

**University of Pittsburgh  
Faculty Assembly Meeting  
2700 Posvar Hall  
Minutes of October 3, 2006**

1. Call to Order: President John Baker called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
2. Approval of Faculty Minutes of September 5, 2006: Approved without change.
3. Introduction of Items of New Business: None.
4. Report of the President, Professor John J. Baker.
  - a. Tobias Memorial/Contributions: The English Department will sponsor a memorial service on October 10, 2006 to celebrate the life and work of Professor Richard C. Tobias. There will be a service in Heinz Chapel at 2:00 pm, followed by a reception in 501 Cathedral of Learning. President Baker circulated a condolence card. Lori Molinaro is collecting donations to a Senate contribution to the Barbara N. Tobias Scholarship fund.
  - b. Senate Committees:
    - i. All Senate Committees have either met, or will soon meet.
    - ii. The Sept. 28, 2006 *University Time* reported upon the Sept. 15, 2006 meeting of the Budget Policies Committee (BPC).
    - iii. The Benefits and Welfare Committee (BWC) will meet October 5, 2006 to discuss the Fitness for Life proposal. The Faculty Assembly will discuss the proposal at a subsequent meeting, pending BWC approval.
    - iv. Two new committee chairs were recently elected: Robert Ries, School of Engineering, will chair the Plant Utilization and Planning Committee, and Tom Smitherman, School of Medicine, will chair the Bylaws and Procedures Committee.
  - c. Senate Appointees: The Senate was asked to recommend two faculty members for appointment to the University Research Council. President Baker recommended Juan Manfredi, Mathematics Department, FAS, and Carol Redmond, Graduate School of Public Health.
  - d. Senate Newsletter:

The first Senate newsletter of the 2006-2007 academic year was distributed October 1, 2006. President Baker invited Faculty Assembly members to send him comments about the newsletter. Recently, Baker received an email from David Wilkins, Professor Emeritus. Wilkins greatly appreciates the newsletter, because it helps him to keep current with what is happening at the University.
  - e. The University's Medical Advisory Committee met September 27, 2006. President Baker related the primary items of interest from that meeting:
    - i. Falk Pharmacy is undergoing remodeling. The pharmacy will add more windows to promote faster pick up service, and will offer free delivery of prescription medications to some campus buildings. A *University Times* article provides more information.

ii. Effective December 1 the UPMC Health Plan will no longer use Argus as it's prescription drug insurer. The new prescription drug insurer will be Express Scripts Inc (ESI), a large nationwide company. More pharmacies will participate in the new drug network. The only major pharmacy that is not slated to participate is CVS.

f. Senate Bylaws and Procedures:

i. Representation on Faculty Assembly: In September 2005, Immediate Past President Irene Frieze asked the Bylaws and Procedures Committee (BPC) to address the following issue:

“Whether the representation in the Faculty Assembly adequately reflects the current distribution of faculty across academic units and, if not, whether and what changes should be made.”

(a) The Senate Bylaws state “Absent an extension from the Senate President, the Committee must report its recommendation to the Faculty Assembly not later than one month following its submission.”

(b) After 13 months, the BPC has made no recommendation concerning faculty representation. BPC was also asked (8 months ago) to address whether the Senate should have electronic elections instead of a mail ballot. In early September 2006, President Baker asked then BPC chair Ted Rice to schedule votes on both issues so that Faculty Assembly could discuss and vote on the proposal.

(c) The BPC met twice in September 2006. President Baker attended the first meeting and Immediate Past President Frieze attended the second meeting. The committee elected a new chair but still has not voted on these two issues. The Bylaws committee is still debating how many representatives each unit should have in Faculty Assembly.

(d) The Senate Bylaws state “The Assembly has the responsibility to elect, to interact with, to monitor the progress of, and to offer guidance to Senate Standing Committees.” President Baker thus asked if Faculty Assembly members might provide some guidance on the issue of how many representatives each unit should have in Faculty Assembly. He asked:

(1) Should the BPC committee be devising a population based plan that would make the number of representatives from each unit proportional to their fraction of the total number of faculty in the Senate. (Such a plan could produce a drastic change in individual unit representation in the Senate)

(2) Alternatively, should the Senate maintain the current US Senate-like structure in which small units are guaranteed at least two representatives to Faculty Assembly? If this case, should the Senate create a proportional mechanism to adjust the number of representatives for larger Schools such as Medicine?

