

**Minutes of the University Senate Budget Policies Committee**  
**Friday, January 29, 2010**

**Present:** Baker (Chair), Barlow (U. Times), Carr, Dixit, Frank, B. Gaddy (UPG), Good, Henderson (Health Sciences), Hart (U. Times), Hughes, Iwema, Milberg, Pinsky (U. Senate), Semcheski (Co-Sec.), Skledar (V.-Chair), Warnick, F. Wilson (UPG), Wion (Co-Sec.)

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of the meeting of December 4, 2009 were approved as circulated.
2. **Report of Chair.** Baker reported that the University's FY 2010 state appropriation has finally been received, after months of delay. He also noted that at the January 26 Faculty Assembly meeting that he reported on the proposed benchmarking standard for faculty salaries at Pitt's regional campuses (report attached). Action was postponed, at the request of regional faculty representatives, until the next meeting.
3. **Proposed salary benchmarking standard for regional campuses.** An extensive discussion of the history of efforts to arrive at a new agreed-upon list of institutions for benchmarking faculty salaries at the regional campuses ensued. Milberg and guests Gaddy and Wilson (UPG) reported great frustration among regional faculty at the process which led to the current proposed "Provost's" list, which includes approximately 255 Carnegie category IIB institutions in the 3 regions contiguous to Pennsylvania (Middle Atlantic, East North Central and South Atlantic). Last year, after long study and extensive discussion, the senates and presidents of the Bradford, Greensburg and Johnstown campuses agreed upon a list (the "Greensburg list") of 128 schools – all the IIB institutions in these 3 regions *except* those identified as "religious." However, last spring the Provost rejected this list, and proposed instead the full list of IIB schools in the 3 regions. According to the regional representatives present, the regional faculties regarded this as a "take it or leave it" proposition, and under the circumstances agreed to "accept" it.

Carr reminded SBPC members that this Committee has deliberately left determination of a new list to interactions between the regional campuses and the Provost's office. He also pointed out that all of the lists considered (including the one previously used, which includes all the IIB campuses of the public AAU institutions) show salaries at Pitt's regionals lagging behind those at the comparison schools. He suggested that at this point the Committee forward to Faculty Assembly two resolutions, one recommending acceptance of the "Provost's list", and the other expressing concern about the process which led to its formulation and acceptance. He also suggested that SBPC might request that the "Greensburg list" be included, as an appendix, in the annual peer group salary report. After further discussion, a "sense of the meeting" resolution supporting his proposal was adopted, by a vote of 6 to 1. It was agreed that Baker would draft the proposed resolutions, circulate them to the Committee for suggestions, and then conduct a vote by e-mail, in time to present the resolutions at the February 23 Faculty Assembly meeting.

For a fuller account of discussion at the meeting and of the history of efforts to arrive at a new benchmarking list, and additional comments by parties involved, see the following articles from

the February 4 issue of the *University Times*:

**Regional salary benchmarking: Faculty claim marginalization**

<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=11103>

**Regional salary benchmarking: Provost, UPB's Alexander respond**

<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=11106>

4. **New business.** Wion updated the Committee on the inflation rates for calendar years 2008 (0.1%) and 2009 (2.7%), to be taken into account in planning for salary raises in next year's (FY 2011) budget. He also urged that the Committee request the annual report on raises not be omitted for the current year, FY 2010, even though there was a salary freeze. Continuity in the reports is important, he argued, and in any case there are bound to be changes despite the freeze, because of retirements and salary adjustments for promotions and market and equity considerations.
5. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned about 1:45 p.m.

Submitted by: Philip K. Wion, Co-Secretary  
2/23/2010

**Report on the Proposed Benchmarking Standard for Faculty Salaries at Pitt's Regional Campuses**  
**January 26, 2010 Faculty Assembly**  
**John J. Baker, Budget Policies Committee Chair**

For about 10 years there has been an off and on discussion with the regional campus faculty about an appropriate group of institutions of higher education against which to benchmark the salaries of our regional campus faculty.

The current benchmark is to compare the salaries of Pitt's regional campus faculty to the salaries of faculty at regional AAU university campuses. Pitt's administration has not found this AAU regional campus benchmark to be good model for Pitt's regional campuses, which are quite different from the regional campuses of other AAU universities.

Discussions on this issue did not go anywhere until about 1 and ½ years ago when the Greensburg faculty proposed a benchmarking standard that became known as the "Greensburg list." The Greensburg list consisted of 128 schools, and was derived by dropping religious schools from the full 255 school list of II B institutions in the AAUP's Middle Atlantic Region, East North Central Region and South Atlantic Region.

The Greensburg list was unanimously approved as a potential benchmarking standard by the regional faculty at all three of our larger regional campuses. However, no one in Pitt's central administration supported the Greensburg list because it eliminated the institutions with the lowest faculty salaries and left on the list the institutions with the highest faculty salaries.

Rather than see the stalemate continue, I urged the regional campus Senate presidents to accept the full 255 school list of II B institutions from the 3 indicated regions. Some regional faculty were

unhappy with this compromise. The Greensburg list was approved by faculty at all 3 regional campuses, had higher average salaries which they felt were fairer and did not include schools (the religious schools) that (they believed) had a different mission from their own.

The 255 school list of II B institutions is far from ideal, but it is not an unreasonable compromise. The average faculty salaries on the full 255 school list are lower than the Greensburg list, but are not unreasonably lower.

According to the Provost's December 21, 2009, letter to Senate President Michael Pinsky, all 3 regional campus Senates and the Regional Campus Presidents have approved the full 255 school list of II B institutions to use for the benchmarking of faculty salaries for Pitt's regional campuses. The Provost has accepted it too, and is now asking the Senate to approve it.