

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes  
2700 Posvar Hall  
May 7 2019

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
<p><b>Call to Order</b> The meeting was called to order by Vice-President Robin Kear. President Bonneau presided over the meeting after arriving 10 minutes later.</p>	<p>The meeting commenced at 3:00 pm.</p>
<p><b>Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting</b> Minutes (April 9, 2019) were approved as written</p>	<p>Approved</p>
<p><b>Items of New Business</b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Report of Senate President</b> <i>Chris Bonneau</i></p> <p>Well, looks like we made it. As the 2018-2019 academic year concludes, I want use this final report to update you on some of the important issues we have discussed this year as well as foreshadow things that will be occurring in the fall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chancellor has set up a committee to examine Pitt’s current smoking policy and make recommendations for any changes. This committee will begin to meet over the summer and hopefully will have a report to us by the end of the fall semester.</li> <li>• Many of the administrative searches have concluded, with Pitt-Greensburg and Pitt-Bradford hiring new presidents. We also have a new Chief Information Officer. We are still waiting for the Chancellor to complete the formation of the committee to replace SVC Levine. Our hope is that will be done imminently.</li> <li>• The graduate students held their unionization vote last month. About 2/3 of eligible graduate students participated in the election and a majority of them decided against unionizing and affiliating with the United Steelworkers. The USW has not yet accepted the results of the election and have filed a complaint with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board. If that complaint is upheld, a new election could be ordered. If it is denied, any subsequent attempt to unionize would have to start from scratch and an election could not be held for at least 12 months.</li> <li>• On the faculty unionization front, the PLRB ruled that the faculty organizers and USW did not present a sufficient showing of interest to have additional hearing or have an election. In order to have an election, petitioners for a union must present signed cards from at least 30% of eligible people in the bargaining unit. While the precise number of signatures has never been disclosed, the PLRB ruling means that the USW did not achieve that 30% mark. This is being appealed. If the PLRB changes its mind, then there will be hearings on who is included in the bargaining unit; if the PLRB upholds this determination, then this effort must also start from the beginning.</li> <li>• There are several other policy committees that are currently either being formed or beginning their work. I suspect we will have action items from all of these in the fall semester. These include the Advisory Committee on</li> </ul>	<p>Report No Discussion</p>

	<p>Inclusion and Accessibility; PA Residency Classification and In-State Tuition; Intellectual Property; Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment; Nondiscrimination, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action; and Electronic Information and Accessibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chancellor’s Public Safety advisory group has also been established. This group will provide a forum for information and oversight into the workings of public safety.</li> <li>• I am pleased to report we will soon have information about the Title IX office publicly reported. As you know, this has been a concern for faculty, staff, and students. The Chancellor agrees that we should make aggregate data available. This will allow for better Senate oversight of that office as well as respond to concerns about the number of investigators, number of investigations, length of time for an investigation, etc. This should be released by the end of May.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, this will be my last Assembly meeting sitting next to Robin and Cindy. They have been tireless advocates in behalf of the faculty and life at Pitt is demonstrably better because of their efforts over the years. I have learned much from them over this past year. We have not always agreed, but the disagreements have deepened my understanding of the issues and concerns faced by many colleagues. We all have different backgrounds, come from different units, have different faculty status...and this has made for a very powerful and insightful leadership team over the past year. I will miss them much and would like to thank them for their years of service to the Senate and to Pitt.</p> <p>As they rotate off as officers, I am pleased to welcome David Salcido as the new Vice President and Gosia Fort as the new Secretary. They have not yet decided who will replace Cindy as the designated person to give me shit, but I am sure they will work that out in short order.</p> <p>To sum up my first term....no collusion, no obstruction, total exoneration.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b>          FRIEZE: How will we see the Title IX report? BONNEAU: Will be published on the website.          DE VALLEJO: How is the Steelworkers (USW) unionization effort been connected to the student workers issues? They don't seem to really be connected to the work of people in a University. BONNEAU: This is a matter for the union officials.          BIRCHER: There is no limitation on bargaining units and who represents them.          GADDY: It grew out of efforts to organize part time people at a regional campus. There was later discussion about whether to continue with USW --- numerous resources, well known --- and students were associated already with the USW. It was a debate, and so this is a continuing issue.</p>	
<p>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</p>	<p><b><u>Bylaws and Procedures Committee</u></b>  <i>Nick Bircher, Co-Chair</i></p> <p><b>RESOLUTION (see Senate website):</b>          The Resolution to Add Representation of Post-doctoral Associates and Scholars to the University Senate (see document</p>	<p>Reports and Discussions</p> <p>Vote</p>