(3) Michael Pinsky and Ted Rice published (Feb. 16, 2006, *University Times*) a proposal that would adjust the number of Medical School representatives to Faculty Assembly.

(4) President Baker observed, “this issue obviously has contentious points or we would not still be discussing it thirteen months after it was introduced.”

ii. Electronic Elections: The BPC is expected to vote on the electronic elections issue in October 2006. In anticipation of that meeting, President Baker asked the Computer

Usage Committee to discuss electronic elections at their September 2006 meeting, and invited Jinx Walton, the Director of Computing, Services and Systems Development (CSSD), to today's Assembly meeting to explain how Senate electronic elections might be carried out by CSSD.

iii. Discussion ensued:

(a) Electronic Voting: Newly elected BPC Chairman Tom Smitherman apologized on behalf of the BPC for the committee's lack of progress; the committee did not realize the urgency of the prescribed timelines. He noted that in Fall 2005, University information technology professionals made a strong plea not to hold electronic elections as early as April 2006; they did not project the systems would be operational. The BPC is committed to a safe and secure electronic voting system, and so looked instead to a April 2007 roll-out.

(b) Representation on Faculty Assembly:

(1) BPC Chairman Smitherman reported that the BPC is leaning toward a representation scheme that is related to the numbers of faculty. There is a great deal of committee sensitivity that an absolutely representational system would not be optimal for the Senate. Currently, it takes 25 times more faculty members to get a representative to the Senate in the School of Medicine, than in the School of Arts and Sciences. Smitherman observed that this disproportion is striking, and not entirely democratic. The BPC is attempting to find a scheme they are comfortable with.

(2) Michael Pinsky and Ted Rice published Proposal B in the February 2006 *University Times*. Rice also mailed faculty a letter asking for feedback. Vice President Pinsky noted that Proposal B is a compromise designed to increase the number of faculty representatives in large units, so that there would be greater representation from those units without taking away representatives from the other units.

(3) According to Smitherman, the BPC is more inclined to endorse a scheme that is closer to Proposal B, than Proposal A. The BPC hopes to formulate a proposal that is simpler and easier to understand than Proposal B. Smitherman suggested that the BPC consider a simpler formula based upon schools, and not units. Unit based representation seemed arbitrary and/or redundant to some BPC members, as most faculty members operate within a school. Smitherman recommended setting a certain floor for, minimum representation, regardless of school size. As a school grows, members would be added. In a relative proportional system, the numbers of faculty needed to justify an additional representative would increase incrementally, but not to the extent that the representational formula for a large school would overwhelm the Senate membership. As a school changed size, there could be an automatic annual adjustment in the number of representatives to the Senate.

(4) Professor Munro does not see proportional (vs. incremental) representation as an important issue. The Senate is not a legislative body, and a large part of the role of the Senate is in information transmission. He believes the numbers of representatives assigned to a particular constituency should be adjusted each year.

(5) Professor Muenzer observed that there can be contentious debates among and between social scientists, natural scientists, and humanists who reside in one school (SAS). Therefore, equal representation by units, below the level of the school is crucial. He noted that this scenario might

not need to apply to professional schools, though he needs more information how these operate with respect to their constitutive units. The issue is not so much one of advocacy, but of getting diverse points of view on the table for discussion. For example, a professor who studies 18<sup>th</sup> century German literature may have a different viewpoint on a Senate issue than an expert in intercultural communication. The role of the Senate is not to make legislation, but to enable members from various units to present different points of view. Thus, a purely representational system may not be desirable.

(6) Professor Balaban shared his perspectives, as a long-time member (and current Chair) of the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee. In many schools, University-wide service is an important criteria toward attaining tenure. He believes that faculty members in the School of Medicine (SOM) are effectively deprived of service related opportunities, placing young faculty members at a disadvantage. He contends that faculty in the SOM are disconnected from University governance, because they do not have an opportunity to participate. The discrepancy in representation between faculty in the School of Arts and Science, and the School of Medicine is obvious.

