

**University of Pittsburgh
Faculty Assembly Meeting
2700 Posvar Hall
Minutes of November 28, 2006**

1. Call to Order: President John Baker called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
2. Approval of Faculty Minutes of October 3, 2006: Approved without change.
3. Introduction of Items of New Business: None
4. Report of the President, Professor John J. Baker
 - a. The Senate's University Press Committee elected a new chair, Kathleen DeWalt, a faculty member from the Anthropology Department.
 - b. Update on the Spring 2007, Plenary Session.
 - i. The Spring, 2007, Plenary Session will be held Wednesday, March 28, 2007, from 2:00 pm-5:00 pm in the Assembly Room, William Pitt Student Union. The topic will be balancing public and private interests in science. Senate President John Baker and Dr. Herbert Needleman will co-chair the session. Dr. Needleman, a professor in the School of Medicine and former chair of the Senate's Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, has done much of the planning work.
 - ii. Two renowned experts will make presentations: Dr. Sheldon Krinsky and Dr. Cathy DeAngelis.
 - a) Dr. Sheldon Krinsky is a Professor of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University. He is the author of six books and over 100 essay and reviews. His most recent book (2003) is: "Science in the Private Interest: Has the Lure of Profits Corrupted Biomedical Research?" Ralph Nader authored the book's Forward section.
 - b) Dr. Cathy DeAngelis is the editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, a University of Pittsburgh alumnus and a member of the University's Board of Trustees.
 - c. Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee for the Promotion of Gender Equity.
 - i. The American Association of University Professors recently released a report on faculty gender equity at U.S. universities. The report was featured in the November 9, 2006 *University Times*.
 - ii. The University Senate's Executive Committee believes that both the Senate and Pitt's administration should continue to promote gender equity at the University of Pittsburgh. Since this issue crosses the interests of more than one standing Senate committee, the Executive Committee decided to form an *ad hoc* committee to promote gender equity at Pitt. The committee is charged to work with Pitt's administration to promote gender equity as it relates to four equity indicators (full-time faculty status, tenure status, full professor status and average salary) described in the AAUP report.
 - iii. President Baker has asked immediate Past Senate President Irene Frieze to chair the committee, and she has accepted. He noted that Professor Frieze has a proven record of working with Pitt's administration on gender equity, and he has great confidence that she will be able to do so again.

iv. Any faculty member interested in serving on this committee should contact Dr. Frieze. President Baker stated that both men and women are welcome to serve on the committee. Indeed, “there is a tendency to think that gender equity is concerned only with women’s issues, because women are more likely than men to be affected by inequities, but equity applies to all faculty. If we promote gender equity, we also promote equity for everyone, and that is my goal in forming this ad hoc committee.”

v. Irene will provide more information including a written mission statement) about the ad hoc committee at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.

5. Unfinished Business and New Business: School of Medicine Faculty Status. Dr. Stephen Kanter, Vice Dean of the Medical School, was invited by Drs. Baker, Smitherman, and Pinsky, to provide information about the numbers of regular and volunteer faculty members in the School of Medicine (SOM), as well as information on the distinctions between the two groups.

a. Regular, Full-time Faculty: There are currently 1948 regular, full-time faculty members in the SOM. Of these:

i. 1748 hold primary appointments in clinical departments.

ii. 200 hold appointments in basic science departments.

iii. 330 of the 1948 faculty members are tenured; 240-250 are in the tenure stream. The remainder are non-tenure stream faculty.

b. Part-time Faculty Members: There are approximately 65 part-time faculty members: two-thirds are female. Part-time faculty members are eligible to serve on SOM committees. They function more like full-time faculty; some had previously held full-time appointments

c. Volunteer Faculty: There are 1795 members of the “volunteer faculty.” Typically, these individuals have titles with the “clinical” or “adjunct” prefix.

i. 1150 faculty have “clinical prefix” titles and are volunteers by traditional criteria. They are not paid by either the University or UPMC, but they do contribute to the teaching mission (and in some cases, to the research mission) of the School of Medicine.

ii. 402 faculty have “clinical prefix” titles and are paid by University of Pittsburgh Physicians (UPP). The individuals are primarily engaged in clinical work. By SOM guidelines, they generally spend greater than or equal to 90 per cent of their effort in clinical practice.

iii. In contrast to the above, if an individual devotes greater than or equal to 20% of his or her effort to research and teaching, she or he would be eligible for a regular faculty appointment (i.e., without the “clinical” prefix).

d. Students in the SOM

i. There are 550-600 medical students. The SOM admits 146 new students each year, along with two students from the oral-maxillofacial program.

ii. There are 300 graduate students.

iii. There are 1300 residents and clinical fellows.

iv. There are 500-550 post-doctoral fellows.

e. SOM Faculty Governance

i. In the SOM, both regular full-time faculty, and part-time faculty, have voting privileges.

ii. If major curricular changes were proposed, the entire SOM faculty would be asked to vote. (John Close observed that a similar model exists in the School of Dental Medicine; only major changes would come before the entire faculty.)

iii. Kanter described a “grass roots” approach to the SOM curriculum. The following groups are responsible for ongoing curricular developments:

- a) The SOM Curriculum committee consists of 20-25 faculty members and elected student members.
 - b) Every course module has a course director and an associated committee.
 - c) Courses are grouped together into “blocks.” (One block, for example, contains courses that deal with doctor-patient relationship, humanism, and communication.) Each block has a coordinator, to ensure that courses work well together.
 - d) The SOM is a teaching intensive institution. Dr. Kanter estimates that 500-700 faculty interact with the first and second year medical students. Some lecturers interact with the entire class; some faculty facilitate PBL groups of 9-20 students; and some engage in intensive 1:1 teaching.
 - f. Faculty Funding Streams. Adam Shear asked for clarification concerning the funding streams for the various faculty groups. Vice Dean Kanter explained that the funding sources vary for different faculty members, and may periodically shift for individual faculty members, depending upon their activities. Senate Vice President Pinsky noted that many faculty members receive their salary in two paychecks: one from the University of Pittsburgh, and one from UPMC.
 - g. SOM Tenure. Adam Shear asked what tenure means in the SOM, and if/how that might differ from other schools in the University.
 - i. Thomas Smitherman observes achieving tenure in the SOM has become increasingly difficult. The following factors are factored into tenure decisions: the *originality, quality, creativity, and impact* of the faculty member’s research upon their field.
 - ii. A tenured faculty member in the SOM does not receive an annual contract letter; they have an assumed appointment. They are eligible for emeritus status if they follow the University guidelines on all criteria. Tenure equates to prestige.
 - iii. Paul Munro observed that on lower campus, there was an “up and out” policy for individuals who do not achieve tenure. Vice Dean Kanter said the “up and out” policy is not required in SOM; each case is considered individually.
6. Reports by and Announcements of Special and Standing Committees of the Senate.
- a. Anti-Discriminatory Policies Committee Award Announcement, Professor Kathleen Blee, Committee Secretary, announced the “Shore-Tobias Award for Action Against Discrimination.” The committee will cast a wide net for nominations: students, staff, faculty, and organizations are eligible. The Committee will accept both nominations and self-nominations. Nominations should be sent to the Senate Office.
 - b. Bylaws and Procedures Committee (BPC) Update – Electronic Elections,
 - i. Dr. Thomas Smitherman, Chair, submitted the attached **Report of the Senate Committee on Bylaws and Procedures to the Faculty Senate on the Question of Electronic Balloting for Election of Officers of the University Senate and Representatives of the Faculty Assembly** (see Addendum I) and summarized the content. The BCP determined that electronic balloting would be reasonably accurate, save time for the Senate Office staff, and be adequately secure and confidential.
 - ii. The BPC recommended that the University Senate strongly encourage the faculty and administration of the SOM to make a major effort to assure the ability of every faculty member to vote electronically. Dr. Kanter’s office is making such an effort, instructing faculty who forgot their passwords how to establish new ones.
 - iii. Dr. Smitherman made the following motion:

MOTION: BP Committee recommends to the University Senate that electronic balloting replace the currently used mailed paper ballot system. We recommend that the Bylaws be modified, as follows, to allow and facilitate this change:

Article V, Section 7.

Replace existing paragraph (3) with the following: “The ballot for Senate Officers shall be made available to all members of the University Senate electronically, while the ballot for Faculty Assembly members from each unit shall be made available electronically to all members of the University Senate in that unit. All ballots shall be accompanied by the background and personal statements provided for above, a listing of members of the Faculty Assembly whose terms do not expire, and instructions for completing the electronic ballot.”

Replace existing paragraph (4) with the following wording:

“Ballots must be authenticated using a secure system for faculty identification. The ballot must be submitted not later than May 1.

Following discussion, the motion carried: 31 in favor; 2 opposed; 0 abstained.

iv. The BPC was unable to determine if the motion would represent a minor or substantive change to the Bylaws.

v. Discussion ensued concerning the need for the electronic ballot to be accessible to persons with disabilities. John Close will bring this concern to the Senate’s Computer Usage Committee. That committee will be asked to report on this issue at a future Faculty Assembly meeting. If needed, faculty registered with the Disability Resources and Services office can seek assistance to complete the ballot (in an electronic or some other format). President Baker noted the complexity of the issues. After much discussion, President Baker summarized the intent of the Faculty Assembly as follows. The Senate electronic balloting process should ultimately be accessible to all faculty, (including faculty with disabilities), at the earliest possible date. If web-based accessibility for persons with disabilities cannot be achieved during the first electronic election, it will be acceptable and desirable for voters with disabilities to seek compensatory strategies to support voting, including those offered by the Disabilities Services Office.

vi. In the last election, approximately 23% of University faculty voted, (17-18% in the SOM). Munro suggested that the Senate track voting statistics in the 2007 election, with particular attention to SOM participation, given the possibility that some might not know the user names and passwords associated with their University of Pittsburgh e-mail accounts.

vii. Immediately prior to the start of electronic balloting, faculty will receive a mailing that is similar in outward appearance, to the envelope that had previously contained the paper election ballot. This mailing will direct faculty to the electronic voting site.

c. Community Relations Update.