	<p>on Senate website) was passed unanimously by the committee and allowed for comment period through the University Times. We can vote on this resolution today and send it to Senate Council next week.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b>  TASHBOOK: I was surprised the resolution was calling for only one representative. By having one seat, will they have voting members on Committees? BIRCHER: Yes, committee members can be on committees. KEAR: Separate student groups have representation on Senate Council.  KEAR: Thank you to Dr. Gau who has been working on shared governance for years since his undergraduate days!  <b>VOTE: Passed unanimously</b></p> <p><b><u>Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-Discrimination Advocacy Committee</u></b>  <i>Cynthia Danford and Allyn Bove, Co-Chairs and various members</i></p> <p><b>PRESENTATION (see Senate website):</b>  Have been dealing with this year: Mission, building names, academic calendar issues, lactation, Office of Diversity and Inclusion regarding non-discrimination policies, diversity directory, and survey of GRE in graduate admissions.  <u>GRE Survey</u>  How might other committees and bodies make contributions related to these survey results.  GradSERU Survey --- EIDAC wanted to look at GRE uses; correlation issues with minority status issues  <i>SEE Presentation materials for details.</i>  Dr. Nathan Urban will be sending out some informational items to faculty and departments to consider best uses of the GRE.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b>  <b>LACTATION</b>  FRIEZE: Is there a published list of Lactation Rooms? DANFORD: Yes, EIDAC website and HR website.  BRATMAN: typographic errors on resolution (correction)</p> <p><b>GRE</b>  DE VALLEJO: This is a complicated and contested set of issues --- some people are not really sure what the GRE truly measures in terms of important criteria for graduate students.  DANFORD: Cost is an issue as well --- costs \$225 to take --- high cost for students, especially if needed to retake</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>MOREL: School of Medicine decided not to use the GRE since peer schools are not using it; funding agencies are no longer collecting GRE scores as measures of academic worthiness of Schools.</p> <p>BOVE: Do you know if they have looked at gender or racial minority acceptance rates since dropping the requirement?</p> <p>MOREL: Qualitatively, at least one program may be experiencing an increasing</p> <p>BRATMAN: Law Schools are moving toward the GRE as an alternative to the LSAT – the LSAT carries with it the same concerns related to minority issues. Is there anything good out there?</p> <p>BOVE: That's part of the problem --- there aren't good measures out there that match well to the professions (PT example was offered).</p> <p>LABRIDINIS: Have international scores been considered.</p> <p>ANSELL: International students don't usually submit the GRE</p> <p>MOREL: When required they usually perform well</p> <p>BOVE: Most research has been done on US subcategories</p> <p>KISELYOV: Biological sciences don't use anymore and diversity definitely “went up”; eliminated because we found lack of predictable indicators</p> <p>MUNRO: Wondering if it made sense for students with low TOEFL scores that could help students (boot camp) for the GRE to boost scores?</p> <p>BECKER: In looking at the data, the number that scared me most was the single biggest criterion was “fits with the program” --- that's a term out of the 50's that can be used for many purposes. How many programs have developed a list of indicators of success in the fields with their applicant screening process aligned? What is it that is required --- and that may not be part of the GRE.</p> <p>BIRCHER: The degree at which GRE scores are relevant to a discipline varies greatly. For some Schools, the relevance is hard to justify.</p> <p>LABRIDINIS: Even across a School, it is variable across academic programs within a School, as well.</p> <p>BOVE: The research is hard to interpret because of lack of specifics.</p> <p>BONNEAU: Glad to hear that SVC Urban is going to be following up with this!</p>	
--	--	--

