

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
Conference Room A, University Club
February 19, 2013**

Topic/Discussion	Action
<u>Call to Order.</u> President Thomas Smitherman called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.	The meeting commenced.
<u>Approval of the Minutes of the January 22, 2013 Faculty Assembly Meeting.</u> President Smitherman asked for approval of the minutes of the January 22, 2013 Faculty Assembly meeting.	The minutes were approved as written.
<u>Introduction of Items of New Business.</u> President Smitherman asked if there were any new items of business to be brought forward.	No items of new business were brought forward.
<p><u>Report of the President. Thomas Smitherman</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There has been much discussion about the status and future of the Sustainability Subcommittee of the Plant Utilization and Planning (PUP) Committee. This subcommittee was formed, to continue the work of an ad hoc committee which had exhausted its total time limits. One could (and I have) argued that both the ad hoc committee and the Sustainability Subcommittee, in fact, operated substantially like a working group. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is consensus that its work has been vibrant and productive. This subcommittee has shared an administrative liaison with the parent PUP committee and these administrators have found that the requisite work to support both committees, in part because of redundancies, is too time-consuming and difficult to continue. ○ Functioning essentially as a working group, the current form and format of the subcommittee does not to my mind; at least strictly speaking, entirely conform to our Bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order, 11th edition. ➤ I proposed to the many who are interested in the continued vibrant and productive function of this group and the Faculty Assembly possible ways forward: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A substantial change in the form and format of the subcommittee, which would require special action from the Faculty Assembly and the Senate Council, and a request to the administration for administrative liaison difference from that of the PUP Committee; 2) Creation of a new Sustainability Committee, entirely separate from the PUP Committee; and replacement of the Sustainability Subcommittee with a new Working Group on Sustainability that would be a function of the University of Pittsburgh, independent of the University Senate; 3) Merging of the Sustainability subcommittee back into the parent PUP Committee; and 4) Formation of a Sustainability Working Group under the aegis of the University of Administration, to which the Senate Officer would nominate faculty members. ➤ Formation of a working group had much support from the 	President Smitherman gave his report.

University Administration. In a conference call including the Senate officers, the PUP co-chairs and Drs. Irene Frieze and Buck Favorini for the Sustainability subcommittee, consensus quickly emerged favoring a dual approach: merging the subcommittee back into PUP and forming a Working Group on Sustainability. The PUP committee chairs are forming a task force to determine precisely how to implement the merger. Senior university administrators have begun to think of the mission and role and scope of this working group. We hope to have final details for you by the end of this academic year. As no Senate action was needed to form the Sustainability Subcommittee, there is no need for formal Senate action to approve its merger back into the parent committee. I believe that the outcome will be quite good both eliminating administrative burdens and continuing and perhaps augmenting and enhancing the work this subcommittee has performed in the past.

- The Budget Policies Committee continues to monitor the process of reviewing the status of the three graduate programs in German, Classics and Religious Studies. We can be hopeful that the review will be completed in the near future. The Provost assures us that the review of the graduate programs for German, Religious Studies and Classics are nearing a conclusion. There have been delays because of illness of some key faculty members.
- The date of our one plenary session for this year is now set for Thursday afternoon, April 18th. The title is ***The Cyberlearning Revolution in Higher Education: Charting Pitt's Direction for Instructional Technology in the age of MOOCs.*** Initial planning efforts are underway. This topic continues to remain dynamic, changing almost daily, timely and controversial, attributes that continue to make this topic very appealing. We hope to give you some answers: Why is this occurring? How will it be implemented? How expensive will it be? How will it be supported financially? In the long run will it really save money? How will it relate to current and ongoing on-line and distance education? How and when will the courses migrate from non-credit to credit courses? Will we lose the values of traditional on-site education?
- Pitt Day in Harrisburg was held on February 12, 2013. Dr. Jim Becker represented the executive committee of the Senate. I understand that many faculty and students attended and that the overall tone was one of strong support for the University of Pittsburgh.
- I am delighted that we have arranged special presentations for all of our remaining meetings of Faculty Senate this academic year. Most of the presentations focus on issues raised by the recent NRC report on Research Universities and the nation's future.
 - The presentation on January 22nd was about remarkable cost-containment and efficiencies at the University of Pittsburgh. It was presented by Mr. Art Ramicone and Dr. David DeJong.
 - The status of the student athlete at the University of Pittsburgh is being presented at our February meeting. The

