

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
Via Zoom**

Wednesday, September 9th, 2020

1. Call to Order

President Chris Bonneau called the meeting to order at 3 pm. After usual Zoom etiquette reminders, he asked the Assembly for the approval of the minutes.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting

The distributed minutes from the August 5, 2020 were approved as written.

3. Items of New Business

There were no new business items.

4. Report of the Senate President, Chris Bonneau (submitted in written)

Happy New Year! I hope the academic year is off to a good start for you. Unsurprisingly, there have been some bugs to work out with this switch to a whole new mode of teaching, but I have heard numerous students and faculty say that they are generally pleased with how things are going. Even some of the more notorious cranks have reported, "this isn't as bad as I thought."

Now, for a litany of updates and news.

- *Pitt remains in the Elevated Risk posture, and there are no current plans to move to Guarded. As a reminder, this means, "all classes will be offered remotely and are a mix of synchronous remote and asynchronous remote activities. An in-person engagement option can also be provided when there is a definable benefit to in-person instruction and the dean or regional campus president or their designee grants permission via teaching implementation plans."*
- *If you have questions about what is or is not permitted, please consult the Standards & Guidelines found here: <https://www.policy.pitt.edu/university-policies-and-procedures/covid-19-standards-and-guidelines>. Additionally, you can find all of the Activity Area Plans here: <https://www.coronavirus.pitt.edu/faculty-staff-workplace/activity-area-plans>*
- *Pitt has revised its guidelines regarding face coverings. Face coverings are now required on campus whether you are inside or outside and regardless of our operational posture. This change was recommended by the COVID Medical Response Office, and is a way to continue to protect both ourselves and those around us. I encourage you to read John Williams' Q&A about this change here: <https://www.pittwire.pitt.edu/news/indoors-and-out-face-coverings-required-when-campus>*
- *Since we last met, there was some email discussion about the one credit S/NC course on Anti-Black Racism that Pitt has developed. This course is an asynchronous course that was developed by our colleagues who are experts on this topic. Many of the questions*

related to the process by which this course was developed and implemented. I hope the responses I circulated from the Provost's office have answered all of them. To reiterate my position on this, I think this is an important addition to our curriculum and I strongly encourage everyone to take this course—faculty, staff, and students. Given recent events both on and off campus, it is important for all of us to take a hard look at how our country has gotten to this point and what role we have had in that—whether it be active or passive. A 1-credit course is not going to solve problems, but it is going to make more people aware of the lived experiences of others as well as force us to think hard about how we can do better. I look forward to more initiatives like this going forward.

- *I want to thank all of the Senate committees for continuing to do their important work over the summer months. There has been a lot going on, and our committees have been active participants on issues across the university. Regarding meetings, I am a firm proponent of maximum transparency on all matters of shared governance. Thus, if your meetings are recorded (which I recommend), the recordings should be made available to those who request them. Our meetings are public, the minutes are public, and the recordings should be public. For confidential or sensitive matters, committees should go into closed session, with participation by committee members only. I want to set a bright line rule here: open sessions are completely open and closed sessions are closed to all but committee members. In addition to transparency, having the recordings available assists interested individuals with accuracy, there are likely to be fewer errors and misrepresentations.*

Finally, I want to spend some time talking about the proposed IP Policy we discussed last time and will vote on at our October meeting. There has been a lot of misinformation circulating about this policy, what it does and does not do, and how it changes our current policy.

- *Let's start with the Policy Development Process, which we endorsed in 2018. The process begins with a request to create or revise a policy and then the Policy Office drafts a charter. The draft of the charter is then sent to the relevant stakeholders, including the Senate President. The Senate President gives feedback, suggests committee members, and ultimately signs off on the charter. The Charter sets out the scope and authority of the committee in addition to committee membership and the shared governance process that will be involved before any policy is approved and implemented.*
- *In the case of IP, you can see the Scope and Authority on this slide. Many of the questions at Faculty Assembly have related to Coursework. Note that this is an explicit part of the Committee's scope.*
- *The Charter also sets out Committee Responsibilities, which include benchmarking against our peers (AAU institutions, with a focus on public AAUs) and a period of open discussion and comment with the university community.*
- *As you can see, the Committee had several faculty members without administrative responsibilities from across the schools and institutes of Pitt.*
- *So, what is in the draft? In summary, faculty members own their stuff, with limited exceptions set out in the policy. These exceptions generally apply only to work funded by the government. In these cases, University ownership of intellectual property is a condition of receiving the grant.*
- *It is important to note the status quo policy. If we do nothing, this is the existing policy that is binding on everyone. This policy on coursework was overwhelmingly endorsed (67-4) by Faculty Assembly in July. Note: this is the **same language** that is in the*

