

University of Pittsburgh
Senate Council Meeting
Minutes of June 13, 2005

1. President Bircher called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM.
2. The minutes of the Senate Council meeting on May 9 were approved as written.
3. President Bircher asked for items of new business for the meeting.
There were none.
4. Report of the Chancellor, Mark A. Nordenberg
Chancellor Nordenberg began by announcing the winner of the 2005 Chancellor's Affirmative Action Award—the Department of Rehabilitation Science and Technology (RST) of the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences. He noted that affirmative action for the purposes of this award is defined as the increase of access to and full participation by, in all aspects of university functions, minorities, women and those who have been declared members of protected classes by executive order, legislation, or court decisions. He thanked the members of this year's selection team, Kathleen Blee, Thomas Buchele, Bill Savage, Vijai Singh and John Wilds. Accepting the award was Professor Rory Cooper, professor and chair of the department. Many other members of the department were also present. The nomination was made by Dean Brubaker. The Chancellor then listed many of the accomplishments of Professor Cooper and the department. The Chancellor highlighted a few examples. RST is inclusive in recruiting and supporting employees and students with a wide range of disabilities. At least seven of the 30 faculty members have disabilities. Of the 40 students enrolled at the time of the nomination, at least ten had disabilities. RST serves as a model for others in how to effectively recruit, retain, educate and employ people with disabilities. RST embodies a culture of access and accommodation. He listed some of the ways students and faculty members with disabilities are helped in the classroom. RST has been instrumental in starting a campus-wide initiative focusing on the inclusion of disability issues in research projects, curricular reviews and development, policy studies, presentations and social events. RST is internationally recognized as a premier center of research and rehabilitation technology, which directly benefits persons with limited mobility. The department and the PA Office of Vocational Rehabilitation have one of the most extensive and comprehensive relationships in the country. The department has a commitment of inclusion of persons with disabilities that extends beyond the university. RST faculty, staff and students volunteer their time and talents to many organizations and to middle and high school students with disabilities. RST provides the umbrella structure for four large rehabilitation technology research centers and it established and hosts a virtual community for wheelchair users. They are known all over the world. RST has ensured that people with disabilities have opportunities to participate fully in life here at the university and beyond. It serves as one of the university's beacons of inspiration and aspiration, and he is pleased to make this award to them. The Chancellor then presented the award to the RST representatives at the meeting.

Continuing his report, the Chancellor told outgoing Senate President Bircher that it was a pleasure to work with him over the last two years, and he presented him with a gavel. He apologized for missing the May meeting and said he regretted missing the presentation of the Senate Service Award to Professor James Holland. He also said he thought Commencement was terrific this year. Part of it was the presence of Helen Faison, who was an inspiration for everyone. Another part was being on campus, rather than going across the city. He was reminded of this by a Board member who said how wonderful it was to have Commencement on campus in the Petersen Event Center. He also noted that Pitt was in the midst of hosting the Senior Olympics and the Petersen Event Center is the headquarters. There are more than 10,300 competitors to Pittsburgh and much of the competition is on the Pitt campus. Two faculty colleagues who played a big role in attracting the games to Pittsburgh were Peter Cohen and Freddy Fu from the Department of Orthopedic Surgery. Many Pitt people served as volunteers to make the games go well. Kathy Humphrey, who was vice president for student development at Saint Louis University, was named Vice Provost and Dean of Students. She starts officially on July 1 but has already been seen on campus. Stephen Thomas, the Philip Hallen Professor of Community Health and Social Justice and the Director of the Center for Minority Health, received the David Satcher Award (named after the former Surgeon General of the US and a former Pitt Commencement speaker) from the Directors of Health Promotion and Education at their national conference. Faith Adiele, a faculty member in the department of English, is one of five winners of the 2005 "PEN/Beyond Margins" award for her memoir "Meeting Faith: the Forest Journals of a Black Buddhist Nun." Mike Lovell, the Associate Dean for Research in the School of Engineering, has been selected to receive the 2005 Burt Newkirk Award from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