status of post-graduate education at the University of Pittsburgh will be presented on April 30th. The Provost will present on April the second and will discuss what Pitt is about, what we are doing, what are the accomplishments that have pushed Pitt up the academic ladder so rapidly. She has also agreed to add some budgetary information in that presentation. I am now working on a special presentation for our last meeting in June. I'll give you more information about that later. Please try to attend as many of these special presentations as you can.

- The Committee on Elections is hard at work under the leadership of Immediate Past-President Michal Pinsky. Their work is nearing completion. Please spread the word to your faculty colleagues to “throw their hats” into the ring for membership on Senate Committees, positions of the Faculty Assembly and the Senate Offices. We look forward to a robust roster

Report of Senate Athletics Committee: Lou Fabian & Kevin McLaughlin, Co-Chairs; Jennifer Tuscano, Asst. Director of Academic Support Services

- Recent NCAA Eligibility Changes
- Academic Progress Rate (APR)
- Academic Support Services

Recent NCAA Eligibility Changes

- For competition, incoming freshman students minimum GPA/SAT increased from 2.0 to 2.3 and 1010 to 1080
- Incoming freshmen must complete 10 of 16 core courses by the end of their junior year
- Junior College transfer students minimum GPA increased from 2.0 to 2.5

Academic Progress Rate

- In-season practice max. 20hrs./wk, out of season 8hrs./wk. Consists of Retention and Eligibility points by team for all Division 1 institutions
- Retention - does a scholarship athlete stay at the University
- Eligibility - is a scholarship athlete academically eligible to play Previous to this year, no NCAA restriction for post-season competition based on APR
- The NCAA recently mandated a team must have an APR of at least 900 (2012), 900 (2013), 930 (2014) to compete in post-season competition
- Pitt's APR composite average for 19 teams in 2011 was 975 with no team below a 952
- In 2011, 42 of 120 Division 1 institutions fell below a 930 APR and would not have been eligible for post season competition in football
- Seven Institutions were excluded based on a 900
 - Texas Southern North Carolina A & T
 - Hampton Univ. Idaho State Univ.
 - Alabama State Univ. Jackson State Univ.
 - Prairie View A & M University
- In 2010, 85 of 345 Division 1 institutions fell below a 930 APR and would not have been eligible for post season competition in men's basketball
- Twenty-One Institutions were excluded based on a 900
- Notables University of Connecticut, Delaware St, Grambling, Coppin, Toledo, Towson, Arkansas-Pine Bluff, California-Riverside, Maryland-Eastern Shore, Morgan St., Arkansas-Fayetteville, Texas-Southern

Pitt's Academic Progress

- In 2011, 334 of 475 student-athletes (70.3%) achieved “scholar athlete” status, achieving a 2 term grade point average of 3.0 or above, including 16 student-athletes receiving a 2 term grade point average of 4.0. The average GPA for student athletes in 2011 was 2.94.
- No Pitt Team has lost a scholarship or been deemed ineligible for post-season competition

Tutoring Program

- Ethical conduct
- NCAA rules compliance
- University of Pittsburgh Academic Integrity
- Full time staff member monitoring academic center
- Tutor are not permitted to type papers or assist in take home quizzes or exams

Staff and Coaches

1. Department staff: annual certification and rules education, new staff orientation
2. Academic support staff: annual meeting with FAR, Athletics Director and Compliance staff; role and support of FAR in academic integrity issues, academic support policies and procedures related to academic integrity; support of the academic mission of the Athletic Department and University

Independent and Directed Studies

Faculty representatives review the list of student athletes who are in enrolled in independent study meet standards