proposed IP Policy. Regarding coursework, if we change nothing and if we choose not to endorse this, nothing would change regarding coursework.

- *So, what would change? We would be harming our colleagues who create other forms of Intellectual Property. So, for those who have patents, currently our colleagues receive 30%; under the new policy, they would receive 45%. For copyrights, our colleagues would continue to receive 50% of the revenue, but under the new policy, the individual's department would now get a cut, whereas now it usually goes directly to the school. So, there is a financial benefit to your unit.*

In sum, I understand that people might not like the language regarding coursework. However, this is the language in the current policy. If we decide not to endorse this, what we are doing is financially harming our colleagues who create patentable products. As the shared governance body for the University, we should stand in solidarity with all of our colleagues and not sacrifice their needs because we are unhappy with language in the new policy that simply restates the status quo.

I encourage everyone to read the new policy and compare it with the old one. Next month, we will be voting on endorsing this policy, which comes with a unanimous positive recommendation from our Research Committee. We have had a comprehensive discussion on this and everyone has had the chance to make their voice heard.

The questions following Bonneau's presentation were nitpicking on the new IP policy, which Bonneau summarized in his report. Bickford reiterated his position that not trying to improve the language of the patch that was endorsed in June, it would be to miss an opportunity to improve the policy. Bonneau stressed that the transfer of ownership of online course materials to faculty was approved in June, and any additional changes to the language will not change the ownership. The policy is currently under revision by Faculty Affairs committee and Research Committee, who are trying to improve the vague language around the university license. There is no change to the policy revising process. The policy will come to FA for a vote next month. Bonneau reiterated that hanging up on imperfections of the language might muddle the impact of the revised IP policy, which not only gives to the faculty ownership of their digital materials but also increases the revenues from the patented products, which will benefit a large number of colleagues who create intellectual property other than coursework.

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

A. Status Update on IP Policy, Professor Irene Frieze

Frieze informed the FA of the efforts taken by the ad hoc committee (consisting of FAC and the people who were very vocal to express their concerns about the policy in June) to work out the best language which would be more clear and understandable and would not leave any group of faculty without protection. Salcido added that some objections to the language stem from the fear that University can monetize course materials. Though the response from the VC office was that University could not sell course materials, the language in the policy does not reflect this assurance. He said also that the request is to protect part time, visiting and contract faculty. Bircher gave an example of Harvard University who uses explicit phrase "not for distribution or sale". Adding such language might be an easy solution. Salcido explained that the reworked new language (currently under discussion) does not use

the exact phrase but it is very close. The attempt is to translate faculty needs into the legal language. He shared with FA the current version of this section of the policy and pointed out that the new sentence about the grievance path was added.

Bonneau explained that the discussion on the Outlier is coming next semester and since it is of concern to all of us it will be definitely on our radar.

6. Unfinished Business and/or New Business

a. COACHE survey, Amanda Brodish, Lu-in Wang, John Wallace

Wallace began presentation of sharing the satisfaction data from the COACHE survey administered in February, March and April of 2019 by explaining that collecting opinions on faculty satisfaction is a useful tool in recruitment and retention of faculty. Pitt overall response was 42% and it was similar across different ranks and slightly higher for women.

Brodish shared the detailed results and discussed key outcomes across 25 benchmarks. She talked also how these results compare to a peer group of five institutions.

De Vallejo: Why were clinical faculty excluded from this survey?

Brodish: There was a similar survey done at SOM at the same time.

