

University of Pittsburgh
Senate Council Minutes
December 4, 2006

1. Call to Order: President John Baker called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes of November 6, 2006 Senate Council Meeting: approved as written.
3. Introduction of New and/or Unfinished Business: None
4. Report of the Chancellor, Mark A. Nordenberg
 - a. In Memoriam:
 - i. William Donaldson MD. Chancellor Nordenberg acknowledged the passing of Bill Donaldson, a Pitt graduate and former Medical Director of Children's Hospital. Dr. Donaldson was a pioneering and internationally renowned surgeon in the area of children's orthopedic spinal surgery. His distinguished service as a Pitt trustee spanned 25 years.
 - ii. Bebe Moore Campbell. Chancellor Nordenberg reported upon the passing of Bebe Moore Campbell, a Pitt alumna who had served on the Pitt Board of Trustees since 2005. Moore's writing is critically acclaimed, with several books reaching the *New York Times* best sellers list. She had been hailed as one of the most important African American writers of this century. Chancellor Nordenberg spoke at a Celebration of Life and Victory Homecoming Service in Los Angeles to commemorate her life.
 - iii. Richard Noble. Richard Noble, a Pitt undergraduate majoring in computer science, perished in a fire last month. He will be remembered at an evening service at Heinz Chapel.
 - iv. Chancellor Nordenberg asked for a moment of silence for these and other individuals of importance to the University of Pittsburgh who passed away during the past year.
 - b. Pitt Extraordinary Students
 - i. Rhodes Scholar. Pitt student Daniel Armanios was selected as a 2007 Rhodes Scholar, one of only 32 US students from 21 institutions of higher learning. Pitt was the only college or university in Pennsylvania to claim a 2007 Rhodes Scholar, and the only US public university to produce a Rhodes Scholar in both 2006 and 2007. Daniel, who is majoring in both chemical engineering and political science, had already received a Goldwater Scholarship, and a Truman scholarship. He is the founder of Session Middle East, a model undergraduate forum to discuss Arab-Israeli differences.
 - ii. Marshall Scholar. Anna Quider was awarded a Marshall Scholarship. Anna, an Honors College student, is majoring in physics and astronomy, history and philosophy of science, and religious studies. Anna is the ninth Pitt undergraduate to win a Marshall Scholarship. Earlier, Anna won a Goldwater Scholarship. She has done undergraduate research in Pitt's Quasar Research Group in the Department of Physics and Astronomy. Prince Andrew visited our campus in 2003 to designate the University of Pittsburgh a "Marshall Center of Excellence," a distinction that reflects the unusual success of our students in the Marshall Scholarship competition.
 - iii. Comparative Data. This year, only eight universities, plus the three service universities, could claim both a Rhodes Scholar and a Marshall's Scholar. Pitt was clustered in this distinction, with: United States Military Academy (West Point), United State Naval Academy (Annapolis), United States Air Force Academy, Harvard University, Yale University, Princeton University, New York University, Georgetown University, Duke University, and Cornell University. The University of Pittsburgh is the only public university in this elite group.
 - c. Pitt Faculty Achievements
 - i. Pitt ranked #1 in National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) FY2005 grant awards, a position that our University has fairly regularly occupied. Pitt faculty attracted 54.6 million dollars in NIMH grant funds in FY 2005. Pitt leads UCLA, Johns Hopkins

University, University of Pennsylvania, and UC San Diego in NIMH funding.

iii. Three faculty members were named 2006 Fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS):

- a. Kenneth D. Jordan, Professor of Chemistry
- b. Robert Y. Moore, Love Family Professor of Neurology and Neuroscience
- c. Jeffrey H. Schwartz, Professor of Anthropology and of History and Philosophy of Science

iv. Nicholas Rescher, University Professor of Philosophy, was awarded the Aquinas Medal for 2007, a lifetime achievement award from the American Catholic Philosophical Association.

