

Minutes of Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

October 2020

Date and time:	October 6, 2020, 11:00 am – 12:30 pm
Location:	Zoom
Present:	Amerigo Allegreto, Chris Bonneau, Helen Cahalane, Lorraine Denman, Tom Diacovo, Irene Frieze, Vicki Gamble, Suzanna Gribble, , Ashley Hill, Robin Kear, Marty Levine, Patrick Loughlin, Vinayak Sant, Tom Songer, Amy Tuttle, Lu-in Wang
Absent:	Micaela Corn, Sandra Guzman, Morgan Pierce, Jay Sukits, Preeti Venkatesan Seth Weinberg, and Frank Wilson

Call to order – The meeting was called to order by L. Denman at 11:02 am.

General questions, concerns comments

1. Tom Songer – noticing students this term different this term, particularly first year students.
2. P. Loughlin – glad to see the COVID numbers for students and kudos to those with messaging

Approved minutes

3. Vice Provost Update
 - a. Spring 2021, It remains the Provost's position that Flex@Pitt is giving everybody choice. When we do move into guarded posture, students can choose to attend when a room is assigned. Complete freedom of choice in how they attend, both faculty and students. There is a COVID concern/complaint line where issues can be made known.
 - b. Currently working on the plan to implement the University wide tenure and promotion committee, piloting in AY21 with tenured faculty going from associate to full professor. How to seek nominations for committees that will form sub committees.
 - i. I. Frieze does this include the SOM? Yes, the four sub-committees are
 1. School of Medicine (TS or AS)
 2. Branch campuses (all cases)
 3. AS (Pittsburgh)
 4. TS (Pittsburgh Non School of medicine)Subcommittees will not have just those faculty in that stream on committee. Still a need to figure out where the University Librarians will contribute on the committees
 - ii. P. Loughlin encouraged that uniformity across departments and schools could help keep candidates informed about the evaluations. Regarding the subcommittee recommendations he asked how are they different than what is currently going on at Provost level.

- iii. L. Wang stated that currently, Vice-Provosts, who are faculty members, are assigned to review and make recommendations to the Provost. The Provost then makes a recommendation to Chancellor. The new committees will take place of vice-provost review (except in expedited cases or recruitment). Committees would make the recommendation to the Provost. The committees are operating at University level so it doesn't change what is happening at school level. Hoping that committees will be in communication so they can learn about practices from schools and share ways schools can be improved. Between this and revised evaluation guidelines should improve transparency on what faculty need to do to progress.
 - iv. R. Kear asked how will committees be informed of a fast-tracked promotion/tenure recommendation? L. Wang, not sure if the committee will be informed, because things have to be expedited. C. Bonneau said no mechanism for disclosing that there is someone with an expedited case.
 - v. T. Songer inquired regarding the timeline for review and decisions? L. Wang said committees will have designated meeting dates and review all materials at the prescribed times, typical review of cases occurs in the spring at the Provost level. Sometimes the schools are late in getting the materials in, but hopefully a more systematic approach will improve timelines.
 - vi. T. Diacovo said he is often asked where it is in the process, hard for him to help the faculty to understand the timeline and when decisions. L. Wang feels the same concern. SOM so large and has many levels of structure where dossiers are held.
 - vii. L. Denman asked in the formation of the committee is there any information on which schools have similar committee functions to help expedite the process. A lot of the wait time is at the school or department level. It would be helpful to have recommendations from Office of the Provost to schools on ways to be efficient.
 - viii. C. Bonneau in A&S dean has until April 30th so the holdup seems to be at the school level. Tenure materials due to dean October 31st so working on the schedule at the school level is a starting point.
 - ix. L. Denman said it would ease faculty stress to provide clarity on where packages are in the process without contacting the Dean's office directly. She is hoping the transparency of the process and subcommittee formation will help DSAS rethink their work-flow.
 - x. I. Frieze asked what is the process if Dean issues a denial? A. Tuttle said the Dean writes the denial letter to the faculty. I. Frieze commented that the if faculty protests then it enters a grievance process.
- c. Related to the subcommittee discussion, L. Wang mentioned the Chancellor wants to develop standards that take into account, as part of promotion/tenure process faculty

involvement in community engaged research and service. L. Wang is developing standards to understand how to define community engaged research and service, what issues would need to be addressed, and how to properly account for the work that is done which doesn't, for example, result in publication in top journal.

4. IP policy to be voted on tomorrow at Faculty Assembly. Two files shared that include the revised language. I. Frieze summarized that the concerns were addressed in a smaller committee out of faculty assembly, that information was sent back to R. Rutenbar, he convened a committee and communicated with D. Salcido, two changes made:
 - a. In the purpose statement point 3 now reads: "encouraging, incentivizing, recognizing, and safeguarding the interests of innovators, Creators, and the campus community to support the creation and further development of knowledge"
 - b. Under course license point ii now reads "*This license entitles the University to make all traditional, customary or reasonable uses of these works, for educational or administrative purposes consistent with its educational mission and academic norms. This license does not include the right to sub-license Course Materials other than in connection with the University's academic operations.*"
 - c. P. Loughlin understands this policy provides more protections and does not want to take the protections away, but he would recommend that there be some way to revisit the policy after a year or two of experience because a lot of the discussions are happening related to course materials because of the pandemic situation that we were all thrust into.
 - i. C. Bonneau indicated there is a process for faculty to initiate a policy review request.
 - d. L. Denman has concerns around the educational portions. Should have more input from faculty to know if this is the best path forward. Doesn't want to vote "no" because there are good points in the policy, but the policy doesn't include all faculty.
 - e. C. Bonneau has been told that the contract with Outlier is through the end of this term. Discussions have been had between departments currently offering Outlier courses and Office of the Provost. He is cautiously optimistic that faculty will be successful in not having the Outlier contract renewed.
 - f. Discussion on how the committee is going to position itself on the vote. In general, the committee wants to support the policy, still has some reservations, and would like to see the portions related to course development and use of materials revisited.
5. DEI report from the committee
 - a. Report was due 10/1.
 - b. Convene a subcommittee to write the report and to start thinking about these issues as it is one that affects all faculty at Pitt.
 - c. L. Denman going to follow up on email to present and discuss ideas.
6. COACHE data discussion
 - a. Committee will extend an invitation to Amanda Brodish and the Provost's data team on how to make requests on specific data as it relates to faculty.
 - b. Information from the data could be included in DEI issues committee would like to address.

Meeting adjourned 12:34 pm