

**Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee Meeting**  
**February 19, 2016**  
**2:00 pm in 538 William Pitt Union**

**Members in attendance:** Tyler Bickford, Mackey Friedman, Beverly Ann Gaddy (chair), Emily Murphy, Wesley Rohrer, David Rowe, Cindy Tananis, Nick Reslink (SGB), Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SAC), John Baker, Amanda Brodish, Stephen Wisniewski, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes), Robert Goga, Thurman Wingrove.

**Absent:** Elia Beniash, Hiro Good, Jessica Sevcik (CGS), Timothy Folts (GPSG), Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Phil Wion, David DeJong, Arthur Ramicone.

Meeting called at 2:10 pm by Chair Gaddy

1. Approval of the minutes of Friday, December 4, 2015 and Friday, January 15, 2016 meetings  
*Draft minutes were sent to the SPBC members prior to the meeting. Both were approved with an edit to the attendees list on the January meeting submitted via email by Tim Folts (GPSG representative).*
2. Matters arising, announcements, proposals for new business
  - A. None
3. Update on PBS review (B. Gaddy & F. Wilson).
  - A. Frank Wilson indicated that the PBS review is going smoothly, that the committee is mainly proposing changes of style and clarification. They are working with D. DeJong and the Council of Deans' representatives. The final revised version is under review, and it will be then widely disseminated. There is also a survey which A. Brody is coordinating. Wilson expects both (PBS draft and survey) to go out soon.
  - B. Wesley Rohrer, also in the PBS review committee, emphasized that the language and structure is all okay; that this was just an updating process.
  - C. Wilson further commented that it helps making sure it is worked "grassroots" style from the departmental level to the higher levels of the RCs, schools, etc.
  - D. Bev Gaddy also added that there were no changes to procedures.

\* At this point, Amanda Brodish recommended that we allow Robert Goga to present item #5 first, since he may need to leave before her presentation is finished.

5. Mean and Median Salary Report (Bob Goga)
  - A. Goga made his annual presentation of the public report "Mean and Median Salaries of Full-Time Employees – FY 2015"
  - B. No major issues were raised
  - C. Cindy Tananis expressed interest in seeing salary ranges (min. and max. salaries) as she felt that median and mean only told part of the data.

*Note: a thorough summary of this presentation has been published in the March 3, 2016 issue (volume 48, issue 13) of the University Times. For Staff: <http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=38186> and for faculty: <http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=38188>*

4. Proposed survey of University related to PBS review.
  - A. Amanda Brodish summarized the creation of the survey, as a tool of evaluation of usefulness of the PBS
  - B. She looked at the survey conducted in 2002 and added a question about what people felt at the departmental level whether the PBS is followed/understood.
  - C. She tested the survey with the BPC members and noted that the average time to complete was 3 minutes; when writing answers (free text at the end) time goes up to 15 minutes.
  - D. Discussion followed to improve the language of the questions where needed, add a “Do not know” option, how to compose the invitation to take the survey message, etc.
  - E. Wilson inquired about whether the 2002 responses were available for comparative purposes, and what the response rate was.
  - F. Amanda indicated that the 2002 responses were available.
  - G. Target groups will be: faculty, staff, and graduate students; Amanda is hoping to launch on Wednesday, February 24 and the survey will be available until after Spring Break. She would like to have the results back to present at the next BPC meeting.
  - H. Invitation to take the survey will come from BPC as charged by the Senate in collaboration with the Provost Office. There will be no incentive; just a re-direct to UPBC page.
  - I. Amanda also shared a printed draft of what the report would look like; a short discussion ensued. Tananis asked why only 4 response categories and not 5 (which Tananis and Amanda agreed would have capture better answers). The main reason was: to be able to compare to the 2002 survey as that survey had 4 response categories.

*Note: a summary of this presentation has also been published in the March 3, 2016 issue (volume 48, issue 13) of the University Times at <http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=38208>*

*Adjourned by 3:13 pm.*