

**Faculty Assembly Minutes**  
**2700 Posvar Hall**  
**March 15, 2016**

<b>Topic/Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b><u>Call to Order</u></b>  The meeting was called to order by President Frank Wilson.</p>	The meeting commenced at 3:00 PM.
<p><b><u>Approval of the Minutes</u></b>  President Wilson asked for approval of the minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of February 9, 2016.</p>	The minutes were approved as written.
<p><b><u>Introduction of Items of New Business</u></b>  There were no items of new business raised.</p>	None
<p><b><u>Report of Senate President, Frank Wilson</u></b>  President Wilson updated on the state budget appropriation news. There is no end in sight. Pitt Day takes on a new meaning. I hope many of you will attend. I will be going. Face to face meetings are important to let them know the damage has already been done.  In the news recently, there have been controversies regarding Freedom of Speech issues. Also Pitt News reporters coming to Senate Committee meetings. Before spring break, I met with the Pitt News editors and told them how happy I am that they are taking an interest in the Senate. I also sent a letter to the committee chairs informing them of the proper processes. If there are any problems, please contact the Senate Office.  Kear: Pitt News attended our meeting last month and there were no issues.  Munro: The administrative liaisons to the PUP committee made it clear in the past they would be less than forthcoming if the press would be present. I think it's not only how we feel about it, but also how the administration feels about it.  President Wilson reminded everyone that the Plenary will be held on March 30 from 12-3 in the Assembly Room of the WPU. It's a timely topic, especially with what is happening on many other college campuses. He thanked Seth Weinberg for his leadership and hard work on organizing what he expects will be a wonderful event.  No additional questions/comments.</p>	Discussion notes are recorded below.
<p><b><u>Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate</u></b></p>	None
<p><b><u>Unfinished Business and/or New Business</u></b>  Faculty Performance Evaluation &amp; Salary Decision Task Force – Vice Provost Laurie Kirsch and Barry Gold</p>	

<p>Provost Beeson convened an ad hoc committee in October 2015 to look at issues around evaluating performance of tenured faculty and associated salary decisions. This followed the work of the Senate ad hoc committee had done and the report it finalized in September 2015. In the Senate report there were concerns on the way in which reductions were made, including the size of the salary reduction, the lack of defined criteria for reducing salaries and the lack of uniformed criteria to determine salary reductions across the university. The Senate report made a number of broad recommendations for university wide guidelines in this area. As a follow up, Provost Beeson convened an ad hoc committee to develop a set of university wide guidelines and recommendations. I'm chairing the committee, members include: Barry Gold, Janet Grady (UPJ), Ann Thompson (SOM), James Knapp (A&amp;S). The committee has been meeting regularly. My hope is that we are able to complete our report in the next few weeks.</p> <p>In doing our work as a committee we recognize that faculty performance related issues may occasionally arise that might warrant significant action such as salary reductions. We also recognize the many contributions made by tenured faculty to the university. As a committee we are committed to protecting the rights of the faculty and ensuring processes which are fair and transparent and uniformed across the university.</p> <p>In our deliberations we note the 1999 memo from then Provost Jim Maher, provides guidelines for the faculty review process and includes a list of issues to be addressed in the annual review which were jointly developed by the Council of Deans and the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee of the Senate. Each year the Provost's Office confirms that annual reviews of faculty have been completed and reviews a random sample of 10% of the faculty performance review letters across all ranks for Provost area schools.</p> <p>The ad hoc committee also notes the University of Pittsburgh policy on salary administration. This policy provides general guidance for salary increases, but no guidance for salary reductions, amounts or reductions which can be given and options for remediation or an appeal. The committee is working on guidelines to compliment and supplement the existing guidelines &amp; policies. We felt it was important as a committee to have guiding principles/core beliefs about faculty performance reviews, salary adjustments and processes for appealing salary reductions. Including: Faculty have the responsibility to contribute to the mission of the university and their academic units, annual reviews of tenured faculty should consider the balance of research, teaching and service. Faculty salaries may be increased, stay the same or reduced based on performance documented in the faculty members annual review. Faculty have the right to appeal a salary reduction. Faculty review processes and salary reduction appeals processes should be fair and transparent and applied equitably.</p> <p>As we work on developing these University wide guidelines, we keep the guiding principles in mind. The guidelines we are working to develop are around a number of topics which include circumstances when no salary increase or salary reduction for a tenured faculty member may be appropriate, the amount of the salary reduction which might be given to a tenured faculty member, remediation opportunities, processes related to warnings of possible reductions, appeal processes, related to proper oversight. The Committee is continuing to work on this and welcomes your input.</p>	<p>Discussion notes recorded below.</p>
--	---

