Call to order—The meeting was called to order by L. Denman at 11:00 am.

1. Welcome new members and introductions

2. Review of committee mission statement
   a. Mission statement was briefly reviewed and is available on the Senate Website, along with other information about our committee, including membership and past minutes.

3. Updates from Faculty Assembly/Faculty Senate (Discussion)
   a. COVID-related policies and concerns
      • Information was presented about reported vaccination rates of faculty, students and staff at the Pittsburgh campus as well as the regionals. Rates are posted on the main Pitt webpages
      • P. Loughlin noted that it would be helpful to know about rates within individual classes, but this information is not made available
      • L. Denman reported that she had seen that many faculty were teaching in-person the first two weeks of class, even though there was an option for remote classes for faculty and students.
      • S. Gribble raised the issue of student testing and how faculty can accommodate students who need to quarantine or are sick themselves.
      • P. Loughlin, concerns about the equipment in the room and providing support for students who are quarantining
         ○ R. Kear, concerns she has as well
      • Academic team involved in figuring out the classroom situation.

b. Committee for approved tenure/promotion cases
   • L. Wang had reported at Faculty Assembly about a Provost Advisory Council on Promotion and Tenure that will eventually review promotion and tenure decisions for all faculty.
      ○ Provost’s Office will probably not review decisions for part-time faculty.
      ○ The Council will review decisions for librarians in the Expectation Stream. There are currently none of these in the Health Sciences Library System, although the
new head of this, Renae Barger, reported to us in an e-mail response to our letter, said she plans to work on criteria for promotion of her librarians later this year.

- This committee is not charged with making policy decisions about the criteria for these decisions.

- L. Denman, AS committee challenging because of the variation in roles of the AS faculty. Many people have been on AS faculty committees who can appreciate and have knowledge of the AS issues that broadly impact AS faculty.

- L. Wang clarified she understands there is wide variation, she hasn’t encountered a problem. The committee advises the provost on tenure and promotion cases for TS and AS faculty. Last year was pilot year and only Pittsburgh campus AS subcommittee did not meet because they were not considering AS promotions in the pilot year. This year they will meet but is a learning and planning year for the AS subcommittee. The regional campus will be considering cases from the regional campuses, includes faculty from Pittsburgh campus and the Pittsburgh sub-committee includes regional committee.

- To try and get a handle on the range of variation in the cases that come to the sub-committee. For example, does the committee need to work year-round? Provost makes appointment but receives names from Dean’s and regional campus presidents.

- Weinberg wants to know is this committee doing an administrative service or into giving substantive review of the cases?

- L. Wang, advising the provost on if university standards are being met. Has not seen a case where Provost over-rulled a Dean’s approval. Not there to challenge the legitimacy of the case. Should have been denied earlier if it wasn’t a legitimate candidate.

c. Ongoing DEI initiatives / cluster hires

- A mission statement has been developed for J. Wallace’s office.
  - Support and promote the success of faculty at the University of Pittsburgh
  - John Wallace had reported at Faculty Assembly that 21 faculty (16 black faculty, 5 latinx) cluster hires had been made, in many different disciplines. for black (16) and latinx (5) faculty hiring. He stated.
  - The majority of the hires were in schools in the health sciences schools.
  - Many were in the tenure stream, but some were hired in the appointment stream. There was a hope that these faculty would eventually enter the tenure-stream.
    - S. Weinberg asked about how this process would occur. It was explained that a formal search would have to be done, if a tenure-stream slot was opened, and the cluster-hire faculty member would have to apply for the position, but others might apply as well
    - T. Songer asked about sustainability to continue growing in this way.
      - J. Wallace would like to grow in program of research and involve hires in the This is a four-year initiative and hope they are successful in the other years as they were this year. Live in a region which is a challenge to address the issues of race disparity in academics.
4. Future topics for discussion and ongoing issues with other committees
   a. Faculty salary increases/policies
      • L. Denman, still a lot of questions on salary increases. For example, lecturer salaries in DSAS that have been stagnant. SPBC is looking into and investigating. L. Denman attends the SPBC meetings and first meeting is on September 17.
   b. Outlier report
      • SPBC is putting together a report detailing several of their concerns around this website. Concerns have been raised in faculty assembly.
   c. New budget model
      • Coming to the entire University, slowly described to various units. Still a lot of questions about what the model looks like or what it does. Hoping to have some clarification on that soon.
   d. Anti-discrimination policy
      • No formal recommendation from the committee, still in drafting and revision phase and will go through the policy review process.
      • C. Bonneau, if you look at the flow of workload, it will come to FASC and other committees before going to faculty assembly.

5. Other agenda items for this AY?
   • C. Bonneau, budget restart overview. Designed to align strategic plan with the budget. We have an incremental budget model currently. Align school goals with budget requests. This isn’t something that will be dealt with by individual faculty. Incentivize deans to find new sources of revenue. Increased transparency of who is getting subvention and how much. Presented at council of deans, some concerns raised on how Dean’s would be affected, but apparently general support for direction of having a budget that rewarded strategic initiatives and syncing budgets with strategic plans. Details, like oversight, has not been discussed yet. Next stage is leveraging the shared governance apparatus or create new mechanisms to make sure that there is robust oversight. Not a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) model, but a decentralized system where Dean’s will have more responsibility for the performance of their schools. This year is a parallel year, assessment will be done, we have the operating budget and be able to check what the budget would have been under the new system and then can observe what the numbers look like. AY23 is a pilot year, AY24 goes live. Timeline continues to shift as concerns are raised.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:32 pm