(7) Professor Wion believes it is important to recognize that the School of Medicine (SOM) is different from all other schools of the University in various and significant ways (e.g., budget is a separate part of the University; the University salary policy does not apply; there are huge numbers of persons in the SOM). Only the SOM faculty members in the basic sciences (approximately 60-80 faculty) have the kinds of responsibilities that are parallel to faculty responsibilities in the rest of the University. Most SOM faculty members have clinical appointments with duties divided between their responsibilities to the hospitals within which they serve, and the various ways they fulfill their other clinical functions. SOM faculty contributions to the actual academic functions of the University are typically more limited (roles and time spent). These differences should be kept in mind when considering proportional service.

(8) Smitherman stated that there are close to 1800 full-time faculty in the SOM. Following a realignment several years ago, full-time faculty members are divided into two segments: the tenured stream faculty (approximately 500); and the non-tenure stream faculty (approximately 1300). Smitherman explained that differences between the tenure stream faculty and the non-tenure stream faculty are far less than one might think. His perspective is gleaned from seven years of service on the SOM tenure and promotions committee (with four years as committee chair). Smitherman emphasizes that all SOM faculty members have teaching responsibilities, provide service for the institution, and are expected to engage in scholarly activities. What does tenure mean at the SOM? The answer could be the topic of a two hour seminar; however, the main large distinction is in the area of scholarly activities. A critical criterion is “what impact has someone made at the national and international level?” If this is at a very high level, the individual is apt to be in the tenure stream. He believes that hundreds of SOM faculty members spend far more hours teaching than some faculty on the lower campus. There is another track at the SOM, the clinical track—but persons in this track are

not considered full-time faculty. It is not clear if these individuals have been considered in the calculation (for Senate representation) in the recent past; Smitherman proposes that they not be. These physicians and surgeons typically work in their practices, or other similar environments, and contribute in meaningful ways to the University, though not as full-time faculty. They provide less teaching and service to the University than full-time faculty do. Therefore, the representation of “clinical faculty” to the University Senate is not an issue.

(9) Pinsky noted that Dr. Levine has made a concerted effort to differentiate between clinical and academic faculty.

(10) Balaban relies on the University Fact Book as a source of faculty statistics. He notes that the number of tenure and tenure stream faculty in the SOM is slightly higher than the total number in SAS. SOM tenure stream faculty members have much less opportunity to participate in the Senate than a tenure stream faculty member in SAS.

(11) Professor Close asked for clarification concerning the total numbers of full-time academic faculty in the SOM. Smitherman confirmed that there are 1800 *full-time* academic faculty, for which the prefix “clinical” is not used. Persons in the third track, are referred (as per their rank), as professor of clinical medicine; associate professor of clinical medicine, etc. The SOM no longer authorizes use of “tenured” or “non-tenured” for signature or letterhead titles. Within the SOM, there are faculty meetings, but no deliberative bodies. The absence of such bodies within the SOM was questioned by some Faculty Assembly members.

(12) Muenzer stated that providing faculty with an opportunity to provide University service is not a primary purpose of the University Senate. He believes that if that is a problem within the SOM, faculty should be able to provide service within the SOM.

(13) Balablan notes that the SOM service requirement is designed to encourage SOM faculty members to participate outside of their own units as citizens of the University. Currently, they perceive there is little opportunity to participate, and so they tend not to run for office. They feel disenfranchised by the system.

(14) Professor Frieze, as a point of information, disagreed, as many medical faculty members have run for election. Smitherman noted that while there are a number of SOM faculty (e.g., Pinsky; Balaban), that serve the University Senate admirably, it is difficult to recruit SOM faculty to serve, because they feel that the likelihood of election, given the current representational schema for Faculty Assembly, is small. Frieze observes this perspective is true also, for faculty in the “lower campus.”

(15) Smitherman noted that the SOM has approximately 2000 students (of these, 1000+ are at the post-graduate level). In response to another FA member’s comment that the SOM faculty-to-student ratio is therefore approximately 1:1, Pinsky observed that “the federal grant funding is a little higher than 1:1.”

(16) Linda Hartman wished to know the identity of the next largest group of faculty in the University, after the SOM? President Baker answered: FAS. Smitherman confirmed that last year, there were 668 faculty in SAS. Baker explained that SAS has 15 representatives, and the SOM and three other schools each have three representatives. If there are more than

100 faculty, schools get one additional representative.

(17) Pinsky said that the present structure was created 15 years ago to remedy a disequilibrium, with a solution similar to what is contained in Proposal B. He said that if the current status is successfully amended, the resultant solution will apply to other schools that might in the future, dramatically increase their faculty numbers. Pinsky does not want a drastic change that would overwhelm the smaller schools, and advocates for a proportional solution.