Questions/Discussion:

Frieze: Is this going to be considered for NTS faculty too?

Kirsch: It has not been given in the charge. The charge has been on Tenured faculty only at this time.

Weinberg: What is the timeline when this might be completed? We have faculty who are going through this now with their salaries being reduced.

Kirsch: My hope is that we will have our report completed in the next few weeks.

Munro: You mention guidelines and policies, are they going to be enforceable policies or guidelines?

Kirsch: I believe the charge was for university wide guidelines.

Munro: Do you know if there will be specific policies or will there be guidelines given to the various schools?

Gold: I assume, we are going to make a report to the Provost and hopefully then it will be added to the bylaws, but that's a good question.

Kirsch: That is something we will follow up on

Norris: TAFC is considering grievances from faculty who are already in the middle of this. What is the status of a moratorium for new faculty cuts and restoration to restore cuts which have already taken place as the ad hoc committee does its work?

Kirsch: I don't know what the status is of the moratorium.

Norris: May I suggest that this committee discuss having a moratorium for the people who in January said they may be receiving cuts this fiscal year?

Kirsch: We can take the suggestion back to the committee.

Costantino: If we feel that way as a committee, can we suggest it to the administration?

Bircher: Yes, we can. We can suggest TAFC draft a resolution.

Miller: What would be the process for having the committee consider these issues for non-tenured faculty?

Frieze: I think the ad hoc nts committee will make a resolution.

Labrinidis: Are there cases were NTS faculty get a salary reduction or are we talking about evaluation and the amount of salary raises? I thought reductions were only happening at tenured stream faculty.

Weinberg: I think non contract renewal is the norm for NTS faculty, I don't know if they get salary reductions. That is a great question.

Spring: The charge was TENURED faculty, not even tenure stream. I think it is appropriate for the ad hoc NTS committee to review, but I don't think it's fair to add it to the Provost's committee (this group's work). The original motion from TAFC targeted TENURED faculty

Tanais: I think it is important to note that we found working on the ad hoc NTS committee, if it's an issue for tenured stream faculty, then it probably is also an issue for NTS faculty. We should be concerned for the overall working conditions for all faculty at this institution, not tenure stream, nts or other.

Savoia: Focusing on just the salary reduction of tenured faculty is the most pressing, but there are plenty of faculty here who are suffering from salary compression. I believe the scope should be broader.

Kirsch: The Provost's Office does monitor salaries. That is an issue that is looked at closely.

Gold: We are also focusing on the evaluation process, how that is done, the warnings or messages sent to the faculty that could trigger a reduction. I think it will be more rigorous, cleaner, more uniformed. Clear messages will be sent rather than vague messages.

Wilson thanked Laurie and Barry and looks forward to reading their final report.

Report & Recommendations from the Senate Council Group on Diversity and Inclusion  
Senate President Frank Wilson

Wilson turned the chair over to Vice President Frieze. The most recent version of the report is on the back table. This group was formed at the request of the Chancellor. He challenged us to begin a campus wide discussion on diversity and inclusion. Representatives from all the constituent groups of Senate Council – student groups, SAC, Frank Wilson as well as Pam Connelly and Kathy Humphrey. We met and came up with an initial draft on how to start a conversation

We initially had four points – they were slightly different, especially #1. It was never the intent to ask for a vote, it was only to start a conversation. In retrospect, we should not have called it "A Pitt Promise for All". We wanted develop a statement of values that everyone participated in creating. The students pointed out, that only undergrad students who came in as freshmen were aware of the "Pitt Promise". Staff and grad students were not familiar with the "Pitt Promise".