<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></p>	<p><b><u>University Budgeting Process</u></b>  <i>Mr. Hari Sastry, Sr Vice Chancellor and CFO</i></p> <p><b>PRESENTATION (see Senate website):</b>                  Been here about 6 months; upward slope of the learning curve.                  What we've been doing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. University Strategic Plan (linking planning to resources)</li> <li>2. Department and School Priorities</li> <li>3. Campus Master Plan</li> </ol> <p>Initial Review of:                  Revenue                  Distribution of Expenses                  Financial Management                  Budget Model and Projections</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b>                  TASHBOOK: Revenue source related to ownership of patents?                  SASTRY: We're looking to grow each area; not significant                  BRATMAN: Gifts and pledges separate from endowments on pie chart? SASTRY: These are only unrestricted accounts                  KEAR: What % of compensation is paid by grants/contracts?                  SASTRY: Will have to get that info                  LABRIDINIS: What is the quasi-endowment? SASTRY: gifts that were less restricted or unrestricted that have been given; we may have opportunity to use (\$1.6B)                  YATES: Grants and contracts funding has dramatically decreased. Is there a contingency plan for this? SASTRY: Congress has been modifying these amounts; we don't think it will be "as bad" as originally suggested. The School of Medicine is hardest hit.                  BONNEAU: That hits all Schools equally. BECKER: Top 5 or better areas will take a bigger relative hit.                  MULVANEY: What about research partnerships? SASTRY: Academic partnership (in kind) or sponsorship (actual money) can add to revenue; we're looking to expand. MULVANEY: Concern about bias in not-for-profit sector partnerships (Social work, education, etc) SASTRY: we understand that revenue generation opportunities may not exist; and begin to look at this systemwide.                  MULVANEY: What are the ideas for strategies for matching budget and planning at the unit level? SASTRY: Each RC develop a plan tied to the strategic plan (to Provost level) and then aggregate up levels at SVC level --- to look at bottomline.</p>	<p>Presentation</p>
---	--	---------------------

	<p>So the decision space is defined --- and will need to be refined based on shared governance model --- then begin to execute.</p> <p>MULVANEY: Filtering down? SASTRY: Decision making at the upper levels through the Provost to prioritize.</p> <p>BIRCHER: Within RCs, how will you see the Planning and Budgeting groups being empowered to get that job done?</p> <p>SASTRY: Bring together business officers across units to prioritize processes and budget processes to then roll that out across units. BIRCHER: One mechanism is at that localized Unit level to encourage faculty engagement.</p> <p>TANANIS: A more systemic approach to budgetary support for efforts (some areas are less able to generate revenues, others more so) is laudable and refreshing.</p> <p>LABRIDINIS: Having common data/metrics and sharing them would help, especially at the more localized areas. SASTRY: really want to press for strategic alignment.</p> <p>FRIEZE: Is there any focus on culling programs and initiatives that are not generating income? SASTRY: Hoping to press the decision-making process to the RC levels --- consider how you will maintain what should be priorities. Centrally we hope to create the right incentives for strategic decision-making.</p>	
<p><u>Announcements</u></p> <p>Results of elections for Faculty Assembly and committees. Congratulations and thank you for your service.</p> <p>After Senate Council next week, there will be a reception to which you are invited, hosted by the Chancellor</p> <p>Have a fantastic summer!</p>		
<p><u>Adjournment</u></p>		<p>Moved and accepted, 4:27p</p>

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



HAIL TO PITT!

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Members attending:

Becker, Bircher, Bonneau, Borovetz, Bove, Bratman, Brodt, Bromberg, Conley, Cousins, Danford, DeVallejo, Fort, Frieze, Gaddy, Goundappa, Guterman, Kear, Kiselyov, Kucan, Labrinidis, Loughlin, Miller, Molinaro, Morel, Mulvaney, Munro, Poljak, Sant, Tananis, Tashbook, Wilson, Yates

Members not attending:

Adams, Betru, Buchanich, D’Cunha, Deitrick, gold, Goldberg, Harper, Harries, Horne, Infanti, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthak, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kelly, Landrigan, Long, Mahoney, Martin, McGreevy, Mostern, Mulcahy, Nelson, Roberts, Rohrer, Smolinski, Soska, Spring, Sukits, Swigonova, Taboas, Triplette, Weikle-Mills, Weinberg

\*Excused attendance:

Arkush, Aziz, Bachman, Dahm, Denman, Henker, Kovacs, Landsittel, Salcido, Stoner, Van Nostrand

Others attending:

Amato, Ansell, Cassidy, Gau, Harrell, Jones, Pelt, Rubio, Sastry, Wisniewski

\*Notified Senate Office