

University of Pittsburgh
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Minutes of October 5, 2005

1. President Frieze called the meeting to order at 3:03.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the September 6, 2005 Faculty Assembly meeting without changes.
3. Introduction of items of new business: none.
4. Unfinished Business: Professor Christopher Ryan, Director of the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board Office (IRB) gave an overview presentation reflecting the changes for people doing research on human subjects.
 - a. Mission. The IRB's mission to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and to make sure that investigators are compliant with the ethical standards and regulations remains. In addition, the office has a service function to support investigators in 1) developing ethical research studies in compliance and 2) communicating study information accurately to subjects during the informed consent process. Dr. Ryan recommended that to help the office help us, we come to them early to smooth the process. If problems do arise, we should contact Christopher Ryan directly by sending email.
 - b. Jurisdiction. The IRB has jurisdiction over all research involving human subjects 1) conducted at the University of Pittsburgh, its regional campuses, and UPMC and its affiliated hospitals and/or 2) conducted by students, faculty or staff associated with these institutions. It also has jurisdiction over research conducted by Pitt employees who are Principal Investigators or Co-Investigators at other institutions. In the latter case, the research protocol and consent must be reviewed by the Pitt IRB.
 - c. Consent for Data collection from non Pitt-affiliated sites. A reminder was given that written permission to collect data at non Pitt-affiliated sites must be included in the IRB submission.
 - d. Required Certifications required for IRB submission. Completion of two certification modules is required of all investigators prior to IRB submission. It is also required of all faculty mentors. The two modules are: 1) research integrity, and 2) human subjects research. With regard to the latter, there is a choice of modules focusing on biomedical research or Social/Behavioral Research. The modules can be found on the following website: <http://rpf.health.Pitt.edu/rpf/index.cfm>. Professor Pinsky asked whether outsiders have to take our modules. Dr. Ryan responded that other programs in the U.S. will be accepted; International programs, however, are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Nancy Sussman asked about the expiration of the certification. Dr. Ryan said that the certifications are currently good forever, but a 3-year cycle will be put into place. Professor Constantine asked whether researchers who do not work directly with subjects (e.g. statisticians) need to take the modules. Dr. Ryan said that if research is human subjects (that is, has an IRB protocol), then all those listed as investigators or Co-Investigators on the IRB cover sheet are required to complete the modules. John Close asked for clarification of what constitutes a "faculty mentor." For example, is faculty mentor synonymous with thesis and dissertation committee chair? Dr. Ryan said the faculty mentor is the person who is listed as responsible on the IRB

protocol. These people used to be listed as co-investigators. Asked by Glenn Nelson who is notified and how timely after approval, Dr. Ryan said that the PI is informed immediately via email PDF file.

- e. IRB oversight is required when an activity is considered to be *research* defined as “A systematic investigation...designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”
- f. Three types of Review, exempt, expedited, and full-board were reviewed.
 - i. Exempt reviews include surveys and interviews. There is no signed consent required. Rather, an informational script is used. The approval is good for 3 years. Scientific review by a prior committee is not required. Subjects must be at least 18 years old. The research must involve normal educational practices and take place in normal educational settings. Included is research on existing data without identifiers (referred to as “no human subjects involvement.”). To be classified in this way, the research must involve no interventions or interactions with “subjects” and include no identifiable private information. Dr. Pinsky asked about “de-identified” data. This data would be stripped of non medical record information such as name, social security number, phone number and address. Information about sex, age, or birth date can be included.
 - ii. Expedited reviews must have prior scientific review, written consent must be obtained from subjects, and there must be minimal risk. Typical categories include studies of individual or group characteristics or behaviors.
- g. IRB Structure was described with regard to the make-up of the Full Board Committee and the review teams for exempt/expedited reviews. It was emphasized as a big operation, supported in the provost’s office by Randy Juhl.
- h. Educational Outreach. Dr. Ryan reiterated that they are happy to provide presentations or consultations to departments, divisions, or research groups. They do email consults (not phone calls), and are happy to pre-review IRB protocols.
- i. IRB Website. www.irb.Pitt.edu
- j. Questions.
 - i. Nick Bircher asked what the appeal process entails. Dr. Ryan said that federal regulations do not provide an appeal process except pediatric research that the local IRB cannot approve. You do have the right to make a presentation to the board. Dr. Ryan suggested that investigators come to talk with the IRB to identify persons to serve as consultants to present issues to the committee and better describe the study and its risks. He said they are happy to work around concerns, but do not have power to overturn decision made by the committee. Ted Rice pointed out that the full board review wouldn’t have that type of problem because it comes to a vote. Exempt reviews, however, go through only one reviewer.
 - ii. John Close raised a question about the prior review process. In particular, in the school of Dentistry a study is first reviewed by the thesis committee, then by the school’s scientific review committee. Dr.