Second recommendation – to create an advisory council that would work alongside Pam Connelly's office of Diversity and Inclusion.

Third recommendation – to suggest to the Provost to declare next year the Year of Diversity and Inclusion. It would come with programming and financial support.

Forth recommendation to begin the discussion next week at the Senate Council meeting in march. That typically is not what happens at Senate Council. We agreed we would share with our constituent groups and we did. It was made clear that I violated protocol and didn't appoint other faculty members other than myself. I will do that in the future. I was excited to move forward quickly, so I do apologize. I shared the progress the group was making with TAFC and EIADAC. TAFC had questions regarding terms and meanings of some words, for example "civility". Objections to the term "obligation" and "accountability". Questions about free speech and academic freedom. I took their feedback back to the committee and we tried to make adjustments and revisions.

I went to the EIADAC committee where the feedback seemed to them, that creating a committee, may overlap with what EIADAC is currently doing. That was also never our intent. My idea was that for faculty, EIADAC is the central committee going forward.

A few other notes: instead of "Pitt Promise" I think possibly a value statement. For some people it's simply symbolic. Free speech is an issue for all of us.

President Wilson asked for questions and opened the issue to discussion.

Munro: What is the scope for diversity? Are we talking about under representative minorities, gender, sexual preference, political ideas, everything? I would like to see something spelled out.

Wilson: We think Pitt needs to engage in a discussion about all of these things. We should be doing this without having a serious incident we are responding to.

Weinberg: You are asking us to make an endorsement to move this idea forward. What body would carry this out? Is it the same group who is working on it now?

Wilson: It would not be the same committee. We would work through our existing committees or form a new one. SAC would work through their own groups. Each constituent group would work through their own channels. I would like us to endorse the process continuing.

Bratman: So you are not asking us to endorse the four recommendations?

Wilson: No, I am not.

Bratman: I think we should define the terms. A statement of what diversity means.

Hartman: Are you asking that the diversity specifically spells out the different groups, because it's hard to be all inclusive, what if you leave one out?

Bratman: Not a list of groups, but broad phrasing, at a minimum includes a, b, c, d. Not just about groups, but viewpoints and identities.

Bircher: An ill-defined notion of what constitutes progress favors the status quo. If your definition of your goal is too fuzzy, it's hard to get there and whatever problem you are trying to fix is not truly defined.

Goodhart: It sounds like there will be a single statement of university values; faculty writes their own, staff writes theirs, students, etc. How will it happen?

Wilson: Each constituent group will begin their own discussions, using their own methods. I would like to see the faculty come up with a strong statement on the importance of free speech as a core value. I'm not willing to say what the staff and students would bring in, but at some point all the groups would get together. I don't know if it's possible to develop such a statement, but it would be a goal.

Goodhart: What I'm hearing is what you would like us to endorse is the process where the Faculty Assembly would deliberate on a statement of values, principles, etc. which we would then take to Senate Council to be a contribution of a university wide inclusive conversation about the development of some overarching statement which we would then all approve through that mechanism.

Wilson: I would be happy with that

Goodhart: I think it's valuable and important work. The word "accountability" triggers the sense that there could be sanctions. Faculty get worried if they say something provocative or controversial they will be hung out to dry. There are examples of this happening all around the country. I would hope any statement of values coming from the faculty would strongly encourage the administration also commit to respecting and supporting faculty speech and expression when faculty are engaged in their scholarly and pedagogical activities. If I don't know the administration will support me, then that is a problem. A statement like this should not just focus on diversity and inclusion, but also include the values that are important to supporting the culture that is at the University where we can all feel confident engaging those discussions in the various ways which are appropriate for advancing our scholarship and teaching responsibilities.

