

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
 University Club Ballroom A
 January 25, 2011

Topic/Discussion	Action
Call to Order. President Michael R. Pinsky called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.	The meeting commenced.
Approval of the Minutes of the November 3rd, 2011 Faculty Assembly Meeting. President Pinsky asked for approval of the minutes of the November 3, 2010 Faculty Assembly meeting.	The minutes were approved as written.
Introduction of Items of New Business. President Pinsky asked if there were any new items of business to be brought forward. Patricia Weiss, Vice President, would like to bring into discussion Port Authority cuts in service.	There was one item of new business presented by Vice President, Patricia Weiss.
Report of the President. President Pinsky gave the following report: Perhaps the most important issue and one that will be our focus for the near term is faculty salaries, cost of living increases in pay and definitions of comparison groups. Professor John Baker has written a Senate Matters column that will appear in the February 3 issue of the University Times that explores some aspects of this issue in greater detail. Also in that issue will be a response piece written by the administration. Briefly, some faculty who were hired many years ago may not have received cost of living increases proportional to the actual cost of living increases for the period. Since retirement contributions and future salary levels are pegged to annual pay increases by compounding, these potential financial short falls could potentially have a major and continuing negative financial effect on long term faculty salaries. In essence faculty are getting paid much less now in terms of real buying power than they were say 10 or 15 years ago. Younger faculty are less prone to this problem only because this issue is compounded over time, but they too are not immune. These points were placed in sharp relief by the recent announcement by the University that the senior administrators, the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, etc. were approved by the Board of Directors to receive a cost of living increase in compensation in proportion to their peer group. Please understand that both Professor Baker and I supported these increases as we stated in a recent University Times article. Our senior administration has done an exceptionally good job in their roles and we support them within that context and are proud to have them as our administrative leadership. Still, the field needs to be level and fair for not only senior administrators, but also for faculty and staff alike. We are in an unprecedented era of escalating salaries for senior university executives, as well as football and men's basketball coaches around the United States. But we need to keep these resource uses in perspective. In a time of marked fiscal austerity, which our	President Pinsky's report was approved and submitted. No comments or questions were presented to President Pinsky.

University and indeed most universities across the country are experiencing, balance and reason with regarding to fiscal commitments remain prudent. These issues are far too complex to summarize or even explore in an open forum such as the Faculty Assembly, but they are issues that must and will be explored between the administration and the faculty through your representative University Senate representatives on the appropriate committees.

A second issue is more chronic but also germane to our roles as both educators and role models for the undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate trainees we are entrusted to teach. One can ask: “What defines the role of the faculty as educators and the student-faculty interaction as student and parent expectations, electronic communications evolve and real world demands rapidly change? This is not a new issue but has been brought to the fore by events last year’s rouge posting of a classroom session on YouTube, reminding us that it is the sanctity of the classroom as a place of open conversation and learning and interaction of teacher and student as a sacred bond which we observe. That issue was appropriately addressed through existing administrative channels and policies. But I will ask members of the Education Policies, Student Affairs and Tenure & Academic Freedom Committees to discuss these issues collectively and proactively, and if need be form an Ad Hoc Committee including representation from the Provost Office, to address the new challenges of the post-recession electronic academic age. The Library Committee is already addressing this with regard to considering open access for cited faculty publications. Independent of this initiative, Professors Judy Erlen and Kathy Kelly reported that the Senate Educational Policies Committee will be continuing its collaboration with the Senate Committees on Student Affairs & Admissions and Student Aid to address the broad range of issues related to undergraduate student retention.