i. Professor Tracy Soska, submitted the attached **Report of the University Senate Community Relations Committee, Community Engagement Subcommittee; Considerations and Recommendations for Community Service and Service-Learning at the University of Pittsburgh , November 28, 2006** (see Addendum II) and discussed the content. The document was generated by a committee that included representatives of multiple university constituencies. The report was shared with the Senate Tenure and Academic Freedom

Committee, and the Senate Educational Policy Committee; both committees provided helpful feedback, and favorable responses.

ii. The report is offered as guidance to academic disciplines, departments, and schools, on how service can be better connected to faculty research and teaching, and what makes for good service work. The Committee wanted to draw a strong distinction between academic public service work, and volunteerism that does not relate directly to curricular efforts and other academic pursuits. (The Committee though, did not mean to diminish the value of volunteerism that does not have a strong academic connection.)

iii. The report recommended that the University pursue the Carnegie Foundation's elective classification for Community Engagement. Soska regards this as an opportunity for the University of Pittsburgh to be fully recognized for the work that it does in the area of academic public service.

iv. Senate Vice President Pinsky congratulated the Community Relations Committee on the document, which was generated with engagement of representatives the University administration.

v. Carey Balaban, Chair of the Senate Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, reported that the TAFC strongly endorsed the report. He noted that the content will be potentially valuable when evaluating promotion dossiers. It will also serve as a positive cultural influence within our institution.

iv. John Close asked whether the report might have an impact on the current ("somewhat ambiguous") definition of faculty service, and if that definition might be amended in the University of Pittsburgh's Faculty Handbook. Andrew Blair, Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs, advised that "we don't lightly modify the Faculty Handbook." He suggested that many committees, including Senate committees, would need to consider the report, and further advisement needed. Soska explained that the Committee's intent was for these recommendations to proceed to the Provost's Office for consideration and noted with appreciation, that representatives of the Provost's Office had participated in the work of the subcommittee that had prepared the report.

v. Balaban described the strong "grass roots" support for the contents of this report, and observed that there currently exists enough leeway in the Faculty Handbook as it is now written, for academic disciplines, departments, and schools, to consider and apply the contents of the report. A strength of the document is that no further action would be required, other than reading the report, and acting according to the guidelines as individual units deem appropriate.

vi. John Slimick appreciated the report's stronger definition of service, and wondered how this will impact the regional campuses, as those entities do not have as many community-based researchers (*e.g.*, psychologists; sociologists, *etc.*)

vii. Soska assumes the committee report could (optionally) be applied throughout the University system. He believes the report's approach strengthens the opportunities that we have as an institution to provide public service, and might even serve to attract additional resources. He has discussed the report with some persons in the political system, and reports they are very interested in the concepts put forth. This type of community engagement, in terms of the institution "stepping forward," is highly regarded by state funding bodies, and might engender further support. GISPIA recently hosted a forum to consider the Brookings Institute's report that touted universities as key agents for community revitalization work.

vii. Jean Carr said she admires the report's detailed elaboration on how one might understand, talk about, and document "service." The report, by virtue of expanding the description of service activities, represents a "leap ahead." Carr likened this to the earlier conceptual transformations that expanded and enriched how we describe and evaluate university-based pedagogy.

viii. Lisa Brush observed that when service includes research (especially with human subjects), it is important for faculty to apply to the Institutional Review Board. This might increase the workload for the expedited/exempt IRB review committee.

ix. The committee identified three levels of service: 1.) service within the university; 2.) service to disciplines and professions; and 3.) service to the community. The report focused on the third level, as it was not well defined, and merited the attention of the committee. This does not change the importance of recognizing the other 2 levels of service, but to provide a further clarification of what is meant by service to the public – an area that needed further support and guidelines.

Motion: To accept the Report of the University Senate Community Relations Committee, Community Engagement Subcommittee; Considerations and Recommendations for Community Service and Service-Learning at the University of Pittsburgh.

The motion passed, unanimously.

d. Ad hoc Committee on Fitness for Life Update

Michael Pinsky, School of Medicine and Vice President of the University Senate provided an update. The Risk Assessment and Management sub-committee of the ad hoc Committee on Fitness for Life, recently provided a report to the Benefits & Welfare Committee, and will hold further discussions with that committee. The suggested Fitness for Life plan would be implemented by UPMC via an integrated, family-based program, in concert with beneficiaries' primary care physicians. The program should be cost-neutral to Pitt. Pinsky's goal is to achieve broad-based support for the plan before John Kozar presents it to the UPMC Health Plan.

e. Comments on the Fitness for Life proposal from the Benefits & Welfare Committee

i. Patricia Weiss, Chair reported that the Benefits and Welfare Committee (BWC) looks forward to carefully examining the report from the ad hoc Committee on Fitness for Life. Weiss commends the members of the ad hoc committee for their good citizenship and service, as well as their efforts toward consensus building. She views the proposal as promising, because as Pinsky noted, it is a wholistic proposal. This proposal "combines a whiz-bang technology element with extensive behavioral intervention."

ii. Weiss reported that the BWC has a good relationship with the office that handles the benefits functions at our University. Weiss is impressed with their leadership, and sense of the environment and what is possible.

iii. Weiss explained the basic criteria for considering such a proposal. The proposal can be forward-looking, but not (primarily) a research proposal, though she hopes valuable data would be gleaned from the effort. The program "can only be done with the welfare and benefit of the Pitt community as the main outcome," not research results *per se*.

iv. Weiss explained that it is important to recognize the historical timeline of the proposal. The proposal is "organic," a result of last year's "Fitness for Life" initiative, for which the University gave Pitt employees who underwent a blood test for lipids and a glucose screening test, a one month premium holiday.