Close wondered, what if they disagree? Dr. Riley said that historically they have accepted the thesis review committee as the scientific review.

- iii. Paul Munro. When you submit an IRB, who has to be listed as co-investigator? For example, on a student project, must the student's advisor be listed? Person teaching the course? Dr. Ryan said that it doesn't have to be a one-to-one correspondence between who is listed and manuscript authors. Need description of research and how subjects are recruited. New electronic submission will be question/answer format with branches that will facilitate answering these questions.

5. Report of the Senate President, Irene Frieze.

a. General Items.

i. Senate Council Meeting September 12.

1. Alternatives to Semester at Sea were reported by Provost Maher. President Frieze asked the assembly if they would like William Brustein to come to a future Assembly meeting to talk about planned alternatives as he is currently collecting comments about the plans for alternatives. The Assembly's response indicated no interest at this time. Dr. Pinsky asked how far advanced the new program is. Dr. Blair responded that it would not start in Fall '06. He also indicated that material about it is on the UCIS website. The new program will involve several sites around the world (on 4 different continents) in which small groups of students would spend 3-4 weeks.
 2. Update on the Schenley Park Plaza by Vice Chancellor Renny Clark. His report indicated that the work is ahead of schedule and that we can expect 2-way traffic around the park in November.
 3. President Frieze noted that both of these items received good coverage in the September 15 issue of the *University Times*.
- ii. Email communication. President Frieze and Vice President Pinsky will be meeting with Jinx Walton (Director of Computing Services and Systems Development) to discuss the possibility of sending mass emails (rather than paper communication) to faculty.
 - iii. Faculty appointments to board of trustees committees. Recommendations made in August by the senate officers for appointments to the committees were recently accepted by the Chancellor (list available for distribution). President Frieze extended an invitation to members of assembly to make nominations (of themselves or others) for next year.
 - iv. Regional Faculty Senate Presidents will be giving a brief report about their campus issues at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly in the spring rather than the Fall. The change was made due to scheduling problems.
 - v. Senate WebPages are difficult to find. We are working with the Provost's Office to make the pages more accessible. Pinsky mentioned that larger font would be helpful.
 - vi. Faculty assembly representatives. Professor Frieze asked Assembly members what it means to represent a unit and what they see as their role. The following comments were made by individuals:

1. Paul Munro said that he has occasionally taken back to his own faculty meetings information that seems relevant and important. Ted Rice remarked that every time you vote, you are representing your unit. Munro noted that since votes come up spontaneously, you do not consult with your unit on how to vote. John Close pointed out that the Assembly operates more as a republic than a democracy in that you don't have time to ask before a vote so you vote for your constituents. He pays attention to what is and is not good for his unit. He sees his role as one of protecting his unit. Constantine commented that "if something outrageous is going on, the troops will hear." Professor Pinsky said that at one point he had fantasies of creating email to send out to faculty, but realized it was useless because people didn't want them. Guy Salama said that very few issues arise that affect his unit (medicine). He cited the difficulty to discuss issues in depth in this panel forum. Phil Wion mentioned that colleagues may occasionally call you or ask about some issue and that as members of Assembly we can refer them to appropriate committees or bring up the issues at the Assembly meetings. President Frieze asked the members of the assembly to continue to think about the issues raised and suggested that we would come back to the discussion in the future.

b. Committee Items

- i. President Frieze reported that most committees have held their first meeting of the fall term or are planning to meet in early October. She encouraged members of the Assembly to be on at least one committee as a pro tem member. To do this, contact her, Fran Czak, or the committee chair.
- ii. Bylaws and Procedures Committee (Ted Rice, Chair).
 1. Bylaw changes will automatically go into effect on October 17 if there are no petitions in response to the ad in the September 1 *University Times*. Thus far there have been none.
 2. Proportional Representation. The Bylaws Committee met September 30 to discuss whether representation in the FA should be adjusted to be more proportional to the current composition of faculty in academic units. Ted Rice reported that the current policy has a base of two representatives for every unit. Those units of over 100 faculty have one additional representative. He likened it to the U.S. Senate which gives each state, regardless of size, two representatives. The House of Representatives, on the other hand, reflects population. In the latter system there is potential danger of small states (e.g. RI) having little voice. This was the rationale for the development of the current faculty assembly system. Professor Pinsky suggested that the number of representatives on Senate Council be limited, but increase the number in faculty assembly to be proportional. John Close said that the School of Dental