The Chancellor reported that at the noon meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, President Bircher formally presented him with a copy of the Faculty Assembly resolution dealing with Semester at Sea and asking for a report on the circumstances leading to their separation from the program. He said he and the Provost would provide such a report. By way of background, he mentioned that customarily the Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh served as a member of the Board of the Institute for Shipboard Education and he served in that role for a period of time. Several years ago, though, a decision was made within ISE to separate functions and to create two boards, the ISE board that would have operational oversight and ISE Foundation board that would try to generate financial support for the program. He moved to the fundraising board and the provost became a member of the ISE board. Therefore, the Provost has been closer to the matters that led to the recent decisions. He wanted to underscore that they both have been close to the program, they have been supportive of the program, they think they functioned in ways that served the best interests of the program, and they both regret that events unfolded in a way that made their decision necessary. It was not an abrupt decision; it was the product of many months of discussion, conversation, negotiation, give and take where at many points along the way, they believed that matters could be resolved in a manner acceptable to the university. It was not a decision made in isolation, but there was a need for confidentiality, principally to protect the interests of ISE and the

Semester-at-Sea Program. There were points of consultation along the way and the Provost would explain more of that. The Chancellor said that they are known as among the most effective collaborators in higher education, and they have reached out and partnered in a broad range of ways. He cited the partnerships with CMU as unique examples. He noted that when you know what it takes to have an effective partnership, you also know when you are in a relationship that has no functional future. He said they reached that conclusion with the relationship with ISE. Safety, especially student safety, always will be among the highest priorities of the university. He realizes that no place or activity is risk free but they need to be in a position to be able to manage risk responsibly. If there is no access to information that will permit you to assess risk, you cannot meet that responsibility. He also wanted to comment that safety extends beyond regulatory compliance. People have said that all the regulations have been met; however, if regulations were all that mattered, Pitt could have saved \$15 million it invested in fire suppression systems in the residence halls because these are not required by any regulation. Pitt decided it was something that was needed even though not required by law. This has been an emotionally difficult time for him and the Provost because of their long attachments to and commitments to the program. They arrived at this point regretfully but they arrived at this point believing that there was only one appropriate avenue to take. He next turned the report over to Provost Maher.

Provost Maher said the difficulties that led to Pitt's separating from ISE, the entity which runs Semester at Sea, were issues that grew over a period of time and several issues grew together. He said he would try to lead the Senate Council through a complex list of events. He said that they believed in the program and they are actively investigating how we can continue to offer our university the benefits of a program like this. However, they believe they reached a point where there was no alternative but to leave the program. Perhaps they should have left sooner, but they were so committed to the program that they stayed until the situation clearly required them to bow out.

The first two of the three main issues arose about three years ago. By then he had been on the board for several years, and he began to hear a theme from academic deans. This was that they loved the program, they were happy they did it, and they thought the program was basically good, but they had two frustrations. One was that while they were at sea, the Executive Dean, an employee of ISE, quite often made decisions that the Academic Dean, a University of Pittsburgh professor, regarded as an unreasonable intrusion into the responsibilities of the Academic Dean. Second, after the voyage was over, recommendations of the academic deans for improvements were ignored. He heard enough of these complaints that he went to William Brustein, who as director of UCIS is the official university liaison with the ISE, and asked him to work with Dean Cooper to put together a faculty committee to review the academic program and to give them some idea of what they should talk to the ISE about changing to improve the program. That committee was formed in the summer of 2003 and it reported in June 2004. The report was very good and very laudatory about many aspects of the program. However, the committee did pick up on the two themes he mentioned. They thought the university should have more control of the academic

program on the ship and they thought that the university should have more continuity so that recommendations of one dean would be acted on for the future.

The second issue that began to concern him three years ago was the management of the voyages themselves. The staff of ISE was quarreling quite a bit with the staff of a third organization called the Sea-Wise Foundation. The Sea-Wise Foundation runs ships. They are the arm of one of the world's major shipping companies, and they had always supplied and run the ship for the program. The Board of ISE had four members, three of them independent. The Ex Officio member was the CEO of the ISE. The other members were a representative of the University of Pittsburgh, the Provost; a representative of the Sea-Wise Foundation; and another, completely independent member, at that time someone who had been the CEO of ISE but who had retired and gone into private business. Three years ago that board started hearing more and more complaints from the staff of the Institute that they were not getting along with the Sea-Wise Foundation, and that they wanted to get their own ship and be free from Sea-Wise. The University looked to Sea-Wise as the organization that knew how to run a ship on the ocean. They had done that for over 20 years of our relationship and Pitt had a lot of confidence in their knowledge of how to select ships, run ships, plan itineraries, etc. The three independent board members, after bickering with ISE staff members, in fall 2003 gave the senior management of ISE clear instructions to repair their relationship with the Sea-Wise Foundation and quit talking about getting their own ship. The ISE management was quiet for about eight months and then in May 2004, without warning, it informed the Board that they had already negotiated and signed off on the fact that Sea-Wise was no longer involved with the Semester-at-Sea Program. This meant they lost the expertise that the university was counting on. At the same time, the ISE management was within a few days of securing its own ship; however, the German banks that were financing the deal were not willing to complete the deal unless the independent board members signed off on the deal.

