

## Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes

Via Zoom

Wednesday, May 11, 2022

### 1. Call to Order

President Robin Kear called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

### 2. Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting

Kear asked for motion to approve the minutes. On a motion duly made and seconded the minutes of the April 13, 2022 Faculty Assembly Meeting were approved as written.

### 3. Items of New Business.

No new items.

### 4. Report of the Senate President, Robin Kear (*submitted in written form*)

*I will try to give a brief report today as we have a full agenda. I looked back over all our activity over the past year, and it has been busy.*

- Specific items we have worked on this year, in no particular order: Interim COVID-19 Vaccine Policy; permanent COVID-19 Vaccine Policy formulation; Pandemic-related Teaching Issues; creation of the Dependent Care Ad Hoc Committee (they will update us in September); various efforts around Budget Model ReSTART; Campus Safety issues; Committee Mission Statements to include diversity, equity, and inclusion; Senate Plenary on Community Engaged Scholarship; recommendations for promotion & tenure; broadened Type A interpretation; Removal of the COVID-19 guidelines for Travel; and more.*
- 5 resolutions were approved this academic year, including two related to academic freedom.*
- 5 University Policies made it through shared governance this year.*
- In addition to countless meetings and attending as many Senate Committee meetings as I could, I represented your interests on the University Planning and Budget Committee, the Resilience Steering Committee, during the Middle States Reaccreditation Visit, the Paid Holiday Committee from HR that recommended Juneteenth as a University Holiday, and with the Pennsylvania state-related Senate leadership gatherings.*
- Thank you all for your time and effort in shared governance, and a big thank you to all of the Committee chairs and co-chairs for their hard work this year.*

*Provost memo on interpretation of Type 'A' transfer policy*

- Working with the EIADAC Committee concerns, clarification on the Type 'A' (Temporary Transfer Out of the Tenure Stream) is being sent to the Deans.*

- *This memo recognizes that COVID-19 and resulting pandemic related issues continue to affect some faculty members in their progress toward tenure. The University will interpret the language in Type A about “exceptional circumstances” to include circumstances that are caused by the coronavirus pandemic and related effects including long-term or serious illness (such as long COVID) of the faculty member or immediate family member; dependent care demands, particularly when caused by COVID-19 infections or staffing shortages; expanded duties to meet the learning or mental health needs of students; and interruptions to research caused by, e.g., funding disruptions, travel restrictions, or administrative slowdowns, whether at the University or an external entity. (this list is illustrative not exhaustive)*
- *For tenured and appointment stream faculty, this year the Provost has already expanded the scope of the information that faculty are invited to provide for consideration with their annual review and tenure and promotion materials related to COVID-19 impact. See the 2022 [Memo on Revised Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty](#) related to COVID Impact Statements.*
- *In addition to this guidance, Faculty Affairs in the Provost’s Office plans to provide training for associate deans, chairs, etc., on this topic as well as the various leaves and similar policies.*

*Response to the Budget Policies Committee Resolution from March*

- *We are waiting on the Provost/CFO memo to the deans, although I am told it is being worked on. The goal of the memo is to strengthen the existing PBC structure and hold deans accountable for the functioning of PBCs in their units. Functioning, healthier unit level PBCs with elected and appointed membership are integral to the success of this new budget model.*

*Union Notes*

- *We are not privy to negotiations between the university administration and the union bargaining committee, but we will be monitoring those discussions as best we can over the summer.*
- *We continue to feel strongly that a robust University Senate and a Faculty Assembly that represents ALL of the faculty are vital to shared governance and to ensuring that all voices are heard.*
- *We will be working hard to protect the Senate’s role in shared governance as those discussions move forward, and we invite each of you to join in those efforts.*

*Senate Elections*

- *Thanks to chair Chris Bonneau and the Committee for Elections. Thank you to Lori Molinaro and Linda SantaCasa for running the elections.*
- *Officer and Faculty Assembly elections have closed. Congratulations to Penny Morel, our next Senate Secretary. Congratulations to all those elected to Faculty Assembly.*
- *Thank you to Gosia Fort, our fearless Senate Secretary, for her wise counsel and faithful representations of our deliberations over the past 3 years.*
- *Senate Committee elections have closed. Thank you all for running and congratulations to those that have won seats on the Committees.*

*Diversity Forum Submissions*

- *The 2022 Diversity Forum, Rewiring Our Systems: Transforming the Intersections of Inequity, will take place July 25-28 and focus on engaging the intersections of social identities impacted by systemic oppression. If you'd like to participate, the Office for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion invites you to submit your proposal by May 13. Registration opens May 16.*

*Pitt Advocates*

- *It is state budget season, and we need to communicate the value of Pitt to our state government representatives. As the Chancellor indicated in a campus-wide email, consider joining the Pitt Advocates network from the Office of Government Relations.*

*Any questions or comments?*

There were no questions for President Kear.

