions should be based on meeting the stated expectations.

4. **Incentive structure**. For NTS faculty, it is critical that clear incentives be tied to their promotion. Increased contract length, increased salary, opportunities for paid leave, and improved office space are some examples of the incentives now offered in some units. We therefore urge all schools/units to develop a clear incentive policy related to NTS faculty promotion.

5. **Review of current status of decision-making solely within the unit**. We recommend that a systematic review be done to determine if some of the NTS decisions now delegated to the school or unit should be made at a higher level of the administration so there is more consistency across units.

A brief history of the committee was also provided as a document (see below).

Discussion:
Kovacs: Why are administrators given academic ranks? What is the logic?

Frieze: In some cases, it makes a lot of sense. Our Director of Psychology Clinic is an NTS faculty member. These are full-time administrative jobs that are very important to the department. These are academic positions.

Kovacs: These are not academic positions. Administration is very different. I think things get confused because an Administrative track is very different than a clinician and a researcher. I am wondering if this is reasonable – giving administrators academic ranks. How does the University balance the Provost's traditional desire to give independence to

the individual units with an overall institutional responsibility for standards across the schools.

Frieze: That is what our #5 is stating.

Tananis: Sometimes we need to recognize how an administrative position varies and is defined differently by definition per school/unit. Oftentimes people are doing the work of an academic and part of that work is administering programs and the academic responsibilities. Many faculty in NTS positions move between a variety of different responsibilities.

Spring: We have already lost a few of our members, and I think it is important that we discuss this in greater detail at our next FA meeting. We will put another question on the ballots for input on the Senate website related to NTS faculty (Lori will post this). This will be the first item of business on the Feb. FA agenda. The Provost's Office and Deans have worked on this for the last five years. We lead in academic athletics and we also lead in treatment of faculty and diversity. Can we improve? Yes. This report deserves our attention. I would like your input on the Senate website on this issue and the Educational Policy issues. This Provost and Chancellor will act on behalf of NTS faculty. TAFC also has been working on issues. Our administration has been very responsive. More things will happen with our NTS Ad Hoc Committee work. Faculty responsibilities blend with administrative responsibility often, like our seats on Faculty Assembly and Senate Council. We all are being asked to address this "shade of gray" issue. We will bring back next month at FA to continue this discussion.

……………………………………………………..

Ad hoc Committee members: Irene Frieze, chair [Psychology, TS faculty], Carey Balaban [Provost's Office liaison], Stephen Ferber [Office of Human Resources liaison], Don Bialostosky [English, TS], Helen Cahalane [Social Work, NTS], Bill Gentz [Univ Library System, NTS], Sue Skledar [Pharmacy, NTS], Jay Sukits [Business, NTS], Cindy Tananis [Education, NTS], Seth Weinberg [Dental Medicine, TS], Frank Wilson [Greensburg, Sociology, NTS].

……………………………………………

History of Senate Examination of NTS Policies

History: These ideas were developed through a multi-year process of Senate activity in collaboration with the administration:
- After a number of interviews with NTS faculty, and with administrators in the Provost Office as well as Arts and Sciences, and review of several excellent school policies, the Gender Discrimination Initiatives Subcommittee developed a set of initial guidelines that were reviewed and approved by the Senate Anti-Discrimination Policies Committee, the Tenure and Academic Freedom Senate Committee, Faculty Assembly and Senate Council during the summer and fall of 2012.
- The Guidelines were endorsed by the Provost at the Senate Council meeting on December 5, 2012 where they were presented. As the Provost explained at that time, her office and the deans had already been working on NTS faculty issues for some time, including several of the issues proposed in the Guidelines and would continue to work on these and other issues.

• With the publicity given these Guidelines, members of the original committee were approached about additional issues that had not been fully considered in the Guidelines and suggested that additional work was needed. • On September 3, 2013, a new Senate Ad Hoc committee was established and charged "with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream faculty, both part-time and full-time with an eye to adjustments that may need to be made and positioning of responsibility for consideration of these matters within the standing committees of the Senate, as well as identification of issues not currently within the purview of an existing standing committees." • Last year, after reviewing the University bylaws, we discussed the policies relating to full-time, NTS faculty. A report was presented to Faculty Assembly in April 2014 that outlined tentative recommendations. [See http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/sites/default/files/Recommendations%20%20%20for%20Faculty%20Assembly%204%2029%2014%20NTS.pdf] Members of Faculty Assembly had many questions and concerns, and the recommendations were not approved at that time. The Committee was asked to continue their good work and report an expanded update at a future Faculty Assembly meeting.	
Unfinished Business and/or New Business No new business to discuss.	
Announcements none	
Adjournment Meeting was adjourned at 4:34 pm.	Adjourned 4:34 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Skledar, RPh, MPH, FASHP
Senate Secretary
Associate Professor, School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy and Therapeutics

Lori Molinaro
Senate Director

Members attending:

Ataai, Baker, Bircher, Burkoff, Cauley, Cohen, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Donihi, Erickson, Falcione, Fort, Frieze, Goodhart, Groark, Hartman, Horvath, Hughes, Irrgang, Kear, Kovacs, Leers, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Novy, Olanyk, Poloyac, Savoia, Schmidhofer, Skledar, Slimick, Smitherman, Soska, Spring, Stoner, Sukits, Tananis, Vieira, Weinberg, West, Wilson, Withers, Yarger

<u>Members not attending</u>:

Beck, Caldwell, Clark, Evans, Frank, Gibson, Gleason, Gold, Guterman, Hravnak, A. Jones, R. Jones, Karp, Kaynar, Kearns, Lewicka, Lin, Mauk, McKinney, McLaughlin, Mulcahy, Munro, Nelson, Nisnevich, Ramsey, Riccelli, Savinov, Shafiq, Smolinski, Weiss

*<u>Excused attendance</u>:

Alarcon, Buchanich, Flynn, Fusco, Gaddy, Helbig, Kaufman, Labrinidis, Scott, Triulzi

<u>Others attending/guests</u>:

Balaban, Barlow, Becker, Cahalane, Coghill, Fedele, Gentz

*Notified Senate Office