Following that success, the BWC decided to consider the possibility of expanding the “Fitness for Life” initiative.

- v. The questions the BWC will be most concerned with relate to implementation.
 - a) Is the proposal medically sound? Medical personnel from the UPMC Health Plan will evaluate the medical merit of the proposal. Weiss observed that some of the published guidelines the proposal refers to are relatively new, and are outside of the protocols that some UPMC clinicians currently employ.
 - b) Is there universal access: for all campuses; for both working and retired persons (even those who reside out of the region? How might electron beam computer tomography (EBCT), a non-invasive procedure to identify coronary atherosclerosis, be implemented in a manner that is universally accessible?
 - c) What is the cost of the proposal? Will it be cost-neutral?
 - d) Does the necessary physical infrastructure for wellness and fitness exist to support the program? (e.g., the necessary physical locations for exercise, counseling and nutritional support, etc.) Can this network be assembled?
 - e) How will the required cultural changes be achieved for clinicians-- (especially the use of EBCT as a standard assessment tool for patients who are at intermediate risk level)?

Weiss looks forward to working with the subcommittee.

vi. Pinsky thanked Weiss for her response. He explained that he expects the program to evolve. The program intends to use existing programs that have not been previously networked. It is fortunate that *programs* for health benefits (e.g., stress reduction and relaxation; smoking cessation, etc) and *interfaces* with primary care physicians, already exist to a large degree in our healthcare system. They are not, however, integrated or interfaced with one other. The proposed program would provide an opportunity to create an integrative infrastructure.

vii. Pinsky views the biggest problem as the needed changes in culture.

viii. EBCT is a proven technology, and will be inexpensive at UPMC. An EBCT screening test conducted at UPMC (non-UPMC sites would be considerably more expensive) costed out well below a two-month supply of Lipitor. Pinsky estimates that 30-40% of patients who currently take Lipitor do not need the drug. Eliminating unnecessary Lipitor use would represent a significant cost savings. The ultimate goal is for Pitt faculty and staff and their families to be healthy, so that they can live a good life.

ix. Cohn asked whether the plan would apply to the regional campuses. Pinsky said that obtaining an inexpensive EBCT evaluation might present a challenge at a distance. Retirees who live at a distance would have access to internet-based resources (including an internet based healthcare coach), but not the physical infrastructure (e.g., exercise facilities.)

7. Announcements. Catherine Greeno asked to make an interim report from the Educational Policies Committee. The Committee has had two meetings with Lisa Brush, Pitt’s AAUP chapter president, on polices regarding part-time faculty. The committee proposed the formation of an ad hoc committee on part-time faculty to continue to study the issues raised by the AAUP regarding part-time faculty. Senate President Baker said that recommendation will be taken under consideration.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Cohn,

Secretary

Members attending:

Aaron, Baker, Balaban, Boston, Brush, J. Carr, Cassaro, Close, Cohn, Coley, Costantino, Deasy, Deitrick, Donegan, Flynn, Frieze, Greeno, Hall, Hansen, Hartman, Hughes, Lotze, Molinaro, Muenzer, Munro, Pike, Pinsky, Saunders, Shear, Slimick, Smitherman, Soska, Stoy, Weiss

Others attending:

Blair, Blee, Brendel, Fedele, Hart, Kanter, Lund

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES

I. Report of the Senate Committee on Bylaws and Procedures to the Faculty Senate on the Question of Electronic Balloting for Election of Officers of the University Senate and Representatives of the Faculty Assembly.

November 27, 2006

The Faculty Senate referred to the Committee on Bylaws and Procedures (hereafter called the BP Committee) in January, 2006, the question of a change, to electronic balloting, in the election process for officers of the University Senate and representatives of the Faculty Assembly as described in the University Senate bylaws, Article V, Section 7, Method of Holding University Senate Elections. This topic has been discussed at every meeting of the BP Committee and at a special meeting of the BP Committee and representatives of Computer Services and Systems Development of the University of Pittsburgh (hereafter called CSSD-UP), which was held on February 3, 2006. This topic has proved to be a complex and sometimes contentious one for us for a variety of reasons. The members of the BP Committee appreciate the patience of the University Senate in allowing the discussion and debate to proceed to the degree that was felt advisable by the Committee.

Questions arose in the University Senate about changing the method of election of officers (hereafter called officers) of the University Senate and representatives to the Faculty Assembly (hereafter called representatives) from the long-used system of mailed ballots with double envelopes to an electronic process. There were three particularly important factors leading to this discussion. The first is the extraordinary change in the life of faculty members of the University of Pittsburgh, parallel to that of the lives of American citizens in all walks of life, in the use of computer technology. The second is the highly successful use of electronic balloting at the University of Pittsburgh for several student elections. The third is the rapidly changing environment in the methods of voting at the state and federal level, especially following the concerns that arose following contested ballots in the state of Florida in the election of the President of the United States in 2004.