## **5. Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate**

### **A. Budget ReSTART presentation**

#### **Provost Ann Cudd and CFO Hari Sastry**

*Provost Cudd explained the framework and engagement efforts. The new model changes how we allocate money, it shifts more decision making to the deans and RCs and it aims to empower the units. The stakeholders were engaged in development of this new model over 10 month period. During this time we had: focus group meetings in 40 RCs, 13 Steering Committee meetings, retreat with all Deans, more than 50 meetings with Deans, regional Campus Presidents and RC Directors, and more than 15 briefings with key stakeholders groups (Council of Deans, SC, BPCP, SBPC, UPBC, and BOT)*

The new model is between the old incremental budget model and completely decentralized model, trying to rectify the shortcomings of either (the incremental model was not transparent and without any incentives for innovation, the extremely decentralized model makes each unit responsible for itself and it has no sympathy for market forces)

CFO Sastry presented the structure of the new model, in which the units are organized by their ability to generate revenue, and divided into Primary RCs (those that generate revenue and cover direct costs like academic RCs or regional RCs) and Support RCs (those that provide services to primary RCs like IT, facilities, libraries, academic administration). He explained the model built on 3 elements: revenue allocation, cost allocation and strategic funding mechanism. The generated money (from all revenue buckets) will be allocated directly to **primary RCs**, from there it will flow to **support RCs** to cover their costs, and through participation fee, to **Strategic Funding** to support initiatives & subvention fund and research initiatives. The better you perform the more you have to finance initiatives.

*Kear (relaying question from chat): Does it apply to SOM?*

*Sastry: No, we did not include SOM in this model, because they are already there, where we*

want to be. So the presented approach is for the non SOM units

*Sastry* explained also that since this model is about aligning your resources with strategies, it is more like the new management model than the budget model. RCs will have ability to set their own priorities and develop plans, incentives to meet or beat their budget targets, and if they are not meeting them, the ability to recalibrate with a help of loan.

*Taboas*: Will this strategic fund be used for the space for growth, which has to be a part of the calculations for new programs or research?

*Sastry*: Yes, space is part of the model. It has to be included in any proposal that come to this strategic advancement fund, but it also provides incentives for not having the space that it is not being used.

*Cudd* talked about the budget decision process flow, which starts with budget development, then submitting the RC resource proposals, going through the review process of Support Responsibility Center Committee (SRCC is a new unit) and UPBC, and finally Executive Budget Committee and UPBC's work is tuned into budget recommendations for the Chancellor and BOT.

*Songer*: How is the oversight of RCs centralized?

*Cudd*: Primary RCs are in charge of the cost/profit reports but with the annual budget review process, the Provost Office and CFO office will be part of discussion.

*Denman*: How the guiding principles and rules are disseminated to the RCs? If you have incentives for growths, this can lead to exploitive practices (large classes).

*Cudd*: We still have curriculum committees, PCUP, USGS, which reviews any changes to the programs, with an additional charge to review proposals for new courses that may compete with offering of other schools.

Provost *Cudd* continued her presentation by talking about the role of the PBCs, efforts to strengthen the existing PBC structure, and the forthcoming memo to address some issues brought up in BPC (like having elected members, bylaws, regular meeting and training modules)

*Labrinidis*: Is there any recognition of fair representation in the guidelines for forming PBCs? What is their role: to decide or just advise the deans?

*Cudd*: Your school is new so it needs to have bylaws. PBC have advisory role.

*Kear* (question from chat): SOM is a functioning RC not included in this model, is there any University administration oversight of its budget management to ensure the same transparency?

*Sastry*: We have not tackle this question yet. *Cudd* added that SOM is subject to the PBS system.

*De Vallejo* commented on the importance of transparency since the SOM faculty makes up half of the Pitt faculty.

*Scott*: How this process will encourage work between schools?

The presentation concluded with talking about the timeline: FY2022 Parallel process, FY 2023 model live (year 1) FY2024 – model live (year 2)

*Songer*: How stable is this plan with the prospect of a new chancellor?

*Cudd*: We are not the first or last to implement a new budget model.

*Denman*: Which aspects of this plan will be more transparent and to whom?

*Sastry*: The cost/revenue allocation by unit would be visible, especially support unit budgets will be more transparent. We plan also to have some information sessions, so the units know what is happening to their budgets between proposal for the last and the next fiscal year (so they see results of their budget plan)

*Bonneau*: We looked at a lot of other schools to craft the model for Pitt, so the notion that this kind of budgetary thinking may change with a new chancellor is highly unlikely, particularly if it is successful. As Hari said it is not model doesn't grow wealth, the thinking and innovation does. Another thing, PBCs will have more information, but whether the unit is on a positive side it relative to their budget goals not their profits.

## **B. Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy** **Professor Shilpa Sant, Co-Chair Research Committee**

*Sant* gave the overview of the new policy, talked about its main points and clarified that ICOI policy is different from the COI form we fill out.

