

University of Pittsburgh
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Minutes of May 3, 2005

1. Because of the delay in the arrival of Professor Bircher, Immediate Past President Hershey called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM.
2. The minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting on April 5, 2005 were approved as written.
3. Introduction of Items of Unfinished Business and New Business
No items unfinished business or new business were introduced.
4. Remarks of the President, Nicholas G. Bircher
Professor Bircher arrived in time to present his remarks. He said that the University Commencement the day before had been a wonderful celebration of the work of the University. Dr. Helen Faison, one of the most influential educators in the region over her career spanning more than five decades, was the commencement speaker. Her address, entitled "You Can Take It With You," was excellent and he hopes it will be printed. Next Professor Bircher reported on the activities of the Senate Standing Committees.
 - The Senate Athletics Committee is on the agenda. Their report on a document from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics will be a preliminary one, outlining the issues the co-chairs have found with the document. Their report will be reviewed by the full committee and he asked that Faculty Assembly members who are interested review the document and send comments to the co-chairs.
 - The Bylaws and Procedures Committee: The proposed bylaws changes that were accepted by the Faculty Assembly were also accepted by members of the Senate Council at the April 11 meeting. One minor change was made that was included was that parliamentary authority should be based on the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*.
 - The Commonwealth Relations Committee: The Committee will meet with the Community Relations Committee on Friday to discuss the current activities of each committee and possible joint ventures. Anyone not on those committees is encouraged to contact their chairs if you have ideas for the committees.
 - The Computer Usage Committee is on the agenda. Professor Bircher said that he had a discussion with Steve Kanter, Vice Dean of the Medical School, and he is committed to solving the problem of dual email accounts.
Next Professor Bircher discussed other Senate Committees.
 - The Chancellor hosted a luncheon for members of the Expanded Executive Committee on Wednesday, April 20. This meeting gave Professor Bircher a chance to thank the four groups which make the University Senate run smoothly: Fran Czak and Sandi Mathews; the Executive Committee team; the Chancellor and Provost; and the chairs and members of Senate Committees.
 - The Senate Elections Committee has reported the election results. The new Senate president is Irene Hanson Frieze, the vice president is Michael R. Pinsky, and the secretary is Ellen Ansell. Professor Bircher also read the names of new members of Faculty Assembly. The overall percentage of ballots returned was 27 percent, somewhat higher than last year.
 - Professor Bircher announced that the next Faculty Assembly meeting is Tuesday, June 7 and the next Senate Council meeting is Monday, May 9.

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

Professors James J. Irrgang and William C. Zamboni, co-chairs, presented an update on the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). Professor Zamboni said Professor Bircher had requested that they give an update on their recommendation on the COIA. Last year they reported twice to Faculty Assembly and recommended that Pitt not join to COIA. They were also asked to review a COIA document called “Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules and Guidelines.” This was sent out to Faculty Assembly members early. Professor Zamboni provided some background on the origin of COIA. They want to develop regulations to control intercollegiate athletics. The new document looks at ways to regulate or govern intercollegiate athletics. A subcommittee chaired by Professor Irrgang, made up of members of the Athletics Committee, members of the Provost’s Office, members of the Athletics Department and the Faculty Athletics Representative, Susan Albrecht, reviewed the COIA document. The document involves five areas of reform or regulation—admissions, scholarship, curricular integrity, time commitment (specifically missed class time and scheduling), and policies regarding academic advising and counseling. There were about 80 recommendations that the subcommittee had to review. It then had to see what Pitt was already doing and make a recommendation regarding the recommendations. The subcommittee now has a final draft version which it needs to show to the full committee in the fall. Then they will come back to the Faculty Assembly for review. Their preliminary look finds that Pitt meets or exceeds nearly every recommendation. Many universities have little faculty involvement in athletics oversight. Professor Eno, the head of the COIA, was very impressed with the level of involvement of faculty at Pitt.

Questions and Comments

Professor Pinsky commented that if we were already doing what they recommend, it should not be too risky to join them. He asked how the COIA was originally created and what is its mandate and from whom. He noted that the committee report says the COIA has no formal organization and that seems to be a major concern. Professor Zamboni said that was his next topic.