v. John T. Yates Jr., R.K. Mellon Professor of Physics and founding director of Pitt's Surface Science Center, was awarded the 2007 Peter Debye Award in Physical Chemistry, to be presented at the 2007 American Chemical Society (ACS) meeting. Professor Yates is a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

vi. Michael Sacks, the William Kelper Whiteford Professor, Department of Bioengineering in the School of Engineering, and William Wagner, Associate Professor of Surgery, Chemical Engineering and Bioengineering at Pitt, and deputy director of the University's McGowan Institute for Regenerative Medicine, were named among the 2006 "Scientific American 50." They were recognized as "researchers who played a critical role in driving key science and technology themes."

vii. William "Buddy" Clark, and Peyman Givi, professors of mechanical engineering, were elected Fellows of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

d. An on-campus wireless technology fair will launch our campus-wide wireless service, to be installed throughout the Oakland campus and all five regional campuses over the next 18 months.

e. The Nationality Rooms are decorated "in all of their seasonal splendor," and have been attracting thousands of visitors to our campus over this holiday season.

f. In closing, Chancellor Nordenberg extended his best wishes to students in attendance (who might also be approaching exams before they approach holiday celebrations), and to faculty and staff. He noted that Pitt is collectively "a great place, with great people." He expressed pleasure with the significant momentum that the Pitt community (i.e., students, staff, faculty, alumni, and friends) has developed this fall. As a result, "a lot of good things are happening, things that continue to distinguish the University of Pittsburgh, to increase our impact, to raise our visibility..." Chancellor Nordenberg looks forward to working with all in attendance to sustain this momentum during the new calendar year.

5. Report of the President of the Senate, John J. Baker

a. Faculty Assembly Update. The Faculty Assembly heard reports from several Senate Committees at the November 28, 2006 session. Three of these reports will be discussed later in this meeting.

b. Library Issue: Senate President Baker related a concern that was brought to the Senate Library Committee by Rush Miller, Director of the University Library System. The John Wiley & Sons publishing company has made an offer to acquire Blackwell Publishing for \$1.08 billion. This represents a concern to the library community for two reasons. The combined corporate entity will control 1200+ titles and scholarly journals, and libraries are typically faced with significant price increases following a merger. The acquisition must be approved by the US Department of Justice. The Senate Library Committee is planning a letter writing campaign to support the Information Access Alliance's petition to the US Department of Justice to order an extended review of the possible effects of the merger. The Information Alliance is requesting assistance from all member libraries

Any Senate member who would like to participate should contact Adam Shear or Rosemary

Hoffmann, co-chairs of the Senate Library Committee.

c. Spring, 2007, Plenary Session.

i. Senate President Baker announced a Senate Plenary Session on Wednesday, March 28, 2007, 2:00 pm -5:00 pm in the Assembly Room, William Pitt Student Union. Senate President Baker and Dr. Herbert Needleman will co-chair the session. President Baker commended Dr. Needleman for his efforts in organizing the session. (Dr. Needleman is professor in the School of Medicine and a former chair of the Senate's Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee.)

ii. The topic of the session is "Balancing Public and Private Interests in Science." Two outside experts have agreed to come and discuss the subject: Dr. Sheldon Krimsky and Dr. Catherine DeAngelis. Sheldon Krimsky PhD is a Professor of Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning at Tufts University. He is the author of six books and over 100 essays and reviews. His most recent book was published in 2003 and is titled "*Science in the Private Interest: Has the Lure of Profits Corrupted Biomedical Research?*" His book has a forward by Ralph Nader. Catherine DeAngelis MD is the editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, University of Pittsburgh Distinguished Alumna, and a member of Pitt's Board of Trustees. More information will be provided at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.

d 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 a feature story in the November 9, 2006 *University Times*. The Senate Executive Committee believes that the Senate and Pitt's administration need to continue to promote gender equity at the University of Pittsburgh. Since this issue crosses the purviews of more than one standing Senate committee, the Senate Executive Committee agreed to form an *ad hoc* committee to work with Pitt's administration to promote gender equity as per the four major equity indicators described in the AAUP report: full-time faculty status; tenure status; full professor status; and average salary. The committee will be called the *Ad Hoc Committee for the Promotion of Gender Equity*. President Baker has asked Senate Immediate Past President Irene Frieze to chair the committee. Baker lauded Frieze's proven record of working with Pitt's administration to promote gender equity, and expressed great confidence that she will be able to do so again. Any faculty member interested in serving on this committee should contact Dr. Frieze. Men and women are both welcome to serve on the committee. As Baker noted: "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 Senate ad hoc committee."

ii. Frieze advised that the committee will deal with faculty, staff and student issues. She encouraged Senate members to contact her if they have are issues of concern that committee should look into. Dr. Frieze will provide more information at the next Faculty Assembly meeting, including a written mission statement.