The University of Pittsburgh does not retain a lot of expertise on running ships and had always relied on Sea-Wise. The small staff of ISE in the William Pitt Union did not impress the administration as people who knew how to run ships either or how to select them and buy them. When they came in with the deal on the new ship, the Pitt administration decided it could no longer serve on the board of an ISE whose mission had changed so profoundly and whose expertise to execute that mission impressed them so little. Since Pitt did not want to lose the program, they told ISE that even though the Provost had to resign from their board, Pitt would negotiate a new contract with ISE that would recognize the fact that Pitt could no longer hold a board seat but would continue with the program. They would have to embody in the contract the protections that Pitt would need to be sure that ISE would meet their newly chosen responsibilities of effectively owning (technically it is a long-term lease) and operating a ship, where the help they would be getting would be through hiring a management company. The Provost said that, by all accounts, it is a fine management company but it is a company that would be taking orders from the Institute whereas Sea-Wise did not have to take orders from ISE and, on occasion, did

not take them. The opinion of people from the University of Pittsburgh was that Pitt was lucky Sea-Wise was not taking orders from ISE.

That is where things stood a year ago. The new contract negotiations started in the summer of 2004. There were two goals. One was to implement the recommendations of the faculty committee that had reviewed the academic program. The other goal was to negotiate a new basis for a relationship no longer relying on having a board seat, but instead relying on a contractual arrangement where Pitt would run the academic program and ISE would operate the ship in a fashion such that Pitt could be confident that it was responsible in putting its faculty and students on that ship. The negotiations were extraordinarily difficult. He was surprised at how difficult they were. The faculty who had complained about the Executive Dean on the voyage appeared to have been right. The ISE was very adamant in its desire to retain its prior practices; they wanted Pitt to certify an accredited program but they did not seem to want anyone but their own people running the program. There was a protracted negotiation where one of the major issues was what is the role of the University of Pittsburgh in running its own academic program. There were also business issues. It is probably not worth going through all the issues, but the Provost gave an example of the kind of things that created a stumbling block. ISE wanted in the contract to have language, which they kept inserting after Pitt would take it out, which Pitt thought meant that they probably wanted to be acquired by someone else. The real worry was that they might want to be acquired by a for-profit organization, which would hurt the reputation and character of the program. They wanted to be able to make that decision without consulting with Pitt. The negotiations dragged on and in November 2004, the Provost felt he needed to give the academic committee an update. At the time the Pitt attorneys were putting into the contract all the things the academic committee had recommended but the ISE rejected. In November he wrote the committee and told them the negotiations were dragging out but he thought they would get a contract that embodied their recommendations. In December they reached closure with the Institute on a contract that did have essentially all of the faculty recommendations in it. The leadership of the Institute said that they needed to run the contract past their new board. The Provost then explained that within a few weeks after he had withdrawn from the ISE board the other independent board members voted in the new board that had been selected by the management of ISE. There was no one left of the old independent board, other than the ex-officio member, the CEO of the ISE. The ISE attorney told them in writing that the board would look at the contract by January 18 and it would be signed by then. The leadership of the ISE agreed that they would be responsible for getting the board to agree to the contract.

The agreement expected on January 18 did not materialize and the situation dragged on and on. It was not until early May that the ISE told Pitt they would not sign the contract. In February, the Provost called a meeting of the faculty committee, shortly after the accident at sea. He briefed them on everything he just reported. At the time that was a delicate thing to be doing because the Institute's stance was that all the things he was reporting were things that the ISE wanted to keep confidential. He told the committee he wanted faculty input and he did not have any group but them. Since

they had officially been working on reviewing the program for him, he could argue that they had quasi-management status as a faculty governance group and he could confide in them. However, they would have to maintain strict confidentiality (and they have). He also told them what he knew about the accident.