Professor Zamboni next reported that the second issue was whether to join the COIA. Last year they recommend that Pitt not join the COIA at that time. This year they again recommend that Pitt not join the COIA. There are several reasons. The first reason is that there is no formal governing mechanism. Things are brought up on email, discussed on email and voted on via email. There is no ratification structure. The organization has 47 institutions out of 305 Division 1A institutions. It is unclear who is driving this institution. There is a steering committee of six to eight members and it is unclear how they are selected. They appear to be from the original member schools. Among the 47 members, only Rutgers and Connecticut of the Big East are members. A second concern is that it is unclear how things can be changed. Pitt could have suggestions to make it better but the organization may not be interested in changing. For example, one issue is a Faculty Governing Board. Some members of the COIA think it should be a faculty committee that has complete power over athletics. Our Athletics Committee thinks there should be faculty representation but not that faculty should have all the power. Faculty may not have the background,

time or knowledge. The third thing is that COIA is pushing for academic reform. The NCAA has recently come up with the Academic Performance Program. In the past the performance was based on graduation rates. The new program looks at up-to-date academic performance, which ultimately affects level of participation and scholarships that can be awarded. It is unclear how the COIA is going to interact with the NCAA and with the institutions. Finally, Pitt is already addressing their concerns. Thus they recommend not joining at this time.

Questions and Comments

Professor Hershey said this reminded him of the time he was on a committee advising the Provost on admission of athletes with less than sterling academic records. One coach made the argument that if Pitt did not give an athlete a chance, the student would just go to another school and Pitt would not be on a “level playing field.” It might work to the benefit of Pitt if more schools were on the same plane as we are when it comes to the recruiting and admission of athletes.

Professor Belle asked whether the COIA has a charge. Professor Zamboni said the COIA is not formally related to the NCAA. They are more a faculty group. It is not clear that the members were all approved by their faculty senate. Some steering committee members come from universities that are not members (Syracuse). Professor Belle asked whether they have talked to anyone besides Bob Eno. Professor Zamboni said no.

Professor Belle asked if there was any formal communication. Professor Zamboni said just phone calls and emails. Professor Belle asked whether it was worth writing down questions that we want to have addressed. Professor Zamboni said they had already done that. There are no bylaws or policies and procedures. They do not think they will have them in the future. Professor Belle asked why any one would join this organization. Professor Zamboni said he thought it was because they had problems with athletics.

Professor Balaban asked whether anything had changed from last year. Professor Balaban said not much had changed but now they have this revised document on academic integrity and athletics.

Professor Jacobson asked whether the 47 institutions had all agreed to join the COIA as distinct from individuals. Professor Zamboni said it was unclear.

Professor Weiss said that last year there were some misgivings about letting this opportunity go. There is always room for improvement. What are the issues that Pitt has and has not addressed. Professor Zamboni said one example is that many universities do not have a faculty committee for “special admits.” Pitt has a committee of five faculty members who have the vote on special admits. The COIA was a quota for special admits, while we do not believe in a quota system. There is also a lot of reform going on within NCAA athletics. The Academic Performance Program is already changing things tremendously. He is not sure how much COIA will contribute to these reforms.

Professor Weiss asked for an example of things Pitt is not addressing such as hourly limits. Professor Zamboni said that hourly limits is an NCAA rule. Pitt has a process to ask students at graduation whether they went over the hourly rule. Professor Weiss observed that graduation was rather late.

Professor Ansell said she was hearing fear of association with this group and wondered why. Why is there a problem? Maybe joining the group would allow us to understand it better and to be a good example. Professor Munro said he thinks it is fear of the legitimacy of the organization. Professor Balaban said the organization approached us and if they want us to join them, they are not doing a very good job. They have to convince us that they have something worthwhile.

Professor Wion suggested that the committee is still pursuing it and presenting a report in the fall. He hopes membership will remain a live issue.

Professor Jacobson suggested picking a few schools that are members and call their athletic department to see what they think of the organization. Some of the document smells of allocation of power rather than reform. Professor Bircher suggested talking to Big East members. Professor Bircher asked the committee to think of preparing a table that has one line for each of the recommendations and whether they are met at Pitt.

Professor Flynn said he would like to know what it means to be a faculty member.

Professor Zamboni said the subcommittee had already done what Professor Bircher was requesting.

