Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee Meeting
September 18, 2015
1:10 pm in 1817 Cathedral of Learning

Members in attendance: Mackey Friedman, Beverly Ann Gaddy (chair), Emily Murphy, Wesley Rohrer, Nick Reslink (SGB), Jessica Sevcik (CGS), Timothy Folts (GPSG), Adriana Maguña-Ugarte (SAC), Phil Wion, David DeJong, Stephen Wisniewski, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes), Robert Goga, Thurman Wingrove.


1. Call to order and introductions (1:10 pm), including the new committee chair (Beverly Gaddy) and secretary (Adriana Maguina-Ugarte) who were nominated in May and ran unopposed this past summer.

2. Approval of the minutes from the May 22, 2015 meeting. Draft minutes for the May 22, 2015 were not sent to the SPBC members prior to the meeting. No action taken.

3. Matters arising, announcements, proposals for new business

   A. D. DeJong announced that what the Salary Increases for Full-Time Continuing Faculty from FY 2014-FY2015, presented today by R. Goga, will be further analyzed and compared with peer institutions by factoring the cost of living. This analysis will be presented at the next meeting of the BPC.

4. Decision on meeting days and times for the year.

   A. Chair Gaddy summarized for the committee that for some time this committee had been meeting at 1:10 pm on the 3rd Friday of every month of the academic year, including May. She asked if this time could remain or if it needs to be changed in light of the new AY and the new members’ schedules.

   B. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the better meeting times will be 2:00 pm of every 3rd Friday of the month. The next meeting will take place on Friday, October 16 at 2:00 pm, in 1817 Cathedral of Learning.


   A. This is an annual report presented by R. Goga from Institutional Research titled “Average Salaries of Faculty and Librarians, A Peer Group Analysis 2014-2015”. Goga reiterated for the committee the source of the data as well as the filters used to standardize the data and make it truly comparable. Data is based on AAUP’s report that is published around March-April every year. This is Pitt-submitted data.

   B. DeJong interjected to say that Pitt “shoots” to have salaries at “at least” the median of comparable universities’ salaries.
C. Goga continued to emphasize that this report includes salaries of full-time faculty, who teach on a 9-month contract/year. Research-only faculty are not included (mostly from Engineering and the Health Sciences). The entire School of Medicine is also excluded as usual. Librarians, as faculty, are included but their salaries are standardized to be 9-month equivalent as they have 12-month contracts.

D. DeJong remarked that the Provost Office has been interested for years now to boost instructors’ and lecturers’ salaries as Pitt is not ranking well. Progress has been made but there is still more to be made.

E. Phil Wion’s draft to have a report on salaries of part-timers is still awaiting for “definitions” of what a part-timer is (# courses?, # hours?, per term?, etc.)

F. Frank Wilson added that a lot of work and thought has gone into this draft; but agrees that progress has been made. He gave credit to Institutional research/DeJong for the hard work put into the data analysis.

G. DeJong reiterated that Amanda Brodish will present how she selected part-time faculty and their associated salaries, although that first discussion (as definitions are still being fine-tuned) will take place in executive session.

H. Goga resumed his presentation by reminding the committee that this report compares salaries at two different points in time (snapshots), and it does not represent a cohort study through time.

I. Gaddy indicated that she does not think the regional salaries’ study is enlightening or useful. Wilson agreed a peer institutions listed (AAUP II B category) are not comparables. Many schools in this category do not report every year, table includes private schools in very dissimilar geographic areas, like the south of the US. Many universities simply should not be AAUP II B institutions. Wilson proposes that we come up with peer-group of universities that more correctly compare to Pitt regionals. For instance, St. Vincent and Penn State are comparables. There are also other significant differences like what it takes to earn the salary: 3- or 4-course load/term.

J. The question of “what’s the difference between instructor and lecturer?” was asked. Wilson responded that it varies by school within and between universities. DeJong added that most of the time, instructors at Pitt are tenure stream hires who have not yet finished their dissertation.

K. Goga wrapped up the presentation by recapping how his office gets the salary data directly from HR, it is combed through, sent to the deans or equivalents for their review, then sent back to his office for further combing of the dat. After each case is understood, it can be correctly grouped and analyzed/compared.

Note: a thorough summary of the presentation has been published in the October 1, 2015 issue (volume 48, issue 3) of the University Times (http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=36963).
6. Update on the creation of a part-time salary report (D. DeJong, P. Wion)

7. Adjournment