I am pleased to announce that the CERTS initiative, chaired by Professor Tracy Soska, from the School of Social Work, has been making excellent and tangible progress over the past month and a half. Recall that CERTS aims to combine intellectual and academic resources across all schools and departments to create a durable community service academic product. On December 9, 2010 Tracy Soska, myself and members of the Oakland Planning Committee met with Provost Beeson to describe the program and get her endorsement. I am pleased to report that we received a very warm welcome and enthusiastic support from her, as she perceived that the value of these activities would be great for students from any School for just participating in such programs. Then, on January 5 this group became part of the larger Oakland Planning Steering Committee whose role it will be to define priorities of need and opportunity, craft specific projects and timetables to realize Community-based programs to

benefit the Oakland Community. We chose to start our CERTS program here in Oakland for several reasons. First, it is easier for students and faculty to participate in initiatives that are local, no further away in many instances than across the street. Second, because Oakland is our neighborhood and as good neighbors we have an obligation to use our resources as needed here. And third because the Oakland Planning Committee has already created an extended infrastructure of Social Service organizations and community leaders, this makes any impact our University can make that much greater. I will be asking Professor Soska to report on the progress made at a later Faculty Assembly meeting this year.

As you know, Professor Nick Bircher is heading our Senate Outreach program. This initiative has designated faculty present a short already-developed presentation to each School or Department annually that explains what the University Senate is, why it is important to them and how they can participate. He reported that the School of Pharmacy completed their outreach presentation. Professor Bircher also want to remind the Faculty Assembly members that volunteering is best, but in the absence of volunteers, specific invitations to speak will be sent to each FA member. Volunteers can contact either Professor Bircher or Professor Irene Frieze if they wish to participate. This is the best way for Faculty assembly members to start an active dialogue with the faculty they represent.

Speaking of Professor Irene Frieze, she reported that Plant Utilization and Planning (PUP) will be talking about how to redesign the Book Center at their next meeting on Wednesday, February 2 at 3pm in the Martin Room which is room 4127 in Sennott Square. Anyone who is interested is welcome to join them.

The Commonwealth Relations Committee is commencing the term with a luncheon meeting on Friday 28 January with freshman Representative Brandon P. Neuman of the 48th District covering portions of Washington County. Representative Neuman earned an MSL degree in 2006 from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law. Other State Representatives and Senators have been contacted to complete the calendar for the term and the committee awaits their confirmation. The focus of these luncheons has been on new Legislators as well as some that have not participated for a few years. The Committee will be visiting the University of Pittsburgh Greensburg Regional Campus in March and they are working on securing a local Legislator for that meeting. Finally, the Commonwealth Relations Committee will participate in the annual Pitt Day with the State Legislature in Harrisburg in March. That event has Pitt students and alumni from around the state contact their representatives and senators directly letting them know how important a vibrant and world class University in western Pennsylvania means to their region and the state as a whole. This grassroots lobbying effort

<p>has proven highly successful in the past in raising the visibility of the University of Pittsburgh in the eyes of the state legislature. That ends my report and would be glad to answer any questions.</p>	
<p><u>Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.</u></p> <p><u>Anti-Discriminatory Policies Committee, Deborah Brake, Co-Chair</u></p> <p>The ADPC has continued to work on a number of issues in furtherance of our mission to promote diversity and ensure full compliance with our university nondiscrimination policies.</p> <p>In the past year our work has included reviewing and discussing information and data regarding gender disparities in faculty salaries. We have heard from a number of persons in the university community on this subject, including then-Vice Provost (now Provost) Patty Beeson. We have also communicated with PACWC on this issue, and expect to continue to work on this issue in the near future. At our December, 2010 meeting, we voted to make the gender equity issues committee a formal subcommittee of the ADPC. We have a great deal of overlap with them in our respective missions and we look forward to working with them and facilitating their work in the future.</p> <p>We have also continued to study and discuss how to improve faculty diversity, including and especially improving our retention of minority and women faculty. One recent focus has been to examine the role of mentoring in retaining a diverse faculty.</p> <p>We continue to serve an advisory role to promote and support the Allies training program for faculty and staff (which was initiated as a joint program of the Rainbow Alliance and the Dean of Student Affairs). In this role we have sought to publicize the program and address issues, such as inadequate advance notice of scheduling, that have hindered attendance.</p> <p>Finally, our committee has been reviewing an exclusion in our university health insurance policy that targets individuals in the transgender community, with a concern that the exclusion poses a conflict with our nondiscrimination policy. Our university health insurance policy currently excludes “transsexual surgery and any treatment related to the preparation for or correction of such surgery.” In August, 2008, our university nondiscrimination policy was amended to add “gender identity and expression” as a protected class, barring discrimination on that basis. After numerous discussions of this issue over the past year, our committee has concluded that the specific exclusion of medical procedures that would be sought only by transgender persons is in conflict with our nondiscrimination policy prohibiting discrimination based on transgender status. However, we acknowledge that there are some complexities to the this issue that merit further investigation, including: the feasibility of dropping the exclusion (including any effect on cost); the different interests and</p>	