Professor Belle asked whether we were approached a second time. Professor Bircher said there was an initial invitation and then another round of invitations at the time of the document. Professor Belle said there were compelling reasons to join and not to join.

Perhaps a communication between the president and Professor Eno should be prepared listing our concerns. Professor Bircher said the appropriate time might be when the committee gives its report in the fall.

Computer Usage Committee

Professor Close said that the committee met on April 22 and he had a few informational items to report from that meeting. First, regarding the dual email account situation, Vice Dean Kanter called him, Irene Frieze and Jinx Walton. He is trying to move forward and but he is moving very slowly. Professor Pinsky said that Dr. Kanter had called him but they had missed each other.

Regarding the deceased faculty accounts issue, CSSD now has the official document on "Third Party Access to University Electronic Mail." It is available on the Technology Site of the web. The School of Dental Medicine had a recent faculty death and his account was terminated within three business days. He tried sending a message to the account and got the message that the account was no longer active. The problem is that if messages are forwarded to a local server, the University message is bypassed. The University cannot do much about that. CSSD also made a presentation in which they are recommending two pieces of software to protect your computer against spyware, etc. One that they suggest is called AdAware. This is one of the top-rated spy-blocking software. It is easy to use and free. The other one that should be used in conjunction with AdAware is called Spybot. These are documented on CSSD's technology website. You have to do this on your local machine. The other thing that CSSD brought up is the problem of units putting faculty and staff data on local servers. CSSD strongly discourages this because of security issues. CMU's business school was recently hacked. Dr. Klinzing also reported on copyright policy. His report had to do with general copyright policy. He did not talk about classroom policy. That is being worked on by a separate committee. A final draft of the copyright policy is now in place. It has to be approved by the Senate but Dr. Klinzing was not certain who needed to approve it. Professor Bircher asked if there was faculty representation on the committee. Professor Bircher said that if there is not faculty representation, then the policy should come through one of the standing committees. Professor Close said he would find out. The policy still has to be approved by the Senate and the Chancellor. Ms. Czak said that the policy was also sent to the Senate Library Committee. Professor Bircher said that when the Library Committee is finished reviewing it, they should bring it to the Faculty Assembly and the Senate Council. Professor Close said that CIDDE is working on the "Teach Act"

material that has to do with use of copyright materials in the classroom or on the web for coursework. Professor Close said Dr. Klinzing also talked about technology transfer for patents. He said that the University is quite generous. When you write a book the copyright is yours. Professor Bircher said that is only true to the extent the publisher allows it.

Questions and Comments

Professor Jacobson asked why the University has not considered an intranet. This would solve some security and copyright problems. Professor Close said some of the units are setting up intranets. Professor Pinsky asked about my.pitt.edu and another person asked about Blackboard. Professor Jacobson said that there are specific sites that are password protected but there are no general sites. What is missing is a secure mechanism for making things available to the general university but not to the outside world.

Professor Pike said he wanted to mention a discussion at the last Senate Library Committee regarding the “e-reserve system.” Rush Miller would encourage faculty members to use the system for placing electronic materials available for class instead of using individual webpages. There are copyright protections available in e-reserve systems that might not be available in an unrestricted faculty webpage. This is highlighted by a conflict between the Association of American Publishers and the University of California at San Diego over their e-reserve systems. The AAP is challenging the university for putting too many things on the e-reserve system. He mentioned that the Library system has licensed copies and there are no copyright issues because the license covers all university users.

Professor Munro asked whether there were copyright issues with putting something on Courseweb. Professor Pike said that is the nature of the conflict between AAP and the University of California. Professor Munro also warned that putting things on an intranet can make things over secure.

6. Unfinished Business and New Business
There was no unfinished or new business.
7. Announcements
There were no announcements.
8. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Josephine E. Olson, Secretary

Members Attending:

Ansell, Baker, Balaban, Belle, Bergen, Bircher, Boston, Brush, Cain, Close, Costantino, Cothran, Czak, Flynn, Goodhart, Greenberg, Hampton, Hartman, Hershey, Irrgang, Jacobson, Kuller, Manfredi, McKinney, Munro, Ogundayo, Olson, Pike, Pinsky, Platt, Ross, Savoia, Skledar, Soska, Stoy, Sukits, Sussman, Weber, Weiss, Wion, Withiam, Zamboni

Others Attending:

Blair, Fedele, Hart