Hall: In selecting our peer group, have we considered the same or similar programs?

Brodish: Yes, and we are able to see how faculty compare across disciplines, but we are not sharing it today because of time.

Denman: Do you have any raw data for the AS faculty even if it is not compared to the peer data?

Brodish: It is not used in benchmarking, but we can talk with your committee about sharing this kind of data.

Landsittel suggested (re: effect size) presenting the data differently to show magnitude and variation at the same time.

Bircher: How many of this statistical data was statistically significant?

Brodish: We focused on change not statistical significance.

Sant: Does this data get back to different departments or stays in the provost office?

Wang: The data was shared via dashboards with deans, directors and campus presidents and shared with faculty in other forms (today's presentation, letter to faculty). Next steps: We are ready now to engage with different groups and committees to talk and share the specific data they might be interested.

De Vallejo reiterated his objections against excluding clinical faculty from the survey, which is supposed to help decision making for the whole university.

b. Teams Discussion, Vice President David Salcido

Salcido introduced his idea to use MS Teams as a platform for additional direct communication between the Faculty Assembly members and Senate Committees. He shared the slide of the setup he created for the Pitt Senate with separate communication channels for each standing committee. All members are encouraged to sign up and start using the site.

Labrinidis suggested signing up all the committee chairs, so no channel is left without monitoring.

Finally, a short discussion followed Bonneau's comment that the awaited message from the Provost had been distributed while we were in the meeting and Gramm solicited opinions from FA members to her interpretation of the message. General understanding was that though the risk posture did not change, faculty has an option now to request dean's permission for an in-person class if there is a "definable benefit" to it. It is an option not a requirement. People who want to return to teaching classes in person can do so, but those that stay teaching remotely will not be penalized for this decision. We have the option to teach remotely under each of the defined risk postures.

Bickford commented on the decision making process, which in this last decision strays a bit from the path of being supported by the medical data, but it seems to be based rather on the desire to be in class. It also pushes the evaluation, whether it is safe or not safe to be in classroom, to individual faculty instead of medical team in CMRO.

Announcements

Salcido, as a member of the Oakland Plan Steering Committee, informed Faculty Assembly that Plan for Oakland (part of Engage Pittsburgh) offers opportunity to get involved and provide feedback at engage.pittsburghpa.gov/Oakland. He encouraged faculty to give feedback to this development plan since though not all of us live in Oakland we all work in this neighborhood.

Bonneau reminded everyone that this is his third and final term as the Senate President and encouraged FA members to consider running for this position in the Senate election next spring.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

Respectfully submitted,

Małgorzata (Gosia) Fort
Secretary, University Senate

Members attending:

Anderson, Aziz, Beck, Bench, Berenbrok, Bickford, Bircher, Bonneau, Brodt, Buchanich, Bungler, Conley, Cousins, Darnell, Denman, de Vallejo, Fort, Frieze, Goundappa, Gramm, Hall, Henker, Jeong, Judd, Kanthak, Kiesling, Klem, Kucan, Labrinidis, Landsittel, Maier, Molinaro, Morel, Mostern, Mulvaney, Newman, Oyler, Paterson, Poljak, Potoski, Rauktis, Roberts, Salcido, Sant, Schuster, Scott, Spring, Streeter, Swigonova, Tashbook, Vento, Wilson, Wood, Yates, Zack

Members not attending:

Adams, Allison, Almarza, Bove, Guterman, Jeffrey, Jones, Kiselyov, Kohanbash, Kory, Kovacs, Gregg-Byers, Mulcahy, Munro, Jurtazashvili, Nelson, Paljug, Popovich, Sukits, Taboas, Triplette, Yearwood

*Excused attendance:

Bratman, Loughlin Pacella-LaBarbara, Stoner

Others attending:

Annon, Brodish, Bruce, Frank, Johnson, Harrell, Jones, Kuchinskaya, Malin, Manfredi, Marshall, Matheson, McMahon, Newhill, Olson, Pil, Ringler, Russell, Rutenbar, SantaCasa, Suppok, Tang, Tuttle, Wallace, Wang

*Notified Senate Office