

## EIADAC Meeting Minutes

3/24/16, 11:00 a.m.

Attendance: Claude Mauk, Kacey Marra, Irene Frieze, David Gau, Kenny Donaldson, Laurie Kirsch, Kathy Blee, Sharon Nelson Le Gall, Katie Pope, Cindy Danford, Nasreen Harun, Kenyon Bonner, Peter Crouch, Paula Davis, Lori Molinaro, Jon Smart

- I. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.
- II. Kacey Marra provided the following summary of Faculty Assembly Meeting on 3/14/16:
  - 1) Discussed allowing Pitt news reporters to committee meetings (permitted, but they have to be announced at the meeting and can be asked to leave for confidential business)
  - 2) Laurie Kirsch and Barry Gold discussed the results of an ad hoc committee discussing new guidelines for FPE and salary adjustments (much discussion ensued, should have final committee report in 3 weeks)
  - 3) Frank Wilson discussed the proposed report and recommendations for the Senate Council Group on Diversity and Inclusion (even more discussion ensued).
    - a. 'Diversity' should be defined
    - b. The whole process should be well-defined before receiving support from faculty assembly
    - c. Pitt promise: Free speech vs respectfulness (Kenyon said it was developed in 1997-99 based on a similar promise at BC)
    - d. Committee needs ad hoc faculty representation
    - e. Schmidhofer: EIADAC has been around for awhile and hasn't accomplished what is needed, also faculty assembly is not diverse
    - f. Marilyn H: pointed out "the mission overlap as well as the practicality of having the same people participating in two groups with nearly identical purposes. Thus consideration should be to have EIADAC be more fully utilized in this capacity, rather than create a separate group. Frank did offer that this recommendation was formulated before they really closely reviewed the mission and membership of EIADAC. I felt like we were finally getting to the point where EIADAC was being recognized and invited to the administrative tables where equity and including discussions and decisions are taking place. My point is that we should more ask that there be a full exploration of the EIADAC mission, and utilize EIADAC to its fullest intended capacity, before there is a decision that an alternative advisory mechanism is needed."
- III. Kacey Marra also gave a summary of Senate Council Meeting on 3/23/16:
  - 1) There was a report from the Chancellor regarding the PA budget. Then he recognized that his 'challenge' in November regarding diversity was unusual, but hoped that we felt it was important.

- 2) Frank opened the discussion on diversity and inclusion, which involved numerous participants.
- 3) An idea was presented to create an ad hoc committee that has one rep from each senate committee.

- IV. Laurie Kirsch provided an update on the proposed policies on sexual misconduct. The policies were presented to the provost in 12/15, then to the Council of Deans in mid-March 2016. Major changes highlighted in the policy include:
- a. Policy and procedures were separated
  - b. Most university employees are now considered “responsible employees” and have to contact the Title IX office immediately if they observe any misconduct.
  - c. Responsible employees cannot maintain confidentiality
  - d. Options for filing complaints are now detailed in the procedures
  - e. Title IX office has a central role in investigating allegations of sexual harassment/misconduct, in conjunction with the Chair/Dean
  - f. The investigative process is now clarified in the procedures
  - g. There are separate investigative processes for students (ie judicial) vs faculty (eg informal or formal)
  - h. The University Review Board has a role in the appeal process as well
- V. A lengthy discussion with the EIADAC members followed:
- a. Paula: Are students brought to campus for outreach programs included in the policy? Laurie Kirsch (LK): Yes.
  - b. Sharon: What if the victim doesn’t send out clear signals? LK: Bystanders are included.
  - c. Irene: Section IV, Page 3: “unwelcome” is ambiguous because it’s not evident that it’s unwelcome to the victim. Kathy Blee (KB): This is covered in IV, open category, including “not limited” and “other acts”
  - d. Irene: Page 3, #3: it is possible for young faculty to be harassed by students, should clarify the “power differentiation” reference
  - e. Irene: Procedures, page 3: Does the Board of Trustees (BOT) have a duty to report misconduct, and if so, is that clear? KB: Yes and it was raised at the BOT meeting. Further discussion on this topic: Claude: can we write this into the policy?
  - f. Paula: Policy, #2, final paragraph, the university will act to end the conduct to be found to be correct first, if the conduct actually exists. Katie Pope (KP): This is reflected in procedures.
  - g. Irene: Page 4, procedures: language differs here (victim. accused); there are rights for the accused, but not clear that all rights of both victim and accused are protected during investigation; KB: Add “fair” to procedures, page 3.
  - h. Irene: Page 10, formal process, identity of parties...”parties” is ambiguous. LK: we will clarify this.
  - i. Sharon: To whom does the Title IX coordinator report to? KP: Pam Connelly, who reports to Kathy Humphreys, who reports to the Chancellor, who reports to the BOT.

- j. Irene: on the last page, not clear what is meant by “any crime was made.” LK: Legally, we have to use verbiage from the Office of Civil Rights. Irene: needs more clarification. KB: we can flip sections d and e to make it more clear.
  - k. Sharon: Where will this policy be housed? LK: Either health and safety or create a new category. Currently, it’s listed in Policies for Personnel, but committee suggested it be housed somewhere accessible for the entire community, as students may not consider themselves personnel.
- VI. At this point, EIADAC attempted to vote for endorsement of the policy/procedures. There were not the minimum required 5 voting members present. Therefore, the policy was emailed to the committee.
- VII. Next topic: Laurie Kirsch discussed the changes in the student-faculty relationship policy, which has been expanded to include staff. Highlights of the changes include:
- a. Faculty/staff/student intimate relationships are prohibited, if there is a supervisory role
  - b. Faculty/staff/student intimate relationships if there is not a supervisory role is “strongly discouraged”
  - c. If the relationship begins before supervisory roles, the relationship must be disclosed immediately
  - d. Questions from Kacey: is ‘strongly discouraged’ a legal term? LK: No but there can be ramifications if the relationship affects the environment
  - e. Kacey: What if freshman are 17 years old? KP: then that is child abuse and under a different policy
  - f. Sharon: does this document accommodate diversity?
  - g. Irene: the document was predominantly written by women
  - h. Paula: please elaborate on strongly discouraged vs prohibited.
  - i. Kenyon: prohibiting all relationships is overreaching.
  - j. Irene: Pitt shouldn’t tell people who they can love
  - k. Sharon: When should consensual relationships be disclosed? LK: Immediately.
  - l. Kathy Blee: Undergrads have wider, more diffuse relationships so it is not possible to determine who is in supervisory roles
  - m. Irene: the policy is more relevant to graduate students
- VIII. Claude mentioned that we will help plan the 2017 Plenary Session, and Ellen Ansell wants to work over the summer.
- IX. Claude announced he is not running for chair next year. ☹

Meeting ended at 12:31 p.m.