*McCormick* asked for clarification why membership of the committee is restricted to professors in associate rank only.

*Yates* explained that it was intentional to get people with experience of managing university business because a lot of transactions they would be looking at, are highly sophisticated.

After a brief discussion, *Yates* said that language can be modify to indicate that we mean all professors.

*Rutenbar* added that it was a new policy, we did not have anything before, which was rather unusual for the institution of our caliber.

*Kear* called for the vote to approve the policy with the edit suggested by *Yates*.

Vote: Yes – 37, NO – 0, ABSTAIN – 3

Passed.

## **C. Recommendations for Consideration in Promotion and Tenure** **President Robin Kear and Vice President Kris Kanthak**

Kear introduced documents, which are the work of two subcommittees of the Provost's Committee on DEI and Community Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure:

- *Under the leadership of Vice Provost John Wallace, this was a provost level committee that worked through the spring term developing recommendations and guidance surrounding these*

*two areas, Community Engaged Scholarship and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The committee was comprised of 35 faculty from many areas of the university who are engaged in this work.*

- *These recommendations are about recognition giving credit for work people are already doing, and who in the past have not received credit through existing Promotion and Tenure guidelines. These are not requirements.*
- *These will make Pitt like other places where this work is important. It is important to remember that this work looks different from traditional ways of granting tenure. At its core, this is guidance on how to view and assess these kinds of scholarship.*
- *My understanding is that what will be that the Provost would issue a memo to the deans to consider how to include DEI and CES in their respective T&P guidelines. The work of this Provost's Committee is providing the detail, background, and recommendations for the memo.*
- *EIADAC approved the DEI recommendations at their April meeting. Faculty Affairs approved the CES recommendations at their April Meeting.*

Kanthak provided some context. She said that we wanted to be a place that does more of CES and DEI, but we do not have enough experience to assess the work that is being done. The process is about assessing and recognizing in promotion and tenure. It is not all, but it is an important piece. These two documents speak to diverse audience in our university. They are written in a way to be flexible to handle different units: those that are already doing this work (information how their work is going to be recognized), those in the process of doing the work (information how to assess their efforts), and people who are not doing CES or DEI yet (provides a road map).

Frieze was concerned that unfunded research like CES may be unsupported in the light of previous discussion of the budget model.

Bonneau stressed that the new model rewards units that exceed budget targets not how much research dollars they bring. Also, the assumption that CES does not bring money is false.

Kanthak intervened saying that budget is important, but it is more important to talk now about CES and DEI work and leave budget for another time. She answered several question posted through chat.

Provost Wallace added that we have been doing CES work at Pitt for a while and we brought millions of dollars, we have great relations in community and we have tremendous opportunities for CES projects that are transformative to communities not only locally, but in regionally and nationally.

Kear pointed to example of CES mentioned in the document.

De Vallejo commented that any research work should be recognized. He wanted to know if it is possible to combine the two documents for simplicity.

Provost Cudd said that it was not necessary because, if approved, both of these documents would be the base of her memo to the deans instructing them to incorporate the CES DEI recommendations into their guidelines.

Kanthak reiterated that these were good documents. If we do not vote on them today, we will not be able to do anything until the next year.

There were additional comments from the chat in support of not delaying the vote, because both documents proved that CES and DEI work are important to the University.

Vote: YES – 36, NO- 2, ABSTAIN – 1

Recommendations passed.

## **6. Announcements**

The next faculty meeting will be in September.

## **7. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4: 48 pm.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Małgorzata (Gosia) Fort  
Secretary, University Senate

### Members attending:

Almarza, Anderson, Archibald, Bircher, Bonneau, Bove, Brodt, Bungler, Collister, Conley, Damiani, Denman, De Vallejo, Fort, Frieze, Glynn, Guterman, Henker, Kanthak, Kear, Kiesling, Klem, Kohanbash, Kovacs, Labrinidis, Mahboobin, Maier, Massanelli, McCormick, Melnick, Molinaro, Paljug, Paterson, Potoski, Rauptis, Reed, Roberts, Salcido, Sant, Schuster, Scott, Shafiq, Songer, Streeter, Taboas, Tashbook, Wiggins, Zack

### Members not attending:

Bench, Bickford, Buchanich, Burton, Covington-Ward, Hall, Jeffrey, Jeong, Jones, A., Jones, R., Judd, Kiselyov, Kregg-Byers, Lewin, Morel, Mulcahy, Murtazashvili, I., Murtazashvili, J., Newman, Nguyen, Oylar, Stoner, Swigonova, Tokowicz, Triplette, Tudorascu, Vento, Wood, Yates, Yearwood

### \*Excused attendance:

Darnell, Pacella-LaBarbara

### Others attending:

Armony, Cudd, Harding, Houser, Jones, Manges, Pelt, Rutenbar, Sastry, Slevin, Solie, Tenney, Tuttle, Wallace, Wang, Wells, Wilson, B. Yates

\*Notified Senate Office