He next discussed the accident. The ship got into a storm in the Pacific in January. The students and faculty had some really bad times during the storm. Regardless of how they look back on it now, there were video tapes that showed that dangerous objects were moving rapidly across the screen, giving real promise of hurting someone badly. We heard accounts of television sets breaking loose and flying across rooms. By the end of the storm, the baby grand piano in the soup saloon had flipped 180 degrees. The student injuries were bumps and bruises, but what has not been mentioned is that there was faculty member who was very severely hurt and whose injuries were serious enough that they were very concerned about her for days while she lay in a Hawaiian hospital. Fortunately, she pulled out. Similarly, it was not just that a window broke and the computers went out. That did happen but there was also dramatic damage done to the hull of the ship. The description he has is that you could stand on the dock and you could see a distorted section of the hull that was about 30 feet high and 15 feet wide. "Crinkled" was the word someone used. This was a serious accident to a ship that had passed all the regulatory tests before it left port. There is a publication that is well-regarded in shipping circles called *Lloyd's List*. The ship management company puts up its daily updates every day. During and after the accident, this trade journal was hammering quite aggressively with questions related to the structure of the ship and whether it was a suitable ship for the use of our program. Shortly after the Provost first heard of the *Lloyd's List* postings, there was an accident to the sister ship in another ocean, reportedly with similar damage. As one can imagine, Pitt was quite concerned.

Pitt sent William Brustein to greet parents and students as the ship came in to Hawaii. They also sent Ted Fritz, one of Pitt's attorneys, to help Professor Brustein with what might arise. They found that ISE was not willing to answer any of Pitt's questions about either the accident or the condition of the ship. That has pretty much persisted since then; they have not been willing to answer Pitt's questions. At the time of the accident and for some weeks after the accident, just about the only information Pitt could get about the accident was from the ISE's website. They would put up information for the parents, and that was the extent of information Pitt would get, even though Pitt is supposed to be very involved in running the program with them.

During February and March, Pitt communicated often and met once face to face with ISE leadership, talking to them about Pitt's need for information that would allow it to assess the safety of its people and also about when the Board was going to sign the contract that was sitting in Limbo. In April the Provost, at the request of the leadership of the ISE, sat down with the board and it was clear that the board was remarkably hostile. He came away quite pessimistic about the chances of their signing the contract. (A little more than a month later, they sent a formal notice that they would not sign the contract.) On May 2, he reluctantly wrote the ISE giving them two years' notice. In the letter he left the door open a crack to a reconciliation,

but he was pessimistic. The letter telling him they would not sign the contract arrived two days later; apparently the two letters crossed in the mail. ISE had closed the door on the crack he left open. On May 3 he brought the faculty committee in again and briefed them thoroughly. They asked if he was sincere about there still being an opportunity for reconciliation. He said he was sincere but he was highly pessimistic because he thought that Pitt could not operate without the provisions of the contract they had negotiated in December and he thought they were going to tell them no (and the letter saying no arrived a day later). Even that contract was probably not good enough because the contract would not have guaranteed Pitt access to safety information of the sort it had been trying to get since February. The ship was going to sail soon and nothing was happening. He asked the committee to try to inventory all the good things for Pitt that resulted from Semester at Sea. He told them that Pitt would pull together all the resources it has been putting into SAS and will make them available if they will help get together a plan, alone or with a consortium of universities, to replace the good things from Semester at Sea. The committee was very sad to know that Pitt was going to have to move away from SAS, but they were supportive of developing a plan that might replace SAS.

Another aspect of the meeting that had a profound effect on him was their concern about safety. He was quite alarmed that, in his eagerness to rescue the situation, he had let Pitt get so close to the summer voyage without raising “holy hell” about safety. He had put off making the decision that, bad as it was, Pitt had to protect its people. On May 5, he wrote to the ISE again, re-raising the issue of safety and alerting them that if Pitt did not get the safety information it needed to be comfortable letting our people go on the ship, Pitt was prepared to leave sooner than the two-year notice it had given ISE. On May 10, he met with Professor Ron Linden, who was the scheduled academic dean for the summer voyage, and gave him the full briefing. He also tried to meet with Professor Harris-Schenz, who is the dean scheduled for the fall voyage. She was out of town and he arranged for Professor Brustein to brief her. They knew there was a 50-50 chance that Pitt would not be sailing on June 17. Also on May 10 there was a conference call between the Provost and Professor Brustein and the management of the ISE. That call and a letter sent by the CEO of ISE a few days later closed the door. In that conference call meeting, ISE made a number of representations about how safe the ship was, but for some time there had been no trust left. Anything Pitt wanted ISE to do had to be in writing; verbal assurances did not impress Pitt because it did not trust them. The phone call was replete with verbal assurances but no hard facts and no documentation was forthcoming. Pitt kept saying it wanted to see documentation. Despite all the verbal assurances, the ISE kept arguing that the only definition of safety is the concatenation of all the regulations and that if you pass the tests of all the regulatory agencies, you are safe by definition. They made that argument repeatedly when he asked for more safety information. The Chancellor has already pointed out that we put sprinklers in our dorms even though the state of Pennsylvania decided not to require them. They believe that there are safety issues that are not yet subject to regulation. The ISE argues that the fact that the ship passed the regulatory test is enough and that the University of Pittsburgh had no right to any further information even though the ship had passed those tests before the accident in February. Pitt had reason to believe that there were any number of