Spring: When this first came up at Senate Council there was universal support for moving forward, I think there still is. I'm going to suggest if I look at these recommendations backwards I'm going to say:

#4) – Sure, let's have a discussion

#3) – It's up to the Provost for her to decide what the Year will be.

#2) – It's a little tricky, it talks about a committee structure

#1) - It's a statement of values, how it gets implemented, by who, when it gets implemented, how it accommodates the things Michael Goodhart talked about. Before today, I hadn't thought about the matter of definition. I think I know what diversity means, but what does inclusion mean? I think it is important to spend time defining the terms & goals. It seems we need to endorse this, but say there are a lot of questions about the specifics of what each thing means.

Hravnak: No one can disagree this isn't an important issue. As a member of EIADAC for a number of years, I'm concerned about creating a separate diversity committee. I don't know if people would go to two meetings a month and we might actually be diluting the intent and work that could be done rather than strengthening it. I think we should look at the current structure before creating something new.

Wilson: I understand the concern and that is why I don't want faculty to endorse this specific document, but would rather carry back to the group that the faculty are ready to play an active role in this and we suggest the process move forward and the details

<p>will be part of the process itself. It's clear to me now, that this advisory committee could in a way become divisionary. I'm not for committees which overlap. Hravnak: Good, I think with some tweaks, EIADAC could work.</p> <p>Weinberg: I want to strongly endorse the comments of Michael Goodhart. We are not only interested in protecting speech inside the classroom, but extramural speech which happens outside of the classroom. That has also been part of what is considered the umbrella of Academic Freedom. We have harassment and have policies to deal with that, we say we aren't going to touch anything that is covered by free speech, but where is the space in-between stuff that is covered by free speech and stuff that is harassment? I don't know what is in that space.</p> <p>Gold: Does anyone have an example?</p> <p>Stoner: The fundamental conundrum facing us here, might be that protected speech be in a separate venue</p> <p>Schmidhofer: I fear I'm missing the point, if we are talking about diversity and inclusion and accountability. Free speech and harassment have nothing to do with the people in this room being remarkably similar looking. Who is responsible for that?</p> <p>Savinov: Will people be added to the faculty perspective?</p> <p>Wilson: We want greater faculty participation</p> <p>Bonner: Author of the Pitt Promise was Dr. Robert Gallagher, former Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, approximately 1997.</p> <p>Wilson: I would like us to endorse the continuation of this process not the specific recommendations here. The faculty would like to see this open discussion begin.</p> <p>Bircher: I would phrase it that Faculty Assembly acknowledges receipt of the report in the present form and endorses further activity of this committee.</p>	<p>Passed unanimously, no opposition, no abstentions.</p>
<p><b><u>Announcements</u></b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b><u>Adjournment</u></b> The meeting was called to end by President Wilson.</p>	<p>Adjournment at 4:29pm.</p>

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

**Members attending:**

Beck, Bircher, Bratman, Cohen, Costantino, Dahm, Dewar, Donihi, Fort, Frieze, Gold, Goodhart, Groark, Guterman, Hartman, Hravnak, Jacob, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kear, Labrinidis, Landrigan, Lin C., Marra, Miller,

Molinaro, Morel, Mulvaney, Munro, Nelson L., Norris, Olanyk, Ramsey, Rigotti, Savinov, Savoia, Schmidhofer, Spring, Stoner, Swanson, Tananis, Weinberg, Wilson, Withers

Members not attending:

Alarcon, Atai, Clark, Frank, Gleason, Helbig, Irrgang, Jones, Kanthak, Leers, Lin. J., Loughlin, Mauk, McLaughlin, Muenzer, Mulcahy, Nelson S., Poloyac, Scott, Smolinski, Toto, Velankar, Vieira, Weiss, Yarger

\*Excused attendance:

Buchanich, Cole, Corral, Czerwinski, Flynn, Fusco, Gaddy, Horvath, Kearns, Kovacs, Novy, Rohrer, Skledar, Sukits, Triulzi

Others attending/guests:

Barlow, Bonner, Fedele, Gentz, Kirsch

\*Notified Senate Office