Members of the University Senate suggested that electronic balloting through the University of Pittsburgh computer system might be quicker, more efficient, and perhaps inclusive of more faculty than mailed balloting. The office of the University Senate was certain that electronic balloting, if successful, would be far quicker and more efficient for that office than mailed ballots. Those assertions have never been doubted by the members of the Committee on Bylaws and Procedures.

The most debated and contentious topics have been:

1. Security and secrecy of an electronic balloting process
2. Accuracy of an electronic balloting process
3. The potential for decreased balloting within the School of Medicine

The BP Committee has reviewed in detail with representatives from CSSD-UP the security of an electronic balloting process for the University Senate elections. We have been assured by CSSD-

UP that an essentially identical system to that used for various student elections in the recent past would guarantee similarly the security of the University Senate elections. Such a system currently requires logging onto the election process with the commonly used systems of an identification name and a secure password. Whether better systems of the future for the University of Pittsburgh might be developed and implemented remains speculative but currently available systems, e.g. finger-print security systems were noted and discussed by the BP Committee. CSSD-UP also noted that the system that has been used for various student elections has also proved to maintain a secret ballot. The members of the BP Committee discussed at length the potential for “hacking” into the University of Pittsburgh computer system to distort the balloting process. CSSD-UP maintains that the current security makes any such “hacking” very difficult and unlikely. The BP Committee also realizes that the rather low interest in any such “hacking” into the University Senate election process also further reduces security risks. Ultimately, the BP Committee has become persuaded that the currently available system for electronic balloting that has been established by CSSD-UP is adequately secure and adequately assures for secret ballots and is not substantially inferior to and may be superior to the mailed ballot system that is used now in regards to ballot security and secrecy.

The BP Committee has also reviewed in great detail the issues of accuracy of an electronic balloting process. Much of this debate followed and paralleled the national debate on the accuracy of electronic balloting at the state and federal level in the absence of a printed paper ballot for confirmation of the accuracy of the election results, especially in the face of a failure at some level of the electronic balloting process. CSSD-UP reviewed with us the results of recent student elections. They are convinced that there have been no errors in the balloting process for that purpose. While there can be some case made for developing printed ballots for confirmation, the current systems developed by CSSD-UP do not support such a function. Furthermore, with the current systems that are available at CSSD-UP, the printing of a paper ballot following electronic selection of candidates could not maintain secrecy of the ballot. Again, the BP Committee noted that the level of interest in “hacking” into the ballot collection and counting process would be very low, e.g. compared to state and federal elections, which would further improve the likelihood of accurate balloting. It was acknowledged that the overall accuracy of counting electronic ballots should not be inferior to counting the current paper ballots.

Finally, on both of the above topics, most of the members of the BP Committee have ongoing experiences in electronic balloting for a variety of academic societies, etc. that appear to be secret, highly secure and accurate

Overall, based upon our multiple experiences in responding to electronic mail versus standard mail, the BP Committee suspects that more ballots would be returned overall with electronic ballots compared to mailed ballots. Some members of the BP Committee have concerns, however, that the level of balloting within the School of Medicine (hereafter called SOM), which is already rather low, might decline further. A few words of explanation are required. With rare exception, there is little motivation for faculty members within the SOM to maintain an active computer account and a password that is known to them with the University of Pittsburgh computer system. In recent months, there has been a concerted effort to encourage faculty members within the SOM to revive their University of Pittsburgh accounts or, at the least, forward their email from their University of Pittsburgh mailbox to their most frequently used mailbox, often that of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (hereafter called UPMC). According to the Office of the Vice-Dean for Faculty Affairs, there are still a significant minority of faculty who have taken no action and that the most frequent action has been to direct their email from the University of Pittsburgh computer system to that of UPMC without maintaining a password that is known to them. Thus, absent a truly major effort within the faculty of the SOM,

the number of faculty in that school who vote in the University Senate elections may decline with electronic balloting. After much discussion, including discussions with the Vice-Dean for Faculty Affairs at the SOM, the BP Committee has decided that this is an issue that must be viewed as a “SOM issue” not a “University Senate issue”. The BP Committee recommends that the University Senate encourage the faculty and administration of the SOM to mount a major effort to assure that every faculty member within the SOM will have the opportunity to submit an electronic ballot.

Therefore, the BP Committee recommends to the University Senate that electronic balloting replace the currently used mailed paper ballot system. We recommend that the Bylaws be modified, as follows, to allow and facilitate this change:

Article V, section 7.

Replace existing paragraph (3) with the following:

- (3) The ballot for Senate Officers shall be made available to all members of the University Senate electronically, while the ballot for Faculty Assembly members from each unit shall be made available electronically to all members of the University Senate in that unit. All ballots shall be accompanied by the background and personal statements provided for above, a listing of members of the Faculty Assembly whose terms do not expire, and instructions for completing the electronic ballot.