issues at stake for student health insurance coverage and for faculty/staff health insurance coverage; and how this coverage question is handled by other universities – a situation that is in flux, as more universities have recently changed their policies to cover such services.

We did note, in concluding that there is a conflict with our nondiscrimination policy, two things: 1) there is already an umbrella exclusion for non-medically necessary procedures, including cosmetic procedures, so to the extent that is the rationale for the specific transgender exclusion, it would be entirely redundant; and 2) that the key governing medical bodies, including American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the National Association of Social Workers, and others, have all passed resolutions in the past few years condemning such exclusions in health insurance policies as a violation of the rights of transgender patients with Gender Identity Disorders and as endangering patient health.

As a result, our committee is in the process of forming a working group to review this exclusion under our health insurance policy comprised of members of the ADPC and the Benefits Committee. The working group will make a more thorough report on this issue and offer any recommendations that come out of this process.

Remarks

President Pinsky commented that we discussed the issue of health care coverage for transgender surgery with the Chancellor and that we do not decide what is covered under our insurance plan. Our issue with the university was that we didn't want the university to single out transgender surgery, but to say that no cosmetic surgery will be covered. Pinsky said that when discussed with the Benefits and Welfare Committee, it was stated that if anything were medically necessary, it would be covered, including transgender surgery.

Brake says that she does not believe this to be the case. The ADPC Committee will meet with the Benefits and Welfare Committee to discuss this issue for further clarification.

Brake suggested that new data shows that several universities are covering specific parts of transgender surgery, such as hormone therapy and the like. The ADPC recommends that coverage of transgender surgery should be determined by physicians and not the administration.

This issue will be readdressed after the ADPC has a chance to meet the Benefits and Welfare Committee and discuss the policy language and actual coverage.

Gender Equity II Committee, Irene Frieze and Kacey Marra

This ad hoc committee was a continuation of the Senate ad hoc Committee for the Promotion of Gender Equity I, which was

terminated at the end of 2008. The Committee was approved to continue working for 2 more years and will terminate at the end of 2010. Irene Frieze [frieze@pitt.edu] chaired this committee. Goals for this ad hoc Committee were to provide an on-going forum for the discussion of concerns relating to gender equity on campus for faculty, staff and students and to develop concrete recommendations for ways to enhance gender equity. The Committee was open to all members of the University community and had a large mailing list of faculty, staff and students.

Major projects were:

1. Child and Dependent care. In the past, the committee worked to help develop more openings for infants and toddlers at the University Child Development Center. This subcommittee continued to monitor the situation at the University's child care center as well as working to help provide additional child care options for faculty and staff. The Committee also developed a resolution to support breast pumping for nursing mothers that was approved by the University administration and Senate Council and worked to help support nursing mothers. The Committee's scope included all dependent care, not just childcare. Elsa Strotmeyer [strotmeyere@edc.pitt.edu] chaired this subcommittee.
2. Leadership Networking and Skills Development. In 2009, we completed a survey of women faculty to look at needs for leadership networking and skills development. Based on some of the suggestions we received, we explored ways of offering some programs in this area. We see this as a continuing need we hope will be addressed by other groups.
3. Assisting Trailing Spouses in finding positions in Pittsburgh. This was a long term interest of the ad hoc Committees. We received reports about the programs that have been developed at Pitt by the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Affirmative Action to determine what is now being done and to better publicize these activities.
4. Faculty Salaries and retention. The Committee was interested in how faculty women are doing in terms of salaries, promotion and tenure and retention. We received periodic updates on this from the Office of the Provost.
5. Sexual Harassment. In the past, the Committee worked with the University General Counsel Office to make required changes to the Sexual Harassment policies and to advise on the training program now required for all faculty and staff. We continued to examine policies and practices in this area and hope this responsibility will be taken on by other groups.