Internal Audit Report, December 2011

Control procedures were found to be very good and effectively implemented

University Senate Admissions and Student Aid Committee

Submitted by Susan Shaiman, Chair

- Mission Statement: The primary mission of the Committee is to make recommendations to the Senate on matters pertaining to Student Admissions and Financial Aid bearing on Admission.
- Committee Activities: In order to carry out the above mission this Committee shall review and make recommendations regarding:
 1. admission criteria to identify 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 impact on student body.
 - How can we assure that the University of Pittsburgh education is a “value”?
 - Learned that we are doing many great things but are hidden.
 - For example, first generation students, low income; we have resources in place for other students who need support; make faculty and departments aware of the resources.
- In the 2011-2012 academic years, the Committee met seven times. Regular agenda items included updates from the retiring Director of the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid (OAF), Dr. Betsy Porter, as well as a focus on understanding and promoting the University’s ongoing retention efforts. And replaced by Marc Harding.
- The Committee met with the following individuals:

- Thomas Crawford, Associate Vice Chancellor, Institutional Advancement, who discussed fundraising efforts and student support.
- Edward Sticker, Dean, University Honors College, who spoke about the Honors College and the need for increased faculty involvement.
- Karin Asher, Associate Director, Career Development Office, who spoke about increasing partnerships with academic programs and departments in order to improve career opportunities for students.
- Anita Persaud, Director, Academic Resource Center, discussed services to assist students in improving critical thinking and other skills.
- Dr. Betsy Porter, Director, Office of Admissions and Financial Aid. Dr. Porter provided the Committee with updates on admissions, including profiles of both applying and admitted students. Dr. Porter also reflected on her 30+ years in the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid (OFA), upon her retirement.

The Committee was represented by Susan Shaiman as a member of the search committee to select a new Chief Enrollment Officer, resulting in the hiring of Mr. Marc Harding, effective July 2012.

In the current 2012-2013 academic year, the Committee has met five times to date, beginning with the introduction of Mr. Marc Harding to the Committee as the University's new Chief Enrollment Officer. Mr. Harding and Ms. Kellie Kane, Associate Director, OFA, provided us with an update of the current freshman class and admissions statistics. Mr. Harding also discussed his process for learning about OFA and the University.

Select Statistics for the 2012 Freshman Class (further information may be found at <http://www.oafa.pitt.edu/stats.aspx>)

- Number of applications: 24,871
- Number of students admitted: 13,959
- Number of students deposited: 3,678
- Percentage of enrolled freshmen from Allegheny County: 17%
- Percentage of enrolled freshmen from PA: 67%
- Percentage of enrolled out-of-state freshmen: 33%
- Freshman minority enrollment: 22%
- Freshman retention rate: more than 90%
- Percentage of enrolled freshman University Honors College eligible: 18%
- Percentage of students offered admission in the top 10% of H.S. class: 59%

Additional information may be found in the University's online 2013 Fact Book (<http://www.ir.pitt.edu/factbook/documents/FB2013.pdf>)

In recent meetings, the Committee has discussed potential topics to explore for assisting OFA in promoting the strengths and demonstrating the value of a University of Pittsburgh education, as well as identifying areas in which improvement may be made. The committee is reviewing University documents specific to issues of student recruitment and retention, including the University's 2012 Self-Study Report (<http://www.middlestates.pitt.edu/self-study-2012>) and the Middle States Accreditation Report (<http://www.middlestates.pitt.edu/middle-states-report>).

An excerpt from the Middle States Accreditation Report, focusing on admissions and retention at the University of Pittsburgh, is below:

- Standard 8: Student Admissions/Retention: The institution meets this standard.
- Summary of Evidence and Findings: Based on a review of the Self-Study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

“The University of Pittsburgh maintains an excellent web presence with respect to its institutional profile, expectations for student admissions and performance; and, on student learning outcomes, detailing policies and practices and making assessment results available to prospective students and other constituencies. It has robust enrollment management processes in place that are consistent with advancing institutional mission.

The institution assesses student success on an ongoing basis through a variety of direct and indirect measures including student academic performance, retention rate, graduation rate, and a variety of external and internal survey instruments.