Replace existing paragraph (4) with the following:

- (4) Ballots must be authenticated using a secure system for faculty identification. The ballot must be submitted not later than May 1.

Finally, the BP Committee recommends that the University Senate strongly encourage the faculty and administration of the SOM to make a major effort to assure the ability of every faculty member within the SOM to be able to vote electronically.

The BP Committee voted to approve this report and recommendation at its scheduled meeting on November 21, 2006 with 8 ayes and 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas C. Smitherman, Chairman

II. Report of the University Senate Community Relations Committee, Community Engagement Subcommittee; *Considerations and Recommendations for Community Service and Service-Learning at the University of Pittsburgh, November 28, 2006*

Introduction and Purpose

This ad hoc Community Engagement Subcommittee was appointed by the Community Relations Committee with endorsement from the University Senate in continuation of an ongoing dialogue in the University community stemming from two Senate plenary sessions focused on Community Service and Engagement, *The University in Civic Engagement: Service in Our University Mission* (2002) and *The Scholarship of Engagement* (2004). As recommended by the Senate, the Community Relations Committee sought to include faculty, student, and administration involvement in the subcommittee, as well as representation from the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee. This subcommittee met through the remainder of spring and summer and in the fall term reported to the Community Relations Committee, which forwarded this subcommittee's considerations and recommendations to Tenure and Academic Freedom and Education Policy Committees for review and input in October. After final Subcommittee discussion and with Community Relations Committee review November 14, 2006, this report is presented to the Faculty Assembly and Senate Council for consideration and acceptance.

The task of this committee was to review current University mission, policies, and guidelines and to consider national benchmarks and Carnegie Classification options on community engagement toward developing guidelines for better defining community/public service as it relates to teaching and research work of faculty and to the student learning experience at the University of Pittsburgh. While the final authority for defining and recognizing service rests within each academic unit, in empanelling this subcommittee, the Senate did seek the broader input of the academy toward providing useful guidelines to assist academic units in developing, implementing and assessing its teaching and research as relates to public/community service.

In its deliberation the subcommittee drew on documents, policies, and input from University administration, as well as faculty in various disciplines and professions. Subcommittee members were provided a range of benchmarking materials on community engagement, public service, and service-learning that drew from other universities, the Carnegie Foundation on the Advancement of Teaching, Campus Compact, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and other credible sources in the field, including peer-reviewed journals. (Some of these materials are included as Appendices to this report.) Monthly meetings of the full group were held as feasible, and a steering group worked between meetings to synthesize and recapitulate the discussions and recommendations of the subcommittee for review and acceptance by the larger subcommittee. The subcommittee appreciates this opportunity to support and recognize the importance of community engaged teaching and research at the University of Pittsburgh, as well as to continue this dialogue in the University community.

Considerations and Recommendations

The following are the major considerations and recommendations of this Community Engagement Subcommittee of the Senate Community Relations Committee:

Considerations

The University's mission statement explicitly addresses service and engagement when it states:
Make available to local communities and public agencies the expertise of the University in ways that are consistent with the primary teaching and research functions and contribute to social, intellectual, and economic development in the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world.

Service, at least for faculty at the University, is not well-defined within our institution. Our annual faculty review policy notes "...service activities such as membership on department of school committees, University committees, service to professional organizations, public service activities that relates to academic expertise."

This subcommittee agrees that service should encompass three dimensions:

- 1) Service to the Academy
- 2) Service to the Profession or Discipline
- 3) Service to Community (Public Service)

The Subcommittee felt the first two dimensions were well understood. It is in the "public service" dimension where this subcommittee is concerned that academic public service is distinguished from "volunteerism," which is an important expression of citizenship but not an academic extension. Service should generate knowledge, and this knowledge should be generalizable to ensure that public service is connected to our teaching and research missions.

The Subcommittee, with review and input from other Senate committees also noted that the term "community" should be understood to generally refer to external groups and organizations outside (local, regional, national, and global) of the University community with emphasis on geographic communities, as well as other sectors of interest for which disciplines may have specific relevance, e.g., the business community, schools and educational communities, the faith-based community, the African-American community, the foundation community.

Recommendations

In recognizing and rewarding public/community service, the following processes, principles and values should serve as guideline for assessing this work, at least at the University of Pittsburgh. Public/Community Service should:

- ***respond to community-identified needs and be co-created with the community;***
- ***have tangible, measurable outcomes that can be evaluated and documented through process assessment and products of research or outreach.***
- ***generate knowledge and that knowledge should be generalizable.***

In stressing community engagement and partnership, our Public/Community Service should also:

- ***articulate a process for entering into a service partnership that respects the assets, values, and dignity of the community;***
- ***build or enhance the capacity of the community or community partners;***
- ***be sustainable by the community and/or by future collaborations with the University;***
- ***educate faculty/students and the community partners through a process in which all are co-learners from the knowledge and expertise of one another.***

Considerations

Similarly, the Community Engagement Subcommittee recognizes and encourages faculty and, especially, student citizenship that includes co-curricular volunteer service and civic engagement activities as part of the living and learning experience at the University. However, connecting community or public service to the teaching mission, faculty role, and student classroom learning experience must, again, extend beyond volunteerism and significantly connect curriculum to service efforts. Service-Learning or Research Service-Learning connects Community Service with the teaching and research curriculum of a profession or discipline through course or project

work for academic credit. There is a growing focus on service-learning and the curricular aspects of community engagement, and our University should build on local and national efforts.