(18) Balaban wants to remain sensitive to a diversity of voices. Therefore, a straight proportional system is probably not appropriate. The current “great inequities” concerning the distribution of membership are “not appropriate.”

(19) Muenzer wondered what the argument would be, against considering a different schema for grouping representatives. He suggests that when the numbers of representatives in all of the Schools of the Health Sciences are added up, the total is one more faculty member than the total for SAS. He notes that the kinds of viewpoints that come out of the Schools of the Health Sciences have synergy with one another. (For example, the Graduate School of Public Health has physicians on the faculty, and the School of Medicine has biologists.) Therefore, to suggest a disproportion is not fair, given the large representation to the Senate from faculty in the health sciences area.

(20) Professor Greeno observed that she is not sure that saying “nobody wants to run for office” means there should be more seats. Gaining participation in the School of Social Work, where there are 20 faculty members, can be difficult as well. Greeno is appointed both in the SOM and in the School of Social Work, and finds that the appointment procedures are very different. Contingent upon approval of the department chair, one could essentially become appointed to the SOM if they are successful in funding their own salary. In contrast, to join the faculty in a hard money school, she was vetted through a year-long process. Greeno also related Stanford University practices when she was a post-doctoral fellow. Faculty members were uncertain that persons who were appointed chiefly because they obtained their own funding, should be granted representational faculty status. Indeed, these individuals were not given faculty titles because of the faculty governance issue. At issue: making ones academic way through grant funding, versus the more traditional academic vetting. She personally does not hold a strong view that one way is better, but observes from personal experience, that faculty members at soft money vs. hard money schools lead “very, very different lives,” though neither could be considered more scholarly, more academic, or more governance oriented. Greeno stressed that she is not labeling this as a problem, but as an observation.

(21) Muenzer drew attention to the fact that FAS has three different units. He suggests that faculty within the SOM might also be categorized into units that make sense. Baker responded that Proposal B does so.

(22) In closing the discussion, President Baker stated that the dialogue was useful. The issue is important to all, and should be resolved sometime in the near future. He personally hopes to keep two representatives from each of the smallest units, with some sort of

adjustment for larger schools. He suggests that Faculty Assembly members e-mail further comments to him, and/or to Tom Smitherman. (23) Vice President Pinsky noted that he too spent time at Stanford University. With regards to the different schools, he declared: “we are a university, and a university has diverse faculty, diverse educational experiences, diverse research experience and diverse community experiences.” “This is all part of what makes us whole.” If we categorize faculty as to whether they primarily serve in the classroom or in the laboratory, “we will be truncating the strengths of our university” instead of creating unity through that diversity. He hopes that there can be diversity in the determination of academic merit across departments, divisions and schools. The capacity to manage and leverage this diversity makes our University a unique and powerful entity in which many different types of academics can find a home. He embraces this diversity as “one of the pluses,” not as a problem.

4. Jinx Walton, the Director of Computing, Services and Systems Development (CSSD) was invited to discuss how electronic elections might work.
  - a. The voting application is already developed. It has been used by the Student Government Board, the College of General Studies (CGS) and for election of the Homecoming Queen and King. It can be modified for new applications.
  - b. The process works as follows. The electronic ballots are developed, and accessed through the university portal (my.pitt.edu). A faculty member would log-on through the portal (authenticating via the user name and password), and would be presented with the appropriate ballot. Upon completion of the ballot form, there is an opportunity to review the ballot and change selections. After the ballot is submitted, the voter receives an e-mail notification that the ballot has been successfully recorded. That information (encrypted) is moved to a data base (behind a firewall), and the results tallied. The system allows each faculty member to vote only one time. Only two data base administrators have access to the data base. Access to the database is logged. The network operations center monitors both the portal and the database. While there is no way to review, post-hoc, that a submitted vote was accurately recorded, CSSD performs rigorous pre-election testing.
  - c. The use of electronic voting increased the voting turn-out for the Student Government Board and Homecoming Elections, but not for the CGS election.
  - d. Walton clarified that the University of Pittsburgh Central Directory contains the eligible usernames and passwords.
  - e. Smitherman reported that the BPC has two concerns about the use of electronic voting for Senate elections. The first relates to an absence of a receipt. Walton said that a voter can print-out their choices, though there is no way to audit, on a transaction tape, that the votes were successfully recorded. Again, each election will be preceded by rigorous testing. Walton said that it is possible to set-up the system to trace individual votes—though this would be lengthy, and work against efforts to ensure the anonymity of voters’ choices. The second BPC concern is whether SOM faculty members uniformly know the passwords and usernames for their University of Pittsburgh e-mail accounts, and regularly use these accounts. Walton replied that Dr. Kantor has been working on this issue, with CSSD assisting. The SOM has told her that 70% of their faculty are either using their University of Pittsburgh e-mail or have their e-mail forwarded to their preferred e-mail account. Passwords can be changed via Dr. Kantor’s office. CSSD does not send user names and passwords via e-mails because of security issues. Vice President Pinsky stated that the SOM is attempting to have 100% of faculty know or use their University passwords by the end of 2006. Vice President Pinsky wondered if electronic voting could occur on a web site that is separate from

