

## Minutes of Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

February 2020

---

Date and time:	February 18, 2020, 10:30 am - Noon
Location:	Cathedral 156
Present:	Helen Cahalane, Lorraine Denman, Irene Frieze, Vicki Gamble, Suzanna Gribble, Sandra Guzman, Robin Kear, Laurie Kirsch, Marty Levine, Patrick Loughlin, Carol Mullen, Tom Songer, Amy Tuttle, and Frank Wilson
Absent:	Yodit Betru, Scott Glaser, Morgan Pierce, Juleen Rodakowski, Jay Sukits, and Seth Weinberg

---

**Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order by I. Frieze at 10:32 am. Introductions were made.

1. L. Denman discussed a faculty concern submitted via email regarding criteria for service and NTS faculty. We can make this a future agenda item as it was also discussed in a 2019 listening session
  - a. Those present were in favor of creating a FASC sub-committee, *let Lorraine know if you are interested in participating in the subcommittee.*
  - b. Librarians should be included in the discussion as service is a component of evaluation
  - c. At the root of the issue is the question of what counts as “promotable service”
  - d. R. Kear will forward guidelines regarding library service guidelines
2. January 2020 minutes were approved
3. L. Denman updated the committee that the digital access policy has been approved at faculty senate and is moving forward. Lorraine will be following up with Angela Bedford-Jack and current efforts for supporting the implementation of the policy.
  - a. F. Wilson mentioned that it went through senate council, as well.
4. I. Frieze updated the committee on the status of the anti-discrimination policy. She believes there is a meeting scheduled for policy office to meet with TAFC. K. Pope forwarded links to federal agencies and organizations on how protected classes are determined. I. Frieze and L. Denman have not yet reviewed, but will share links with FASC.
  - a. The policy office has not commented, in writing, on the questions posed by FASC. Possibly waiting until after the meeting with TAFC since concerns were similar. P. Loughlin was curious as to what the other reporting levels were (in January, it was mentioned that 3 reporting levels were available to choose from, the University is choosing the level that matches Title IX). I. Frieze indicated she would write to the police representatives and ask about information on the other reporting levels.
  - b. F. Wilson believes there are still too many objections for the anti-discrimination policy to go through faculty assembly.

5. I. Frieze opened the discussion on the annual review of faculty letter that has not been updated since 1999. The Provost requested that FASC and TAFC review the letter and provide updated language for the letter that is sent from the Provost to campus presidents, deans and heads of schools regarding annual faculty reviews. I. Frieze indicated that coming up with a new letter was difficult between the FASC and TAFC representatives, but they have drafted some guidelines that can be incorporated by the Provost's office for a new letter.
  - a. The committee discussed each item on the list, however, it was onerous for the whole group to discuss individual word choice. P. Loughlin and L. Denman will work together, consolidating the comments from those present and refining some of the points to be presented back to FASC and TAFC down the line. Below is a summary of the broad points that were discussed:
    - i. The opening of the letter should indicate that the annual letter to campus presidents, deans, and heads of schools is for annual review of faculty.
    - ii. Salary recommendations are difficult to capture in a global way, those present were in agreement that point 2 should be eliminated as a guideline.
    - iii. Point #3 could be broken into two points (or a 3a, 3b point), one for tenure/tenure stream faculty and a second for appointment stream as there are different areas of expectation.
    - iv. Point #4. L. Kirsch made a point that there should be specific reference on progress toward promotion (or tenure) within this guideline. Those present were in strong agreement that promotion language and assessment on that progression should be included so that guidance can be given on where someone should focus their effort.
    - v. Point #9. L. Kirsch commented that reference for in-person meetings are especially important for early career faculty. Those present agreed.
    - vi. General comment that "letter" should be replaced by the word "evaluation" as not all units write a letter, but use a more formatted evaluation.
    - vii. T. Songer thanked the sub-committee for their work on this project.
6. L. Kirsch provided an update from the Office of the Provost.
  - a. On March 2, 2020 a workshop on effective faculty performance reviews will be held. A faculty member with human resource experience will be participating. The workshop will be live-streamed, registration required.
  - b. Provost's office would like to recognize faculty in a similar manner to the honors convocation held for undergraduate and graduate students. There are many individual ceremonies to recognize Chancellor's award winners, Provost's award winners, etc. The idea discussed by L. Kirsch with K. Humphrey to hold a single annual faculty honors convocation around February 28<sup>th</sup>. Also, there has been discussion to add stand-alone events to recognize faculty years of service at Pitt (e.g., 10, 20, 30 years of service). Those present were enthusiastic about both ideas and encourage their development.
7. Future meeting dates are scheduled for:
  - a. Tuesday, March 24, 2020 – 10:30- Noon (Cathedral 156)
  - b. Tuesday, April 14, 2020 – 10:30-Noon (location TBD)

**Meeting adjourned at 11:48 am.**