For more information about the ad hoc Committee, see <http://sites.google.com/site/friezewebste/Senate-ad-hoc-Committee-for-the-Promotion-of-Gender-Equity> . Information is also posted

about the earlier ad hoc committee at <http://www.pitt.edu/~frieze/senate/womenatpitt.html> . Prepared by Irene Frieze in January 2011.

Plans for new subcommittee
“Gender Discrimination Initiatives”

The objective of this committee is to ensure that faculty are treated equitably by gender in several areas of University activities, including recruitment, hiring, allocation of leadership responsibilities, compensation, and promotion. In addition to the main campus, we plan to also extend these policies to the regional campuses. As the Provost’s office has examined salary differentials in the lower campus, we hope to work with the Provost’s office to identify salary differentials between men and women faculty in upper campus. We hope to work closely with the provost’s office to develop a universal template to be used in each department that will have descriptive procedures for appointing, compensating, and evaluating Deans and Department Chairs. The template will incorporate features that make the opportunity for administrative appointment equally available to both women and men and should include input from faculty on administrative performance.

We will assemble a committee of faculty, staff, post-docs and students across the campuses to discuss the gender equity issues. This will be a focused group committed to generating a solid plan to address the salary differentials, develop seminars and workshops that will give faculty across the campus the opportunity to develop leadership skills, and pursue improved child- and dependent-care. We will also continue to monitor the University child development center, childcare issues, and sexual harassment policies and procedures.

Remarks

Slimick remarked that we already have evaluation forms for the administration at Bradford and asked if this would be in addition to that evaluation system.

Kacey Marra responded that it would be in conjunction with the existing evaluation tools.

John Baker commented that he was not sure what system was in place for evaluation of Deans and administration.

Vice-Provost Blair responded that the Chairs are evaluated every 4 years and that the Deans are evaluated every 5 years and that it is taken very seriously. It is an online survey that uses the instrument that was developed by the Council of Deans.

Beverly Gaddy commented that the Chairs at Greensburg have not been evaluated, they will just have been appointed to a second three year appointment in the fall. Baker also remarked that the Chairs in the Dental

School have not been evaluated.

Blair remarked that the results of the Chair evaluations go to the Deans and that it should be available to the faculty and that it is meant to be formative in nature.

Maria Kovacs asked why the evaluations of Chairs are not more transparent. Can an announcement be made that the Deans and Chairs are due for evaluations so that the faculty knows?

Blair responded that all of the members of the Department are aware that the evaluations are taking place. It is up to Deans and senior vice-chancellors as to how they use these evaluations.

Francesca Sovaia commented that she still does not believe that all faculty are being given access to the evaluation results and has not been involved in the process.

Dr. Pinsky asked for a show of hands as to who in the room has been asked to evaluate a Dean in the past. A majority of the faculty in the room raised their hands. He then asked for a show of hands as to whom in the room has been asked to evaluate a Chair and many faculty raised their hands.

Vice-President Weiss asked for clarification on how the faculty involved in evaluation is selected.

Blair responded that the decision of who will be polled is a function of the governance structure of the individual school.

President Pinsky asked Blair to provide information on the faculty involved in the evaluation of the Chair of French and Italian in CAS, as Sovaia, a tenured professor, has no knowledge of said evaluations.