Recommendations

In addition to the previous guidelines for Community Service, Service-Learning or Research Service-Learning should:

- ***demonstrate co-learning among university and community partners that is sustainable in the field as well as in the classroom;***
- ***provide a record of what knowledge was co-generated; how the curriculum was applied in the field; and what learning was internalized.***

Service in teaching and learning may also incorporate *Research Service-Learning* to:

- ***enhance professional development and leadership of those engage in the learning;***
- ***advance research as an integral component of the service provided;***
- ***promote faculty and student scholarship within the discipline or profession, as well as across disciplines and professions.***

Considerations

As the University considers stronger guidelines on faculty public/community service and on service-learning or research service-learning, it should also consider the growing recognition and status accorded community engagement in higher education. In addition to community engagement guidelines in accreditation standards for many disciplines, several national higher education associations have endorsed strong statements on civic or community engagement. Most notably among these is the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which has recently added a new “Community Engagement” option among its classification standards. Many highly regarded research universities are now seeking to be recognized under this new “elective” classification as an opportunity to further distinguish their institution for academic excellence in community engagement and service-learning. Once again, the U.S. News and World Reports, has made community engagement and service-learning another area for ranking institutional excellence in the competitive higher education marketplace.

Our University has already distinguished itself as an engaged university through its Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC), hosting a national COPC conference, bringing national leaders on community engagement to our Senate plenary sessions and other campus forums, and faculty publications in the literature of civic engagement. More recently, the University of Pittsburgh was recognized among the twenty-five higher education institutions ranked as “Saviors of Our Cities” by Evan Dobbelle of the New England Board of Education for its community and economic impact. The perception of the University of Pittsburgh is an “engaged” institution that has had significant community and economic impact in its region and local communities. This growing recognition of our University’s work affords an opportunity to make community service and service-learning centers of excellence within our institution.

Recommendations

Given our University’s emergence and recognition as an “engaged” institution, this subcommittee further recommends:

- ***the University pursue the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification for “Community Engagement” as best fits the work of this institution in terms of its outreach and curricular efforts..***

APPENDICES

- I Community Engagement Subcommittee membership**
- II Carnegie Foundation: Community Engagement Elective Classification**
- III Benchmarking University Engagement Conference – May 23-24, 2005**
Keynote: Benchmarking and Assessing Community Engagement
Amy Driscoll, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching
- IV Campus Compact – Presidents’ Declaration of Civic Engagement 1996**

I Members of the Community Engagement Subcommittee:

Tracy M. Soska, Chair (Social Work)
Robert Goodman (Public Health)
Linda Hartman (University Library System & Co-chair – Community Relations Committee)
Maureen Porter (Education)
Helen Petracchi (Social Work & representing Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee)
Eric Hartman (GSPIA Student)
Administration
Patricia Beeson (Vice Provost)
G. Reynolds Clark (Vice Chancellor)
John Wilds (Assistant Vice Chancellor)
With Additional Input:
Kathy Humphrey (Dean of Students and Vice Provost)
Michael Pinsky (Vice President, University Senate)

II. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

Community Engagement Elective Classification

As of February 28th, 2006 institutions that are engaged with community can apply for a new elective classification for Community Engagement. Elective classifications rely on voluntary application and documentation by institutions. They provide another way for institutions to describe their identity and commitments with a public and nationally recognized classification.

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

Application Process

The application process consists of two steps: first, a letter of intent; and second, responses to a comprehensive documentation framework. The first step requires a brief letter from the institution's president or chief executive indicating a commitment to participate in the documentation process in 2006. Letters should be sent to:

Amy Driscoll, Associate Senior Scholar
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
51 Vista Lane
Stanford, CA 94305

The deadline for letters of intent is April 30, 2006.

Once participation has been approved, the second step involves documentation using a framework of questions probing both indicators and categories of community engagement. Those questions will initiate an internal process of documentation for the institution and will involve self-assessment, data gathering, and reporting.

Documentation Process

The first stage of the documentation process requires the institution to describe a set of entry or foundational indicators, *Institutional Identity and Culture* and *Institutional Commitment*. Each indicator must be demonstrated by both required and optional documentation examples and descriptions. For example, one requirement of *Institutional Identity and Culture* for Community Engagement is that “the institution indicates that community engagement is a priority in its mission.” When institutions meet the documentation requirements of the Foundational Indicators, the first stage is complete. The institution may proceed to the second stage. Institutions that are unable to meet the requirements of the first stage are not encouraged to proceed to the second stage.

The second stage of the documentation process is the provision of data, examples, and descriptions of focused engagement activities in the categories of *Curricular Engagement* and *Outreach and Partnerships*.

Curricular Engagement describes teaching, learning, and scholarship which engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance the well-being of the community, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

Outreach and Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use benefiting both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, discovery, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, economic development, capacity building, etc.).

