

Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee: Agenda
Friday September 23, 2016, 2 pm
1567 CL

Members in attendance: Elia Beniash, Tyler Bickford, Panos Chrysanthis, Mackey Friedman, Beverly Ann Gaddy (chair), Emily Murphy, Wesley Rohrer, David Rowe, Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SAC), Amanda Brodish, Stephen Wisniewski, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes), Kathleen Hansell-Prigg (SAC ex-officio)

Absent: Cindy Tananis, Samantha Jankowitz (SGB), John Rossmiller (GPSG), Jessica Sevcik (CGS), John Baker, Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Phil Wion, David DeJong, Arthur Ramicone.

Meeting called into order by Chair Gaddy at 2:00 pm

1. Introductions. Continuing and new members introduced themselves as this is the first meeting of the year.
2. Approval of minutes of May 20, 2016 meeting. *Draft minutes was sent to the SPBC members prior to the meeting. Chair Gaddy made corrections to point 2.C. and 6.E. Minutes were approved with edits.*
3. Matters arising, announcements, discussion of monthly meeting time for the year, proposals for new business
 - A. No new matter/announcements
 - B. Chair Gaddy inquired with member about the monthly meeting date/time (3rd Fridays of the month), and whether it needed to be changed. Some members do have conflicts, and no agreement was reached during the meeting. So it was proposed that Adriana would send a Doodle request for available times to set the next
 - C. On new business: a discussion ensued as to whether a salary equity report from the Provost Office is due. Amanda Brodish indicated that it probably would be available in the spring
 - D. Gaddy also summarized the success in reviewing and approving the PBS process, and that this year BPC needs to monitor compliance.
 - E. Gaddy also mentioned that this year the committee should review the salary appeal process for all employees, as currently it sends an employee to raise the issue with the same supervisor that approved the raise. There should be a way to elevate the appeal higher up when deemed necessary.
 - F. Regarding the salary report, Emily Murphy asked whether the report can include the maximum and minimum salaries. It was discussed again that unfortunately this could have the negative effect of identifying certain individuals and their salaries.
 - G. A discussion ensued as to the presentation schedule of the reports from the Provost Office. Nobody could remember exactly the full schedule but Amanda confirmed that the gender equity report is due this year. Adriana indicated that the scheduled was listed in the April 15 minutes [*Gender gap report will present it in the fall, the*

cohort/continuing faculty report is due the fall of 2017, and the part-time faculty report is due in 2018]

- H. Phil Wion inquired whether the “attribution report” was not due. Amanda reminded the BPC that the study is done by the CFO office every 3 years.
 - I. Phil also mentioned the need to have a letter in the University Times about the PBS process, and encourage participation from all parties. There was a discussion about how differently PBS committees may be applying the guidelines/rules.
 - J. Elia Beniash wondered whether the different PBS committees wouldn’t benefit from a joint meeting to exchange their knowledge, and how they implement PBS.
4. State appropriation approved, 2.5% increase for Pitt.
- A. Tyler Bickford inquired what happens next with the 2.5% increase in the state appropriate when 0% was expected (budgeted).
 - B. Frank Wilson shared his thought that it should be usable; BPC had discussed priorities at the prior meeting. Wilson reminded us that BPC can recommend but the Chancellor is who decides the priorities.
 - C. Wesley Rohrer asked if anyone had looked at the salaries of staff. He considers the staff to be a very hard working group of people. Current system of job classifications and staff salary ranges makes it very hard to promote a staff person and he feels we are losing valuable personnel.
5. Proposal for a new peer group for salaries of regional faculty (Gaddy, Wilson, DeJong, Brodish)
- A. Gaddy summarize the issue of currently having a non-comparable group of institutions when analyzing and benchmarking the salaries of regional faculty. Regionals have not been keeping up with faculty salaries in truly comparable institutions. A 2009-2010 proposal was rejected, and she feels there is a need to develop a new comparable peer group.
 - B. Wilson and Gaddy presented what they researched over the summer to create a reasonable benchmarking group for Bradford, Greensburg and Johnstown (not Titusville because it only gives 2-yr degrees). They looked at the Carnegie classification 2015 definitions; then determined that the Federal iPEDs would work better for salary comparison. He distributed 3 handouts. The main criteria was to look for public, non-research driven institutions, within a regional (not national) catchment area. The regional catchment area would only include PA’s bordering states plus VA: NY, NJ, DE, MD, WV, OH.
 - C. Another list was presented that included private institutions as well. It included religious institutions which was said to have lower faculty salaries.
 - D. A shorter subset of institutions was presented after eliminating the private, BA-granting universities as they are not comparable. Wilson explained that Greensburg, for instance, compete with St. Vincent regularly, but following his systematic approach (as presented) St. Vincent was not listed. And this time it was not appropriate to cherry-pick comparable institutions.
 - E. Stephen Wisniewski warned against confusing “comparable” with “competing” institutions.

- F. Amanda presented their research based mostly on 2015 Carnegie Classification of BA colleges in PA and neighboring states plus VA. It produced 139 institutions. Then presented 3 more maps with smaller subsets; first to be excluded: institutions with “primary profession” focus (127 colleges left); then further reducing the area of the regional comparison to eliminate institutions east of Harrisburg, PA, south of Charleston, WV leaving a group of 44 institutions.
- G. Wilson commented that Greensburg regularly sees students and faculty coming from Philadelphia, and Philadelphia’s region. He argued that it should be excluded. In fact, faculty so apply to work in Greensburg from just about everywhere.
- H. Wilson feels that Carnegie criteria is still the most consistent way to classify comparables.

[*The UTimes published a summary on this topic on September 29:*
<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=40432>]

Adriana had to leave by 3:35 pm. While the meeting was ending, she had no record of any actionable moving forward.

Future Meetings: TBD, Adriana will send Doodle request for available times