Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
2700 Posvar Hall
Tuesday, November 5, 2019

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
Call to Order The meeting was called to order by President Chris Bonneau.	The meeting commenced at 3:00 pm
Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting Bircher pointed to a couple typos to fix, then minutes of October 8, 2019 were approved.	Approved
President's Report What a month it has been in the world of shared governance. Some highlights: • I am pleased to report that the proposed nondiscrimination policy has been pulled from the agenda today. Last week, Senior Vice Chancellor for Engagement Kathy Humphrey met with a group of folks to hear their concerns about the proposed policy. After that conversation, she agreed that the policy should go back to the committee for further deliberation. I think this is a very positive outcome and I want to thank Irene Frieze and Seth Weinberg for their assistance on this issue. The concerns raised were not new, and I wish they were resolved before the last minute. But better late than never. • The interviews for the Senior Vice Chancellor for the Health Sciences are underway. Consistent with his commitment to the faculty, the Chancellor has arranged for a small group of health sciences faculty to meet with the finalists. Working with Vice President Salcido, we identified a representative from each of the health sciences schools as well as the library. After all the interviews are completed, we will prepare a report to send to the Chancellor assessing each candidate's strengths as well as any concerns the group has. This level of faculty involvement at this stage of a search is unprecedented and is a reaffirmation of the importance of shared governance. • Based on our conversation last meeting, we have arranged for Provost Ann Cudd, Vice Chancellor Kris Davitt, General Counsel Geovette Washington, and a representative from the Senior Vice Chancellor for Research's office to come to faculty assembly at our December meeting to discuss the process by which grants and gifts are screened and vetted. These are the best folks to address questions and concerns by the faculty on this issue.	

• Finally, we will hear from the Faculty Affairs Committee shortly on a recommendation that non-tenure stream faculty be renamed to appointment stream faculty and that "teaching" be added to the list of professorial modifiers that schools can use. I want to heartily endorse this move. Moving away from deficit language like non-tenure stream is important to signal to those colleagues that their work has significant value to the university. Appointment-stream isn't perfect, but many smart people have thought about this and could not come up with anything superior. And it is important for all of our colleagues to have professorial titles. Does anyone here know what Lecturer II means? But we all know what Teaching Associate Professor means. Just like we know what Research Associate Professor means. These changes are more than just cosmetic; they are a step in the direction of providing many of our colleagues the respect and recognition they deserve. Obviously, this is not the end of the conversation. But this is an excellent opportunity to continue moving the ball forward.	
Items of New Business No new items	
Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Loraine Denman and Irene Frieze, Co-Chairs *Denman* summarized the Statement from the FAC on NTS Nomenclature distributed to the members of FA via email, which recommends acceptance of the label "Appointment Stream Faculty" in place of NTS label and the use of standardized professorial titles with modifiers (Teaching, Clinical, Research, or Field) when needed for all faculty. She asked for endorsement of their recommendations. Discussion *Bickford* commented on the proposal by pointing out that lecturers are a consistently used category good for benchmarking the salaries. If they are to be folded into the professorial titles, this could complicate the benchmarking. *Frieze, Bonneau* and *Denman* continued the topic trying to get clarification on how the different categories are used now in the benchmarking process and how the use of lecturer is tied mostly to Arts & Sciences. *Labrinidis* asked whether AAUP (Association of American University Professors) could change their reporting standards. Then *Wilson, Weinberg , Bickford, Roberts* and *Bonneau* talked about the issues associated with the flaws in the benchmarking process (no clear knowledge how other institutions are reporting, possible "do not report" instruction if there is no "lecturer" category, having local practice how to compare different categories).	Report Discussion Vote

Bickford re-stated his position on the issue and introduced another possible consequence of this change which is uncertain: In A&S, a tenure assistant professor outranks a senior lecturer and can vote on the renewal and promotion issues. So it is an important question whether the assistant professor will have saying in the promotion of the teaching full professor? *Triplette* asked Denman for more information on the report's recommendation to further discuss instructor and adjunct titles. *Denman* explained that their conversation with Provost Cudd was more focused on full time faculty, so the Committee just wanted to make sure that the subject of part-time instructors and adjuncts was not forgotten. *Frieze* added that these titles are used very differently across the schools and they should be standardized. Motion from *Faculty Affairs Committee* to endorse Second from *Roberts* Vote: 21 yes's 3 no's 5 abstentions Passed	
Unfinished Business and/or New Business 1. **Pennsylvania Residency Policy** – *Tom Hitter*, Asst. Vice Chancellor for Policy Development and Management and *Beth Stack*, Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Student Financial Services This Policy includes a significant procedural component because it is meant for parents of our students and as one stop source of information. It is largely rewriting the current policy for better clarity. *Gramm* added that the SAAA committee discussed and endorsed this policy though there was one issue that was not resolved: lack of waiver for graduate students. There is no clear path for graduate students to apply for a waiver or grant that would offset the cost of out of state tuition. So we have these concerns that we would address on SAAA committee. *Stoner* asked for clarification of the enrollment definition. If it is a 1st day of a term, then maybe some footnote is needed, because some parents might think it is the day of registration. *Rauktis* asked about students in foster care (from PA but seeking foster care situation in other state). *Stack* responded that they could use the same petition process that non-traditional returning to the state are using. The petition process is designed for students to	Discussion and Vote

point to a special life situation (kids returning to PA to take care of their parents not with an education intent).