6. Reports of the Student Members of Senate Council.

A. Student Government Board

i. Will Powers reported that this is his last Senate meeting. He views the opportunity for SGB to present concerns directly to administration in Senate meetings as extremely valuable, and thanked the Senate.

ii. SGB President Joseph Pasqualichio will also be rotating off the University Senate, and thanked the Senate for the opportunity to represent students. Pasqualichio described some of SGB's notable recent accomplishments; these serve as evidence of the increasing popularity of SGB. Recent successes include:

- a. Freshman Affairs committee with 400+ members.
- b. Internship program for students within student organizations.
- c. Freshman mentorship program.
- d. Improved website design.
- e. Allocations process – improved efficiency with electronic upgrades.
- f. Discussions on campus security policies that have been followed-up by rapid changes by Pitt Police and Facilities Management.
- g. A successful diversity week and the “I am...” campaign.
- h. Cross-cultural and civic leadership center.
- i. 10th Annual Pittsburgh Project Oakland Clean-up with Student Volunteer Outreach.
- j. Monthly Town Hall meetings (instituted by SGB President Joseph Pasqualichio).
- k. A successful *Get out the Vote!* campaign which resulted in an increase in voter registration, (from 2% to 28%).
- l. A new food option in Lothrop Hall. SGB also provided feedback for plans to upgrade dining options in the Towers, and has had a direct impact on the design.
- m. Legal file sharing with Ruckus is in progress for online music and videos.
- n. Office of Student Life sponsored a successful leadership retreat.
- o. The SGB Freshman Handbook, *The Compass*, was a success, with much positive feedback from students and administrators.

iii. SGB President Joseph Pasqualichio thanked Senate Council for the voice it affords SGB, especially with regard to South Oakland housing issues. He thanked Chancellor Nordenberg for his immense support over the past three years. Pasqualichio also appreciates Dean of Students Kathy Humphrey's outstanding interaction with students, her sage advice, and her willingness to attend late night SGB meetings.

B. College of General Studies Student Government, Joyce McDonald, President.

- i. CGS will hold a “meet and greet” for students, faculty and CGS administrators.
- ii. CGS students will participate in the WTAE *Project Bundle-Up* telethon, conducted in collaboration with the Salvation Army.
- iii. CGS Student Government is preparing a link on the My Communities section of the University web portal (my.pitt.edu), to better link students to services and events.
- iv. In response to a prior Senate Council discussion, CGS Student Government will be careful to monitor the noise levels of events so that they do not interfere with classes.
- v. Kathleen Gallant reported on the many successes of Non-Traditional Students Week. These included a workshop to encourage CGS students to study abroad. CGS Student Government developed a scholarship application manual, and will continue to collaborate with the Study Abroad office.

C. Graduate and Professional Student Association

- i. Schools of the Health Sciences, Erick Tatro. The School of Medicine's “90k from 2009” group (<http://www.90kfrom2009.com>) sponsored a fundraising event. Their citywide graduate student mixer attracted 500+ attendees and raised over \$5,000. The group seeks to raise \$90,000 for the Program for Healthcare of Underserved Populations, an organization that funds several free health clinics. Contacts for “90k from 2009: are

Lauren Toney, (Lauren@medstudent.pitt.edu) and Jeffrey Walch, (jmw34@pitt.edu). An annual ice skating event will coincide with the last final exam for 1st year PhD students.

ii. Lofty Durham, School of Arts and Sciences asked for assistance from Senate Council to identify faculty members (one from each of the SAS divisions) to serve on a committee to select winners of the Elizabeth Baranger Excellence in Teaching Award. The award will recognize teaching excellence by graduate student instructors. Thirty-seven students were nominated for the award. Senate Baker offered to help identify faculty members.

7. Report of the Staff Association Council, Angela Peskie, Vice President for Marketing and Communications and Gwen Watkins, Vice President Steering.