Institutions will select the appropriate category with which to describe the campus engagement with community, or will decide to demonstrate both categories, as comprehensive community engagement. The deadline for this second stage of documentation is September 1, 2006. The documentation process is extensive and substantive, focused on significant qualities, activities, and institutional provisions that ensure an institutionalized approach to community engagement.

Review Process

Participation in the documentation process for the community engagement classification is limited in 2006 in order to assure thorough reviews, and to provide opportunity to revise the framework as part of the implementation process. A national advisory panel has been identified to support the review process for the first year.

The new elective classification for institutions engaged with community is an exciting move in Carnegie’s work to extend and refine the classification of colleges and universities. The classification represents a significant affirmation of the importance of community engagement in the agenda of higher education.

Questions

Questions about the community engagement classification can be sent to driscoll@carnegiefoundation.org.

III BENCHMARKING UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT CONFERENCE, MAY 23-24, 2005

Keynote Address: Amy Driscoll, Carnegie Foundation

Benchmarking and Assessing Community Engagement

Benchmarking

- Criteria for assessing results compared to empirically or nationally developed standards (Allen, 2004)
- A process of identifying and learning from models that are recognized as outstanding (Palomba & Banta, 1999)
- A perspective that compares and adds an external viewpoint (Suskie, 2004)

Elective Classification for Community Engagement

An elective classification is one that relies on voluntary participation by institutions, and does not include the full universe of institutions.

The term, community engagement, is proposed because it offers the widest coverage, the broadest conception of interactions with community, and promotes inclusiveness in the classification.

Definition

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/ state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. Community Engagement achieves the following:

- Enhanced teaching and learning of relevant curriculum
- Expanded research and scholarship
- Preparation of engaged citizens
- Response to societal issues
- Contributions to the public good
- Strengthened civic responsibility

List of Participating Campuses: Carnegie Pilot Study

- Portland State University
- Northern Kentucky University
- LaGuardia Community College
- Kapi'olani Community College
- Santa Clara University
- University of Denver
- Indiana University Purdue
- University at Indianapolis
- California State University
- Sacramento
- Elon University
- Spelman College
- University of Minnesota
- University of
- Pennsylvania
- Tusculum College
- Michigan State University

Intentions of Classification of Community Engagement

- Affirmation and documentation of the diversity of campuses and their approaches to community engagement
- Indicators that recognize the “good work” that has been done while encouraging ongoing development toward the ideals of community
- Engagement
- Encouragement of inquiry and learning in the process of documentation
- Instrumentation and documentation that provide useful information for institutions
- Documentation that describes the scope of institutional engagement
- A framework that builds on current work of other organizations for a shared base of measurement or documentation
- A documentation process that is practical and makes use of existing data

Foundational Indicator

- Institutional Identity
- Institutional Commitment

Indicator: Institutional Identity - Documentation Examples:

- missions (institutional, departmental)
- marketing materials (brochures, etc.)
- website
- campus core values and norms
- community perceptions
- alumni descriptions
- mentoring of other campuses
- faculty scholarship
- tradition/history
- celebrations, recognitions, events

Indicator: Institutional Commitment - Documentation Examples:

- executive leadership
- strategic plan
- Definition of and plan for engagement
- budgetary allocations (internal/external)
- infrastructure (Centers, Offices, etc.)
- community voice in planning
- search/recruitment priorities
- professional development support
- assessment/recording mechanisms
- student learning outcomes
- graduation requirements
- transcript notations of student engagement
- development case statements (fundraising)

Categories of Community Engagement

- Curricular Engagement
- Continuing Education, Public Information, And Shared Resources
- Collaborations

IV CAMPUS COMPACT - Presidents' Statement of Principles*

In their support of public and community service, Campus Compact member presidents are joined together in their commitment to the development of personal and social responsibility as integral to the educational mission of their campuses. In the spring of 1996, they endorsed the following principles:

1. Campus Compact presidents strongly advocate the participation of students, faculty, staff, and higher education institutions in public and community service. Such service may range from individual acts of student volunteerism to institution-wide efforts to improve the social and economic well-being of America's communities.
2. Campus Compact presidents share a resolute commitment to speak out on issues of public concern and to articulate ideas that contribute to the common good of American and global society. Campus Compact member presidents strive to influence the quality of civic discourse and to ensure that key issues of civic concern are fairly discussed in impartial forums.
3. Campus Compact presidents support initiatives that promote productive collaborations between colleges and communities. Such initiatives seek to create opportunities for renewed civic and community life, improved educational and economic opportunity, expanded democratic participation by citizens and the application of the intellectual and material resources of higher education to help address the challenges that confront communities.
4. Campus presidents support the development of opportunities that increase student, faculty, staff and alumni involvement in citizenship-building service activities. Community and public service, especially when linked to the core educational mission of the college and university, are powerful vehicles for developing citizenship skills — including participation in the political process — and the spirit of civic engagement required for life in a democratic civil society.
5. Campus Compact presidents support service learning because it enables students and faculty to integrate academic study with service through responsible and reflective involvement in the life of the community.

**Presidents' Declaration of Civic Engagement (1996)*