issues raised in the public press and other external sources regarding the design of the ship, the choices of the route of the ship, and other aspects of the operation that deserved discussion. Pitt has never said the ship is unsafe; it does not know whether it is unsafe. It just knows that it has legitimate reason to be quite worried and its legitimate inquiries for information were getting nowhere, at least up to the time that they publicly broke with ISE.

On May 12, he sent ISE a letter declaring the contract with it to be void. The basis for that had to do with multiple violations of the contract on their part, one of which was that ISE would not give Pitt safety information. On May 23rd Pitt met with ISE and told them Pitt was finished. It would no longer sponsor the academic program. At the meeting ISE asked Pitt whether it would at least help them to keep going while they looked for another university partner. Provost Maher said that he thought if they could change the way they maintain the relationship with the university partner, they could become an asset to the university world and our students could keep going on it. It was clear that it would not happen at Pitt but he did not want to do anything that would make it hard for that to happen somewhere else. Pitt did agree that it would certify the credits for the summer and the fall even though it would not put its people on the ship. On May 27, when ISE failed to come back with a joint statement alerting faculty and students about Pitt's concern about the voyage, Pitt felt a strong moral obligation, despite ISE's need for confidentiality, to make sure people who had joined that voyage because of the lure of the name of the University of Pittsburgh were appropriately informed about Pitt's concerns. On that day he wrote to all Pitt faculty who were on the summer voyage telling them that the university was not sponsoring the voyage and that they could not go on the voyage as Pitt employees. However, they could take a leave of absence and go on the voyage as private contractors. The Institute is retaining money that it would have given to Pitt to pay Pitt faculty so ISE should be able to pay these faculty-on-leave both salary and fringe benefits. Pitt gave that letter to the ISE and told them that they should inform everyone else on the voyage about Pitt's concerns. Later the last week in May, a new local attorney showed up threatening to take Pitt to court. On June 2, Pitt met with that attorney and with the leadership of ISE and at the meeting Pitt told them it would not have its people on a ship that might be dangerous and where there was so little information being supplied. On June 3rd, ISE filed a lawsuit asking for an injunction, which would have forbidden the University to alert anyone going on the ship or anyone else about Pitt's safety concerns. The judge did not give ISE that injunction.

Between June 2 and 3, Pitt was surprised to learn that the modifications to the ship were not finished. He does not know if they are finished now. On June 6, Pitt wrote the faculty again, giving them more information about Pitt's concerns. Later that day the press got hold of the filings of the ISE in court but for complicated reasons they did not get Pitt's answer. Faced with that fact, Pitt released later that day the statement that it had given to faculty earlier on a confidential basis. On June 9 the law suit was settled. Pitt agreed to a third voyage after examining information from Professor Kathleen DeWalt, who was scheduled to be the academic dean for the spring voyage. She had selected enough of the faculty and reviewed enough of the curricula to certify that voyage as well. Therefore, there are three voyages certified

by the University of Pittsburgh. One of them leaves Canada on the 17th of June. Pitt is not sponsoring that voyage and no one on the ship is going on University of Pittsburgh pay. As part of the settlement, Pitt forced the ISE to provide safety information to everyone who goes on the ship and students will have to sign a waiver saying they understand the issues and are going anyway.