the *my.pitt.edu* portal and, if voters don't recall how to log-in, whether a temporary password could be sent to their e-mail. Walton pointed-out that would require an entirely new development effort.

- f. Munro suggested that if electronic voting is approved, at the time of the election, faculty could receive a mailed letter that contains voting instructions; the envelope should look like the one previously used for Senate elections. He also suggested that voters consult their individual units if they need to obtain their passwords (vs. receive passwords by mail). President Baker concurred. Another suggestion would be for SOM faculty to be able to use their UPMC user names and passwords to achieve authentication. Walton did not know if UPMC would allow this. Additionally, the process would necessitate a new development.
- g. Walton said that faculty members in the Central Directory would use their primary user accounts to vote, not user names associated with sponsored accounts.
- h. A suggestion was made to offer both electronic and paper ballots for the first year. Others said that transition is not needed.

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

a. Election of Faculty to Serve on the University Review Board (URB).

- i. Faculty Assembly has the responsibility to nominate and elect five faculty members to serve on the University Review Board (URB) for a 2 year term of service. (Four of the five current members have agreed to be nominated for another two year term: Jim Craft, School of Business; Irene Frieze, Psychology Department; Marah Gubar, English Department and Ann M. Mitchell, School of Nursing.
- ii. Faculty Assembly needs to nominate one more faculty member to serve on this board. President Baker noted that the URB hears appeals in academic integrity hearings, and thus serves a very important function. He asked for a volunteer for nomination to this Board.
- iii. There were no active cases last year. John Slimick volunteered to serve.
- iv. The process for nomination to Faculty Assembly and Senate Committees was clarified, and is broad-based. The Senate issues an invitation to all eligible faculty to self-nominate for Senate office, Senate committees and representation on entities to which the Senate makes nominations. Chairs of Senate committees are also asked to recommend members. Elected representatives to the Senate Committee on Elections also seek and invite candidates, and that committee makes the actual nominations. Pro-tem committee members are also added to committees. Senate appointments to some University and Board of Trustees committees are made by the Executive Committee with the consent of the nominee.
- v. Frieze offered to step-back from the position if another member wished to serve.
- vi. President Baker called for additional nominations. There were none.
- vii. Jim Craft, Irene Frieze Marah Gubar, Ann M. Mitchell, and John Slimick, were unanimously approved to serve as the Senate nominees to the University Review Board (URB).

6. Unfinished Business and New Business.

- a. Electronic Elections: discussed during the President's report.
- b. Representation on Faculty Assembly: discussed during the President's report.

7. Announcements: The Fall Plenary Session will be held Thursday, Oct. 19, 2006, from 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm in the Assembly Room, William Pitt Union. The topic is "Fostering Mentoring for Sustaining

Organizational Vitality.” President Baker encourages all to attend, as well as to invite your colleagues to attend.

8. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by President Baker at 4:15 pm

Respectfully submitted,  
*Ellen Cohn,*  
Secretary

Members attending:

Baker, Balaban, Bergen, Carlin, Cassaro, Close, Cohn, Flynn, Frieze, Greeno, Hall, Hampton, Hartman, Kaufmann, Manfredi, McKinney, Molinaro, Muenzer, Munro, Pike, Pinsky, Ross, Sciote, Slimick, Smitherman, Sussman, Wion, Withiam

Others attending:

Bircher, Blair, Brendel, Fedele, Hart, Klinzing, Walton