Medicine is like a Rhode Island and could be impacted significantly if the representation is changed to proportional. Munro asked what is considered a unit. Rice responded that it varies across the campus. In the Health Sciences, each school receives 2 representatives. In Arts & Sciences there are 15 representatives based on 3 divisions with 5 representatives each. Munro questioned whether the Faculty Assembly is really a legislative body. He pointed out that, to his recollection, there haven't been contentious votes in Faculty Assembly. He suggested that the body serves more as a means for communication. Phil Wion suggested that if the system isn't broken, there is no need to fix it. President Frieze commented that from the medical school perspective, it is broken. Jean Carr raised the question of representation of adjunct faculty. Steve Belle pointed out that the structure of the university is a NY, CA and many RI's. He felt we should move to try to bring balance. Guy Salama extended the analogy with the US government pointing out that the senate is focused on foreign policy while monetary issues are handled in the congress. President Frieze suggested that further comments should be conveyed directly to the committee chair, Ted Rice.

- iii. Athletics Committee (Bill Zamboni, Chair). The committee met on September 29 and reviewed their report on the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). They are in the process of contacting several institutions that joined COIA and one that has not. President Frieze pointed out that there have been heated opinions on this matter in the past, and said that people with special interest in COIA are invited to attend the committee's November meeting. A report of the committee's final consensus will be given at a future Faculty Assembly meeting by Chair Zamboni.
 - iv. Commonwealth Relations committee will hold its next luncheon on Friday, October 14 at the Titusville campus. The speaker will be Representative Scott Hutchinson of District 64, representing Venango County and part of Butler County.
6. Reports by Special and Standing Committees of the Senate
- a. Computer Usage Committee Update. Co-chair John Close asked if a change in mission statement requires approval by Faculty Assembly. The answer was no.
 - i. There was a request to look into the possibility of having a more consistent privacy policy with email. For example, you cannot share accounts. If wrongdoing occurs, it is required that it be looked into. However, the committee has no authority to dictate to UPMC as it is a private corporate body.
 - ii. There is a proposal before the provost for the establishment of campus-wide wireless. The time-frame is 18-24 months. Sereika asked if it was to be restricted to open spaces and academic classrooms. George Pike said that the plan is for whole buildings to be wireless. He said that outside is a lower priority. There is no plan, however with regard to the order that buildings will be completed. The implementation process has

not been structured or publicly announced. Munro pointed out that their building is wireless and that it is not necessarily good in classrooms. While some students may be appropriately using their laptops to take notes, others may be inappropriately accessing the Internet. Pike responded that the issue of classrooms did come up, and that there were different opinions. The decision was made to do the wireless building-wide. He explained that the demand was there. Professor Pinsky remarked that Duke University has wireless and said he was impressed at being able to play a presentation from your own computer.

- iii. In regards to the issue of dual email accounts, John Close said that the problem is not extant enough outside the school of medicine to do anything about. Pinsky said that it was also a problem in the school of pharmacy where, he said, more than 50% don't know that they have a second account. He said that Cantor has no plan to go outside the school of medicine. That HIPPA dictates that you can't have medicine automatically sent to Pitt.edu, but you can go the other way. The problem is being handled one department at a time. He said that it is a University of Pittsburgh, not UPMC issue. Close reiterated that the extent of the problem is not the same outside the school of medicine. Pinsky felt that we need to look more carefully. John Close said that CSSD has sent out a flurry of postcards related to Pitt accounts. Munro suggested that they stop giving people automatic Pitt accounts. Close said that it used to be that way. But it is easier to automate it. Munro suggested that the account be inactive and instruction on how to activate accounts be given so that people have to opt in.

7. Items of New Business

- a. There were no objections to canceling the October 17 Senate Council meeting.
- b. No other new business.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40.

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Ansell, Secretary

Members attending:

Ansell, Belle, Bergen, Bircher, Boston, J. F. Carr, Chattopadhyay, Close, Constantine, Costantino, Czak, Frieze, Hall, Hayden, Manfredi, Munro, Nelson, Olson, Pike, Pinsky, Rice, Salama, Sciote, Sereika, Skledar, Sukits, Sussman, Tuite, Wion, Withiam

Others attending:

Barlow, Blair, Fedele, Hart