

Minutes - Senate Budget Policies Committee  
Friday, November 15, 2019  
2:00-4:00 pm in 817 Cathedral of Learning

**Members in attendance:** Tyler Bickford (co-chair), Panos Chrysanthis, Yolanda Covington-Ward, Mackey Friedman, John Mendeloff, Emily Murphy (co-chair), Yashar Aucie (GPSG), Jennifer Elizabeth Jones (UPPDA), Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SC), Brian Smith (SC), Frank Wilson, Richard Henderson, Thurman Wingrove, Donovan Harrell (UTimes), Bob Goga (Institutional Research).

**Absent:** Elia Beniash, Jennifer Lee, Wesley Rohrer, John J. Baker, Melanie Scott, Beverly Ann Gaddy, Phil Wion, Amanda Brodish, Narahari Sastry, Stephen Wisniewski, Chris Bonneau.

Call to order

After moving the meeting to 501 Cathedral of Learning due to an overbooking of 817 CL, this meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm.

1. Approve October minutes

October minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

2. Matters arising

There were no matters introduced.

Tyler Bickford (co-chair) took this opportunity to update the members about a “budget primer” presentation at the January meeting, as well as a discussion about how the UPBC budget and planning process works (in February).

Bickford also reminded the members that, in relation to University Policy 07-09-01 (Personnel, Salary Administration regarding Salary Increases), Steve Wisniewski is finding out from Faculty Affairs what the process is for faculty, and Dave DeJong is looking into the equivalent staff process.

3. Faculty Salaries Peer-group Analysis (IR)

Bob Goga presented the annual report: “Average Salaries of Faculty. A Peer Group Analysis 2018-19”. This is regular report which is comparable to previous years reports. As it is customary, School of Medicine faculty is excluded from the analysis. Goga clarified that Visiting “Ranked” professors are to be reported as Instructors

Panos Chrysanthis posed the question regarding what may be a skewed average salary because it includes ranked visiting faculty as they earn more than regular instructors/lecturers. Chrysanthis inquired about whether in the future we can see the average salaries for instructors without including the visiting professors’ salaries.

Goga advised the committee that Penn State University has already opted for classifying instructors/lecturers as ranked professors, which renders their data non-comparable to previous years or to that of most peer institutions.

Chrysanthis reminded the members that this is something Pitt is also pursuing by changing faculty’s working titles.

Bickford inquired whether this committee can continue to receive comparable data. Goga believed so, since the internal data will remain in the system.

As per the salary report, when Pitt is compared with public peer institutions, Pitt's ranking improved by two ranks for associates, assistants, and instructors, but remained the same for full professors and lecturers.

When Pitt is compared to private and public peer institutions, Pitt's rankings comparisons are the same as above, except for full professors who lost one rank

Regional campuses data is for the 2017-18 year as it is based on IPEDS data not AAUP's. Amanda Brodish will be reporting later on the CPI-adjusted salary report.

Further discussion ensued around the changing of faculty working titles. Policy indicates that the goal is to be at/above averages, and currently only full professors are meeting this goal/ If Pitt was to change the titles, this will affect the reports this committee has been receiving; the longitudinal studies will no longer be possible. It will become very important to use internal data (not AAUP/IPEDS) to identify instructors and lecturers under the old model, versus the new model.

Chrysanthis pointed out that, for a while now, several universities have already moved in the direction of change. New model basically identifies Instructors as PhD holders, and Lecturers as MA/MS holders. SCI has "Professors of Practice" also; where would they fall in the classification? Are they included in the report? Goga volunteered to find this out.

Frank Wilson explained that we do have a variability of titles within Pitt. Education does not distinguish TS vs NTS; one could be a professor, associate, assistant, etc. Wilson wondered about why Pitt does not report or consider producing a "All ranks average". It is an average reported by AAUP and IPEDS, and Wilson considers it an important measure. He thinks it is not flattering to Pitt, but it is a good measure.

Bickford indicates that the Gender Salary report does have an all ranks average.

John Mendeloff wondered if it may not obscure information, if seen just by itself.

Wilson agrees that it may pose issues; for instance, say Michigan has a higher number of x professors than Pitt: it may skew the data if it is not normalized.

Bickford proposed two changes to the report:

- (a) To include ranks by percentage
- (b) Segregate internal data next year to continue to have comparable data to prior years (moved and approved by the committee)

Mendeloff questions the purpose of that report. Bickford clarifies that it would to see if Pitt is achieving its goal of meeting average salaries when compared to peers.

#### 4. Discussion of BPC goals and priorities

Bickford inquired whether anyone could report on the budget cuts: are they being felt? If so, at what level? For example, the English department is cutting the number of undergraduate classes, and running fewer classes with more students. With the 0.5% cut in the A&S budget there is no recovery, no hiring temporary teaching positions (to save). English normally hires 60 to 80 part-timers per year; not this year.

Chrysanthis shared that in SCI the opposite is happening due to the high enrollments

Brian Smith inquired about when the (former) Total Rewards data/job classification status report from Dave DeJong would be communicated to staff. He is personally looking forward to the December meeting for this update.

Mendeloff shared that he does not have much personal experience with his unit's PBC. He participated in one in the past. But wondered about trying to have a more in-depth analysis/report of the unit/RC? E.g., "if we do X will it improve student enrollment?" (if that's a priority) or any other priority.

Bickford will share, before the December meeting, the PBC survey materials from the last survey, to see where the survey can be improved to gather more in-depth information. Would meeting with PBCs face-to-face to talk about best practices be useful? A discussion about the feasibility and timing of those meetings ensued. Meetings are scheduled usually in January & February to meet the March 1 deadline imposed by Provost office.

Chrysanthis would like to know if the committees' compositions are true to form/policies; are they representative of their constituents or just composed of administrators?

Student representative Jennifer Jones inquired if a report on post-doc salaries can be prepared for this committee. She was informed that there was not such a report at the moment but there was agreement that this is something to be looked at. NIH has data and could be a good parameter for science disciplines. Chrysanthis knows that the Provost office is looking into this.

Bickford will include this as a matter arising in the December meeting.

Adjournment