A. SAC Elections Committee. Seventeen staff members were accepted for SAC membership. The Council now has 67 members.

B. Marketing and Communications Committee. The Marketing and Communications Committee is working to produce a fall/winter newsletter.

C. Program and Planning Committee. A Holiday Bazaar was held November 3, 2006. Proceeds from that event, plus the Fall Assembly, raised \$701 for the SAC Endowed Book Fund.

D. SAC Endowed Book Fund Committee, SAC raised \$9,200 in the first 14 months of a three year, \$10,000 campaign. SAC welcomes contributions in the form of cash or checks (to "University of Pittsburgh; memo: SAC endowed book fund), or by an online contribution (via a payroll deduction). The Committee selected three recipients of the 2006 SAC Endowed Book Fund Award:

i. Jessica Bopp (parent: Lisa Bopp, Neural Basis of Cognition)

ii. Nathaniel Mohny (parent: Joanne Mohny, CSSD)

iii. Melissa Nero (parent: Elizabeth Nero, School of Medicine-Dean's Office)

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

A. Anti-Discriminatory Policies Committee Award Announcement, Professor Thomas Buchele, Chair. To honor the contributions of Barbara Shore and the late Richard Tobias, Professor Buechle announced the "Shore-Tobias Award for Action Against Discrimination." The committee will cast a wide net for awardees: students, staff, faculty, and organizations are eligible. The Committee accepts both nominations and self-nominations. Nominations should be sent to the Senate Office.

B. Bylaws and Procedures Update – Electronic Elections, Dr. Thomas Smitherman, Chair

i. The BPC decided that electronic balloting would save time for the Senate Office staff; would be adequately secure and confidential; and would be reasonably accurate. The BPC committee report is attached as an addendum to the Minutes

ii. The BPC recommended that the University Senate strongly encourage the School of Medicine to make a major effort to assure the ability of every SOM faculty member to vote electronically. Dr. Kantar's office is making such an effort by instructing faculty member who forgot their passwords, how to establish new passwords.

iii. The BPC unanimously agreed to not maintain paper ballots.

iv. The BPC could not reach consensus as to whether eliminating paper ballots and instituting electronic ballots would represent a substantive change, or a minimal change to the Bylaws.

v. Dr. Thomas Smitherman made the following motion to Senate Council, on behalf of the BP Committee.

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:

In 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.

vi. Senate President Baker reported that this motion had been approved at the November 28, 2006 meeting of Faculty Assembly by a large majority. Additionally, the matter has been referred to the Senate Computer Usage Committee to ensure that persons with disabilities are able to vote. As per Paul Munro’s suggestion, immediately before elections commence, Senate members will be notified by campus mail that elections will be held electronically.

vii. Following discussion, the motion carried unanimously. The plan is for electronic elections to commence spring, 2007.

C. Community Relations Update, Professor Tracy Soska; Linda Hartman and Wes Rohrer, Co-Chairs. Professor Tracy Soska, discussed 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**. The report had previously been shared with the Senate Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, and the Senate Educational Policy Committee, with helpful feedback and a favorable response from both committees. The report was also accepted by Faculty Assembly. The report is not offered as a formal policy, but rather, as guidance to academic disciplines, departments, and schools, for 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 in the context of service activities that do not have a strong academic connection.) 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. The report will next be sent to the Provost’s Office for their consideration.

9. New and/or Unfinished Business: None

10. Announcements: None

11. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by President Baker at 4:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Cohn
Secretary

Members Attending

Alexander, Baker, Balaban, Boston, Brush, Carr, Cassaro, Chattopadhyay, Close, Cochran, Cohn, Costantino, Durham, Frieze, Gallant, Hall, Humphrey, Juhl, Kaufmann, McDonald, Molinaro, Muenzer, Munro, Nordenberg, Pasqualichio, Peskie, Pike, Powers, Ramicone, Ross, Saunders, Savoia, Sciote, Tatro, Watkins, Weber.

Others Attending

Blair, Brendel, Buchele, Clark, Frisch, Hart, Hartman, Homonai, Leff, Pack, Smitherman, Soska, Supowitz, Wilds

**APPENDIX:
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 pursues 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)*