That is where things stand now. It is a sad story. It is a program that means a lot to many people, including the Chancellor and the Provost. There is a committee that is beginning to work on ways that Pitt can replace its participation in such activities. It would be wonderful if the leadership of ISE would decide to do business differently with universities than the way they have done business with Pitt for the last three years, and get themselves a good partner and keep the program running in such a fashion that we could recommend it to our students. Right now there is no one who is happy with the outcome. When things like this happen, everyone loses. However, he believes Pitt would be much worse off if it stayed with ISE and it would not be living up to its responsibilities to its students and faculty to manage the risk they are exposed to in a responsible manner. Pitt is big in international studies and it is a strange world out there. Pitt people will encounter risks but we want to be able to assess those risks and be sure that each time Pitt people go into a risky situation, they are in the hands of an organization that Pitt thinks is deserving of its trust and the risk is not greater than required.

Questions and Comments

Professor Frieze said people were excited about the possibility of a new program. If people have ideas, to whom should they direct them? The Provost said Professor Brustein. He said he would make sure that the whole community is engaged in discussion.

Professor Munro asked what safety information did Pitt want. Provost Maher said the partial information Pitt has gotten from *Lloyd's List* and other sources raises issues about the design of the ship and its suitability for some of the oceans the program goes on. Pitt has gotten information in tangential ways that might indicate that engineers who have looked at the ship would say things like—if you make the following modifications, it should be a fine ship as long as you plan routes carefully. The ship was designed to run rich tourists around the Mediterranean at a high speed. The design of it is said to be such that it would run rough in other parts of the world. We do not know but we would like to see the reports that marine engineers have given ISE to see what qualifications they have put on the use of the ship. Then Pitt would want to know that the ISE would restrain routes to meet the recommendations. Mr. Cochran added that Pitt was looking for two important things. One was an assessment of the condition of the ship after the accident occurred. The other was information from competent engineering firms that the ship was suitable for the types of travel that ISE has used it for and intends in the future. Pitt found that modifications were not even done yet. It became apparent from looking at a consultant's report that \$4 million in modifications were recommended for it to be used for its intended purpose and then only with a proper itinerary choice. The report was done in May and the ship supposedly got a sign off in February after the accident. There were 700 kids on a ship that may have needed modifications to be safe. There is apparently an 85 page report that Pitt does not have because ISE requested that Pitt sign

an unacceptably restrictive non-disclosure agreement before ISE would release it to Pitt. It claimed that if Pitt shared it with others, it would cause ISE irreparable harm. Mr. Colwell thanked the Provost for the report and said it was good to hear all the information upfront. The Provost said he felt bad that Pitt people had to read it in the papers first, but the legal issues complicated things.

5. Report of the President of the Senate, Nicholas G. Bircher

Professor Bircher extended his congratulations to Professor Rory Cooper for receiving the Chancellor's Affirmative Action Award. He thanked the Provost and the Chancellor for their prompt and definitive reply regarding the Semester at Sea Program. As it was his last Senate Council meeting as President of the Senate, Professor Bircher thanked every one. He particularly thanked the Chancellor and the Provost, who made his job not only easy but a great pleasure. He said they were truly scholars and gentlemen who, by their personal efforts, make shared governance work. He said he believed it was another successful year in the University Senate and the Presidency of the Senate is a priceless education in how to get things done in a collegial manner. He thanked his colleagues in the Staff Association Council, who have made a concerted effort to communicate issues of mutual concern. He also thanked the student leaders who took time from their studies to bring their perspectives to us and to represent their fellow students. He then gave presents to Ms. Czak, Professor Olson and Professor Frieze. The gifts to Professor Frieze were numerous books related to *Robert's Rules of Order*. Professor Bircher introduced Ms. Cindy Brendel, the new assistant in the Senate Office. He announced that Sandi Mathews, who worked in the Senate Office for 10 years, recently took a position in the Faculty Affairs Office in the School of Medicine. Professor Bircher reported that members of the current Senate Executive Committee as well as the newly-elected officers will meet on June 22 to plan for the fall term. He announced that anyone who has ideas about a possible topic for the fall plenary session should contact President-elect Irene Frieze as soon as possible.

Next Professor Bircher reported on activities of Senate Standing Committees.

- Professor Carr, Chair of the Budget Policies Committee, has sent the Committee's recommendations on next year's faculty salary increases to the Chancellor. As these are conveyed confidentially, the Committee "will not make them public until after release of the UPBC's recommendations or action by the Board of Trustees, whichever comes first".
- Professor Close, chair of the Computer Usage Committee, provided some informational items at Faculty Assembly; in the interest of time, copies of his report are available on the back table.
- Vic Provost George Klinzing continues to work with the Library Committee on the revised draft of the Copyright Policy. He addressed issues raised by members of the Staff Association Council and met with the Co-chairs of the Library Committee to discuss their concerns last week. He will continue to meet with individuals and committees until all the issues are resolved with the goal of having Senate approval this September. If you have further comments, please convey them to Professor Frieze or the Co-Chairs of the Library Committee.

