

Senate Budget Policies Committee Meeting
December 12, 2014
1:10 pm in 1817 Cathedral of Learning

Members in attendance: John J. Baker (Co-chair), Elian Beniash, Balwant N. Dixit, Beverly Ann Gaddy (Co-chair), Hiro Good, Emily Murphy, Michael Pinsky, Linda Rinaman, Frank Wilson, Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SAC), David DeJong, Amanda Brodish, Richard Henderson, Art Ramicone, Michael Spring, Kimberly Barlow.

Absent: Nasreen Harun (SGB), Travis Ritter (CGS), James Dalton (GPSG), Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Phil Wion.

1. Call to Order at 1:12 pm.
2. Approval of the minutes from the November 21 meetings (if available).
Draft minutes for the October 17, September 19, March 21 and April 18, 2014 meetings were made available in advance to Chair Baker, but not yet to the committee members to review. The minutes will be sent to committee members ahead of the next meeting.
3. Staff Salary Cohort Report:
 - A. A Salary Cohort Analysis, FY98-FY13 was presented by Amanda Brodish. This Analysis had been previously presented to the UPBC. The study analyzed a cohort of faculty and staff who were employed in FY98 and still employed in FY13, and compared their salaries in FY98 and FY13 against four indices shown below:
 - 1) The percentage increase had they received every year from FY98 to FY13 ONLY the maintenance component (%) of the annual salary pools;
 - 2) The inflation rate from FY98 to FY13;
 - 3) The percentage increase had they received every year from FY98 to FY13 at least the full maintenance, merit, market and equity components of the annual salary pools; and,
 - 4) The percentage increase had they received every year from FY98 to FY13 at least the full maintenance, merit, market and equity components of the annual salary pools, plus allocations from academic initiatives.
 - B. Over the 15 years, those consistently receiving only the maintenance % of the salary pool would have seen their salary increase by 28%, which did not keep up with inflation for the same period (43%).
 - C. Those consistently receiving at least the full salary pool (M/M/M/E) during the same 15-year period would have seen their salary increase by 49%.
 - D. Those consistently receiving at least the full salary pool plus academic initiatives during the same 15-year period would have seen their salary increase by 58%.
 - E. This analysis included tenured and non-tenured full time faculty, in all schools and all campuses, who were employed as an Assistant, Associate or full professor in FY98, and as full professors in FY13. It did not include the cohort of faculty who started as assistant professor in FY98 and were associate professors by FY13.

- F. The analysis also included full-time instructors/lecturers who were employed in FY98 and still employed as a full-time instructor or lecturer in FY13. The headcount of 76 was questioned as too low a number, but was thought to be a reflection of a large turnover in instructors/lecturers employed in FY98 who had left the university by FY13.
 - G. For staff, the cohort included those who were employed in FY98 and still employed in FY13, in all schools and all campuses, but without differentiating career paths, pay grades or job classifications.
 - H. Out of over 7000 staff, 1105 were included in the analysis. This seemed a rather low number when the “perception” is that Pitt has many more long-term employees than only about 15%. Art Ramicone offered to look into the numbers, but offered as an explanation a higher turnover rate in professions such as IT and finance: comparatively speaking, Pitt is low pay, therefore there is a high staff turnover.
 - I. Discussion ensued as to whether it would make sense to break the staff into two tiers:
 - a) Those who transferred jobs during the 15-yr period; and,
 - b) Those who stayed in the same job/department.
 - J. The results of this cohort analysis were published in the January 8, 2015 edition of the University Times (<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=33603>). This article shows the percentage of employees in each cohort group in this study whose pay increases **exceeded** each of the 4 indices (maintenance, inflation, M/M/M/E, and M/M/M/E+).
4. Items of new or old business (time permitting or for discussion at a future meeting).
- A. Spring brought up an old-business issue: the salaries of non-tenured faculty. Definitions are still needed.
 - B. Pinsky was under the impression that Irene Freeze’s committee had developed them and that they could be requested from her.
 - C. Spring clarified that they have an interim report, the result of hard work and lots of meeting hours spent on clarifying definitions. He is working with the Provost office on said report. Spring did reiterate Pitt’s definitions for “adjuncts” versus “part-timers”. The former receive no benefits (as that person has a paying, day-job), just an honorarium for a particular service (e.g., a lecture, a specialized course); while the latter teach at Pitt for a living and receive benefits in addition to receiving a salary. Furthermore, a regular part-timer receives benefits and salary, while a temporary part-time receives no benefits (although might be eligible), just a salary. There was consensus that this is rather complex and indeed definitions are needed to correctly understand the diverse employee groups and their compensations.
 - D. Meeting times for the spring term: The group agreed that the 3rd Friday of the month may continue, except for January as David DeJong had a conflict. January’s meeting will take place on Friday, January 23.
5. Adjournment at 2:40 pm