Senate ad hoc Committee to Investigate NTS Faculty Issues
Minutes for April 23, 2014

All members attending EXCEPT Katie Greeno, Marilyn Hravnak and Samuel Tisherman. [All three of them have since resigned from the Committee]

Our agenda was to discuss and revise the report below. Our goal was to prepare a report for presentation at Faculty Assembly on April 29. Changes made at the meeting can be identified with the Track Changes comments below.

Non-Tenure Stream (NTS) Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate NTS Faculty Issues
Recommendations Progress Report for Faculty Assembly April 29, 2014 (April 23 draft)

History: These ideas were developed through a multi-year process of Senate activity in collaboration with the administration:

- After a number of interviews with NTS faculty, and with administrators in the Provost Office as well as Arts and Sciences, and review of several excellent school policies, the Gender Discrimination Initiatives Subcommittee developed a set of initial guidelines that were reviewed and approved by the Senate Anti-Discrimination Policies Committee, the Tenure and Academic Freedom Senate Committee, Faculty Assembly and Senate Council during the summer and fall of 2012-2013 academic year.
- The Guidelines were endorsed by the Provost at the Senate Council meeting on December 5, 2012 where they were presented. As the Provost explained at that time, her office and the deans had already been working on NTS faculty issues for some time, including several of the issues proposed in the Guidelines and would continue to work on these and other issues.
- With the publicity given these Guidelines, members of the original committee were approached about additional issues that had not been fully considered in the Guidelines and suggested that additional work was needed.
- On September 3, 2013, a new Senate Ad Hoc committee was established and charged “with the analysis of university policies and procedures related to non-tenure stream faculty, both part-time and full-time with an eye to adjustments that may need to be made and positioning of responsibility for consideration of these matters within the standing committees of the Senate, as well as identification of issues not currently within the purview of an existing standing committees.” Members are: Irene Frieze [Psychology, TS faculty], Carey Balaban [Provost’s Office liaison], Stephen Ferber [Office of Human Resources liaison], Don Bialostosky [English, TS], Helen Cahalane [Social Work, NTS], Bill Gentz [Univ Library System, NTS], Katie Greeno [Social Work, TS], Marilyn Hravnak [Nursing, NTS], Sue Skledar [Pharmacy, NTS], Jay Sukits [Business, NTS], Cindy Tananis [Education, NTS], Samuel Tisherman [Medicine, TS], Seth Weinberg [Dental
The Ad Hoc Committee has been meeting regularly since September 25, 2013. This report is intended as an update on some of the issues we have been considering. Comments are appreciated. Meeting minutes are posted on the Senate Website.

---------------------------------------------------------------

Initial Recommendations for Faculty Assembly.

1. Although good progress has already been made regarding sensitivity to the special concerns of Non-Tenure Stream faculty (NTS faculty), still more needs to be done. A continuing university-wide culture shift and/or awareness campaign regarding the increased role, presence, and contribution of NTS faculty is needed. We urge the Office of the Provost to continue their university-wide efforts to create a culture that appreciates the increased role, presence and contributions of NTS faculty.

2. The Provost’s Office requires that each school or unit is currently required to have a clear policy/guidelines on NTS faculty appointment, review, and promotion. The unit documents are reviewed regularly by the Provost’s Office and periodically by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for compliance and consistency with University bylaws, policies and procedures. These unit policies are reflected in content of the annual review of the faculty performance. We recommend that units consider making these documents readily accessible on their website to all faculty members in the unit available on the university website.

3. The 1999 Memorandum on Annual Review of the Faculty (http://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-affairs/annual-review.html) indicates that annual letters should explain in clear and specific terms the expectations for the coming year and how these relate to earlier agreed on job duties. We recommend that a statement of progress toward promotion should be considered, as appropriate, to the role of each NTS faculty member in the unit.

4. We have identified features of NTS appointment and promotion guidelines from units that we recommend for consideration as common elements for each school or unit’s NTS promotion document
   a. A list of available possible titles for NTS faculty should be made available to each school or unit. Titles should be made more standard.
   b. Duties of NTS faculty should be clearly specified in initial appointment letters. These duties should be reviewed in annual letters of evaluation.
c. The NTS promotion process should consider “tracks” or “paths” for NTS faculty to achieve longer terms of appointment.

d. The NTS promotion guidelines should include incentives for promotion, which may include, but are not limited to extended contracts, title change, course release, paid or unpaid leave or salary increases.

e. Requirements for granting Emeritus status to NTS faculty should be included. The current Emeritus policy requires an update to clarify the criteria to grant Emeritus status to NTS faculty.

5. Committees that consider appointment and promotion of NTS faculty in each school or unit should have appropriate adequate representation from NTS faculty members.

6. The Senate Budget Policies Committee should periodically review NTS salaries across the university.

issues Not Yet Addressed

1. NTS considerations need to consider part-time as well as full-time NTS faculty. In what ways do the above recommendations differ for full time and part time NTS faculty?

2. What are the guidelines for searches for full time and part time NTS faculty positions? Do affirmative action guidelines need to be followed for part time searches?

3. What faculty development opportunities are NTS faculty given and what should be provided? Should this vary depending on duties?

4. What are the differences in duties for TS and NTS faculty? What should the differences be?

Recommendations about Senate Committee Oversight and Continued Involvement on Identified NTS Issues

A. Admissions and Student Aid. No recommendations.

B. Athletics. No recommendations.

C. Benefits and Welfare. Continue to periodically review benefit policies for NTS faculty.

D. Budget Policies. Periodically review NTS salaries across the university.

E. Bylaws and Procedures. No recommendations.

F. Commonwealth Relations. No recommendations.

G. Community Relations. No recommendations.


I. Educational Policies. Make sure that NTS faculty with teaching duties have input into decisions about curriculum content and curriculum changes in the unit.

J. Equity, Inclusion and Anti-Discrimination Advocacy. No recommendations.

K. Library. Make sure NTS faculty have full access to library resources, when their teaching duties extend beyond their technical contract dates.
L. Plant Utilization and Planning. No recommendations.
M. Student Affairs. No recommendations.
N. Tenure and Academic Freedom. Make sure there is a clear mechanism for NTS faculty to bring grievances and appeals of appointment decisions to the committee.
O. University Press. No recommendations.

April 18, 2014 draft for comments. Initially prepared by Sue Skledar and Irene Frieze, with consultation with Don Bialostosky and Katie Greeno. Earlier modifications based on conversations with members of the administration and Senate officers. This version drafted by Carey Balaban and Irene Frieze, with comments from Cindy Tananis and Seth Weinberg.