- In cooperation with the Plant Utilization and Planning Committee, Paul Munro recently emailed members of Faculty Assembly asking them to again take a minute and forward the call to respond to the Questionnaire regarding the establishment of a new Pitt Club. He has received almost 400 questionnaire responses to date. Professor Bircher reiterated his request to forward this e-mail to people in respective departments and schools. At the June 7 Faculty Assembly Meeting, Prof. Bircher advised the PUP committee to provide a short list of suggestions for the University Club, including the possibility of portions of the building intermittently serving in a manner similar to the Pitt club for faculty and staff.
- Professor Pinsky of the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee will report on the progress that has been made with respect to IRB practice in the fall. Next Professor Bircher reported on other committees.
- The Expanded Executive Committee, which includes the Chairs of the Standing Committees, will meet later in the summer to discuss any unresolved issues and upcoming issues for the fall. This is a time of transition for the Committees. Some Committees are in the process of electing a new chair; others will wait until their first fall meeting. The Senate Office will work with the Committees over the summer to update the membership rosters.
- With respect to the Ad hoc Committee to Study Consumer Satisfaction with UPMC, Dr. Loren Roth, Chief Medical Officer of the UPMC, has volunteered to work with this committee. Professor Bircher said this is a spectacular opportunity to partner with our health care system for purposes of improving both health care and claims. Professor Bircher said that he, Professor Hershey and others will be working to further refine the charge of the committee and will report in the fall.
- Next Professor Bircher asked Professor Frieze to report on the Ad hoc Committee for the Support and Advancement of Women at Pitt. Professor Frieze said that Professor Maureen Porter had been elected the new chair of the committee and they would report in the fall.

Other University Committees/Organizations:

- Professor Bircher thanked the Chancellor's Affirmative Action Award Committee for its diligent efforts and excellent choice of Dr. Cooper and his program for this award.
- Professor Bircher announced that the Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees would be Friday, June 24 at 9:30 a.m. in the Assembly Room of the William Pitt Union. The next Faculty Assembly meeting will be on September 6 and the next Senate Council meeting will be Monday, September 12. Following this meeting there will be the Chancellor's reception in 2501 Posvar Hall.

Questions and Comments

The Chancellor said there is no immediate action forthcoming on State Appropriations. For the last few years the Board has not been able to vote on the budget at its June meeting. That is likely to be the case this year as well.

6. Report of Student Members of Senate Council
Schools of the Professions.
Mr. Anzoise said he had nothing to report.

7. Report of the President of the Staff Association Council

Mr. Colwell said the Marketing and Communications Committee put out the staff newsletter before the Memorial Day holiday. They forgot to mail it to Senate Council and will try to get copies to members. The committee will now be working on updating the SAC website. The election committee announced that winners of the election were announced at the June 8 meeting. Rick Colwell was reelected as president. Gwen Watkins was reelected as vice president. Angie Peskie was elected as Vice President for Marketing and Communications. Carol Hodgkiss was elected as treasurer.

Gwen Watkins reported on Kennywood Day. It was held Saturday and there was an attendance of 1006 people. A number of senior administrators were there. She thanked everyone for their participation. It was a wonderful day.

Mr. Colwell said Council Campus, where officers of all the regional campuses meet at a campus, is scheduled for June 14. They will be leaving for Bradford after this meeting. He thanked Professor Bircher for his efforts on shared governance.

8. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

9. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Josephine E. Olson, Secretary

Members Attending

Anzoise, Belle, Bircher, Cain, Cochran, Colwell, Costantino, Cothran, Czak, Flynn Frieze, Goodhart, Greenberg, Hampton, Hershey, Juhl, Levine, Maher, Munro, Nordenberg, Olsen, Orbach, Peskie, Pike, Ramicone, Singh, Soska, Sukits, Watkins, Wion

Others Attending

Blair, Clark, Cooper, Fedele, Frisch, Frampton, Garfinkel, Hart, Harvith, HersonChavis, Hill, Homonai, Savage, Steele, Turk, Wilds, Williams