Bircher remarked that these evaluations should be conducted in the School of Medicine and this should be brought to the Chancellor.

Marra commented that they want to evaluate how the chairs are hiring and compensation of their faculty members.

Gaddy remarked that evaluations should be done before reappointment and not after and that the chairs should be evaluated annually.

This issue will be discussed further with Vice-Provost Blair to clarify the procedures to interested members of the university faculty.

Senate Elections Committee, John Baker, Chair

Elections for Senate Officers and Faculty Assembly will tentatively be held the first part of April. Elections for Senate Committees will tentatively be held the latter part of April. We need at least 2 candidates for each open position, so we are seeking candidates for all 3 officer positions as well as several Faculty Assembly positions.

<p>On behalf of the Senate Elections Committee, I am asking for candidate nominations for any and all of these open Senate positions. Anyone who is interested in being a Senate Officer, a Faculty Assembly member or a Senate Committee should contact Lori Molinaro in the Senate Office, or myself, and nominate yourself or someone else for one of these open positions. We appreciate all of the help we can get in filling them.</p> <p><u>TED Talks</u>, Ron Laporte Laporte discussed Technology, Energy and Design (TED) talks and doing those at Pitt to advertise for the university as well as provide an opportunity for faculty to interact.</p> <p><u>Remarks</u> <i>Faculty Assembly members commented that this was a good idea and President Pinsky suggested that this would be good for recruitment, advertisement, etc...and that we should be doing this type of thing at the university. Pinsky remarked that we may be able to get an ad hoc committee together to develop the program for the talks.</i></p>	
<p><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business.</u> Vice-President Weiss brought forth the issue of cuts in Port Authority service and asked if anyone had heard concerns from their constituents regarding these cuts.</p> <p><u>Remarks</u> <i>Susan Shaiman commented that students are concerned about these cuts in her department and that it is difficult for the students to get to their assigned clinical opportunities and that this may deter students from coming to our university.</i></p> <p><i>Paul Munro suggested that the university renegotiate their contract with Port Authority to cover more routes for our students.</i></p> <p><i>Bircher suggested that we survey the departments to find out to what locations our students are going for their off-campus learning opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>Balaban remarked that we should determine where the cuts are hurting students, staff and faculty the most to see if we can keep service for those times and locations and cut other routes that are less frequently utilized.</i></p> <p><i>President Pinsky will bring this issue to the Chancellor at their next meeting.</i></p>	<p>New business was introduced by Vice-President Weiss.</p>
<p><u>Announcements.</u></p>	<p>There were no announcements.</p>
<p><u>Adjournment.</u></p>	<p>Meeting was adjourned at 4:26pm</p>

Members attending:

Arena, Baker, Balaban, Beatty, Berry, Bircher, Bonneau, Brake, Burkoff, Caldwell, Chisholm, Close, Costantino, Erlen, Fonzi, Frieze, Gaddy, Gallagher, Galloway, Hartman, Henker, Iwema, Kear, Kearns, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Lunsford, Molinaro, Munro, Neufeld, Pinsky, Rickman, Rinaman, Savoia, Shaiman, Singh, Slimick, Smith, Smitherman, Sparto, Spring, Terry, Trovato, Weiss, Wendell, Withiam

Members not attending:

Bauer, Boone, Chase, Constantino, Daley, Deitrick, Hall, Ho, Hravnak, Karapinka, Lin, Majumdar, Mark, Pan, Ray, Savinov, Smolinski, Steinberg, Towers, Wilson, Zutter

*Excused attendance:

Bartholomae, Becker, Buchanich, Chaiklin, Culley, Elliott, Fabian, Frank Greenberg, Harbert, Johnson, Kelly, Kendrick, Miller, Muenzer, Rougeux, Seybert, Sukits, Tuite

Others attending:

Blair, Brendel, Fedele, Hart, Marra

*Notified Senate office