The institution has in place an enrollment management plan and strategy aligned with a commitment to student achievement. Student learning objectives are clearly articulated to incoming and prospective students. There is ample evidence of academic advisement and academic support programs to help students succeed and achieve their educational objectives.

A variety of student enrichment and support programs for underrepresented students and at-risk student populations are available, appropriately resourced, and routinely assessed. The institution is committed to sustaining progress and advancing student retention.”

In the coming months, the Committee will be learning about support services within the University designed to assist underrepresented students and high achieving, first generation, low-income students enrolled at the University.

Report of Plant Utilization and Planning Committee: Susanna Leers and Patricia Weiss, Co-Chairs

- Mission Statement: concerned with physical plan and environment
 - Monthly meetings: regular reports from liaisons from administration at Pitt; presentations by invited guests; site visit to renovations and project
 - Sampling of projects: Chevron Center Science Center Annex, Hillman Patio; Graduate School of Public Health, Salk Hall Addition; Book Center Renovation, Nordenberg Hall
 - Presentations: architect for Book Center, building security, facilitates administration liaisons about building and architecture t awards, director of grounds keeping, registrar on classroom scheduling
 - Site Visits: North Point Breeze ULS, chevron Science Center
 - Responding Issues: pedestrian safety at specific spots on campus, sustainability subcommittee, classroom scheduling

Sustainability: reabsorb committee into PUP; developing a small task force to identify agenda; not within committees scope onto a University wide committee that may be developed; increase pro-tem members of PUP

Classroom Assignments: productive conversation with the registrar, problems with room scheduling; 5 examples from A&S, 1 from GSPH, 1 from SW.

- Automatic scheduling take care of only 40% of classes; 60-100 losers and impossible; new analytic products available but it is expensive
- 2 university policies: 1. Course meeting time policies: faculty can requested

<p>exemptions; 2. Classrooms facilities policy....rooms are scheduled by her office, schools, and departments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more detailed information for increasing capacity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Departmental rooms are not used efficiently ○ Complaints about Nationality Rooms for teaching and learning ○ Acoustic issues for many of the rooms • Staffing Issues: Registrar office impacted by the retirements, lost many individuals with historical knowledge of many important issues • Guidelines for departments to schedule rooms for which they have control • Discussing training issues among the staff 	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New</u></p> <p>.</p>	No action needed.
<p><u>Announcements.</u></p> <p>Approaching time when nominees will be needed for positions in Faculty Assembly and University Senate</p>	Information only; no action needed.
<p><u>Adjournment.</u></p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM</p>	Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Rose Frank, PhD, MSN, ACRN, FAAN
Senate Secretary
Associate Professor of Public Health, Medicine, and Nursing
Graduate School of Public health

Members attending:

Alexander, Baker, Becker, Bircher, Borghesi, Burkoff, Butterworth, Chaiklin, Chiarulli, Clark, Constantino, Costantino, Fabian, Flynn, Frank, Gibson, Hartman, Kear, Kearns, Leers, Lewicka, Lin, Lyon, McKinney, McLaughlin, Miller, Molinaro, Neft, Shaiman, Smith, Smitherman, Spring, Tananis, Terry, Vieira, Weiss, Wendell, Withers

Members not attending:

Barker, Bauer, Bonneau, Caldwell, Chase, Clermont, Cohen, Culley, Daley, Feuer, Gallagher, Hravnak, Jones, Labrinidis, Majumdar, Mulcahy, Riccelli, Rougeux, Savinov, Shafiq, Skledar, Smolinski, Tisherman, Wilson

*Excused attendance:

Bartholomae, Beck, Bledsoe, Buchanich, Cauley, Culley, Erickson Gaddy, Gleason, Karp, Kelly, Kovacs, Lunsford, Neufeld, Nisnevich, Pinsky, Savoia, Slimick, Song, Sukits, Withiam

Others attending:

Balaban, Barlow, Fedele, Frieze, Tuscano

*Notified Senate Office