Minutes of the University Senate Budget Policies Committee
Friday, October 18, 2013
1817 Cathedral of Learning


1. Call to Order: SBPC Chair Baker called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm.

2. Approval of the minutes: Approved with one correction.

3. Annual Faculty Salary Peer Report for the Oakland and Regional Campuses.

   
   B. For the first time, tables for instructors and lecturers were also included, which was much welcomed.
   
   C. Vice Provost DeJong also pointed out that basic science Medical School faculty were not included in the data.
   
   D. M. Pinsky commented that the cohort analysis done two years ago which followed the salaries of the same group of faculty for 15 years indicated that continuing faculty at Pitt do comparatively well relative to inflation, although the current tables show Professor and Associate Professors as dropping in rank.
   
   E. P. Wion was glad to see the numbers (totals) of faculty.
   
   F. B. Gaddy commented that the total numbers of lecturers/instructors seemed low; DeJong pointed out that the totals reflect only full-timers, no part-timers.
   
   G. A discussion ensued regarding the difference between a lecturer and an instructor. DeJong offered that the usage of either term is idiosyncratic by school, and how it fits a given discipline better. Baker commented that instructor is the lowest tenure stream faculty rank, while lecturer is a non-tenure stream appointment.
   
   H. Gaddy commented that the current peer group of IIB schools is not truly comparable with Pitt regional campuses because it includes a large number of religious schools.

4. Effect of Cost of Living Differences in Different Regions of the U.S. on Faculty Salaries.

   A. Amanda Brodish compared 32 peer-AAUP schools, using ACCRA cost of living for Q2 of 2013. She used the city where the university was located or the closest one. The University of Pittsburgh was “set” to a value of 100.
   
   B. For regionals, she used the Sperlings Best Places to live, and the Greensburg campus value was set to 100.
   
   C. For the IIB campuses, since there are too many to use in the comparison (225 in total) she sampled 21 IIB institutions to serve as comparables.
D. After adjusting for cost of living, Pitt Professors and Associate Professors jump to a rank of 10; assistant professors to 12. Lecturers and instructors adjusted salaries are still near the bottom of the ranking.

E. The regional campuses also showed an improved ranking when faculty salaries were adjusted for cost of living. Gaddy expressed concern that the regional IIB campuses are not well-served by the sampling; not true comparables.

F. Pinsky and Baker shared the opinion that the analysis reflects that Pitt is doing relatively well compared to peer schools when adjusted for cost of living.

G. Gaddy feels that the committee needs to look at the part-timers. Greensburg has many of them and feels it is important to know the data about PT instructors/lecturers. M. Spring indicated that this request could be channeled through the ad hoc committee.

H. Spring would like to see a study of “other factors” that make Pittsburgh livable and family friendly.

I. Some portions of the report were published in the Oct. 24, 2013 University Times. The entire report can be viewed at www.utimes.pitt.edu/documents/FacultySalaryCostOfLivingComparison_FY13.pdf.

5. In closed session: Discussion of the draft report on whether University Planning and Budget System policies have been followed in the case of the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences’ proposals to suspend the graduate programs in Classics and German and terminate the graduate program in religious studies.

   A. Two small changes were made in the draft.
   B. The revised draft was approved for release by a 7-2 vote.

6. Items of new or old business (if any and time allows): none.

7. Adjournment.