The motion to approve this policy came from the SAAA committee. It was voted. Passed unanimously.

2. **Electronic Information and Technology Accessibility Policy** – *Tom Hitter*, Asst. Vice Chancellor for Policy Development and Management and Pam Connelly, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion

Hitter said that it is a new policy. *Connelly* introduced this policy and talked about long history of work on the digital accessibility issue the importance of responding to technology changes and being easily adaptable. So the policy moved some priorities to units. There should be different timelines for EIT on websites (2 years and those in classroom 4 years).

Bratman: Can you talked about affected populations besides visually impaired?

Bedford-Jack responded that the standards reflect all disabilities (those with mobility restrictions, cognitive or hearing impairments)

Salcido asked about university business activities mentioned in the scope of the policy: is it entirety of activities or some activities are excluded a priori? This prompted a lengthier discussion between *Salcido, Connelly, Bedford-Jack, Weinberg* and *Gramm* on how it aligns with fundamental or secondary EIT categories, how exceptions are understood: not all things hosted on the University site are part of University activities, therefore out of scope, but any events by third party hosted by University are in scope, how exceptions can be made for thing we cannot control, how in a classroom setting this policy does not stipulate making the resources available in digital form but making accessible those that are digital.

Bonneau reminded everyone that this policy is needed to comply with federal requirements.

Triplette and *Bratman* provided specific examples to seek guidance how to proceed in order to stay compliant with the policy.

Denman asked about costs associated with policy and *Brickford* wanted to know, since the costs are pushed to the units, if there are any plans to support the units in making EIT accessible.

Connelly and *Bedford-Jack* responded that costs are difficult to estimate, but the idea behind the policy is to make the accessibility requirement an integral part of any process which creates or provides EIT. Since it is not possible to do it at once,

prioritization plans at schools will help us gather the needed information and we have the seeking exception path for cases which cannot be made accessible right away. The answer about financial support was very vague. Connelly stated that policies and procedures at Pitt do not customarily or historically include funding mechanisms, as the budget process is a separate process.

Labrinidis raised the issue of YouTube videos in the class (more embedded or linked to when used in class

Bircher was concerned about level of institutional commitment expressed in non-compliance clause (SVC for Engagement can impose the standard and bill the non-compliant unit for the cost) and added, in a response to *Denman's* comment, that cost of removal is minimal, but the cost of captioning videos "to bring into compliance" might be enormous. This led to more comments exchanged between *Connelly, Denman, Labrinidis,* and *Bedford-Jack.*

Bickford concluded that we are on board with policy, but there are some unanswered questions how it would be implemented and who is responsible for it

Triplette expressed her worry that this policy could change the quality of her teaching (if I have to caption all media, I may not want teach media anymore)

Weinberg added that it may be unintended consequence that people will drop content instead of dealing with this issue.

Connelly said that the accessibility issue will impact all of us, but it is important not to discriminate and having the policy before the Office for Civil Right gets involved gives us a lot of control.

Becker supported the idea, but was against passing the responsibility for compliance to faculty and the units instead of being the university effort. He would like to see more money and people.

Bove presented the opposite view supporting the responsibilities on the unit level instead of coming down from the central administration as more effective since the school will determine how to go about this.

After a short discussion on how to phrase the motion, *Bonneau* asked for a vote to send the policy back to the Committee for more information on resources (to address the raised concerns about funding, responsibilities and implementation)

Motion passed with:
28 yes
3 opposed
1 abstention

Announcements *Bonneau* announced the A&S meeting with the Vice President *David Salcido* following the FA meeting and invited interested faculty to stay. Then, with his usual flair for humor he pointed out to an interesting [article about Ben Bratman](#) who uses his experiences at improv theater to teach his law students an oral argument in the class.	No questions
Adjournment	Moved and accepted at 4:25 pm

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Gosia Fort, Senate Secretary

Members attending:

Aziz, Beck, Becker, Berenbrok, Bickford, Bircher, Bonneau, Bove, Bratman, Brodt, Chirimuuta, Conley, Cousins, Dahm, Danford, Denman, Fort, Frieze, Goundappa, Gramm, Haley, Infanti, Klem, Kohanbash, Kregg-Byers, Kucan, Labrinidis, Molinaro, Nelson, Poljak, Rauktis, Roberts, Salcido, Scott, Stoner, Swigonova, Triplette, Vento, Weinberg, Wilson, Yates

Members not attending:

Adams, Almarza, Bachman, Buchanich, Hall, Irrgang, Jeffrey, Jeong, Jones, Judd, Kanthak, Kaufman, Kaynar, Kiselyov, Long, Martin, McGreevy, Miller, Mulcahy, Munro, Potoski, Sant, Smolinski, Spring, Taboas

*Excused attendance:

Anderson, Bunger, Darnell, De Vallejo, Gaddy, Henker, Kiesling, Kovacs, Landsittel, Loughlin, Morel, Mostern, Mulvaney, Murphy, Popovich, Sukits

Others attending:

Bedford-Jack, Connelly, Graham, Harrell, Hitter, Jones, Manges, Pope, Sciannameo, Stack, Tenney, Tuttle

*Notified Senate Office