

Minutes - Senate Budget Policies Committee
Friday, October 18, 2019
2:00-4:00 pm in 501 Cathedral of Learning

Members in attendance: Tyler Bickford (co-chair), Panos Chrysanthis, Mackey Friedman, Jennifer Lee, John Mendeloff, Emily Murphy (co-chair), Wesley Rohrer, Jennifer Elizabeth Jones (UPPDA), Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SC), John J. Baker, Melanie Scott, Frank Wilson, Amanda Brodish, Richard Henderson, Stephen Wisniewski, Susan Jones (UTimes), David DeJong (HR).

Absent: Elia Beniash, Yolanda Covington-Ward, Yashar Aucie, (GPSG), Brian Smith (SC), Beverly Ann Gaddy, Phil Wion, Narahari Sastry, Thurman Wingrove, 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 September minutes

September minutes were approved unanimously as submitted. On 10/25/19 Thurman Wingrove submitted edits to text regarding his presentation which had not been accurately summarized. Edits were inserted before submitting minutes to Lori Molinaro for publication.

2. Matters arising

Tyler Bickford (co-chair) acknowledged and reiterated that this committee will send any financial questions to the Office of the Provost and the Office of the CFO ahead of time.

Bickford also introduced a new matter which was raised at Faculty Assembly regarding the changing of faculty titles. BPC will monitor the procedures are followed.

3. Final Fall 2019 enrollments

Stephen Wisniewski presented the final undergraduate enrollment figures. The target number of students admitted and attending the main campus this fall was 4,205. The actual yield was 4,038. This included DS (A&S) with 2,838 students, Engineering with 504 students, SCI with 188 students, CBA with 325 students, and Nursing with 183 students. About 41% came from out of state, and about 4.4% are international students. International students are distributed across schools; the top 5 schools with more international students are (from higher to lower): SCI, DS, CBA, Engineering, and Nursing. The SAT average score for this class is 1343 (3 points less than last year, but not a statistically significant difference; it is a high average score).

Comparatively with the previous two years, out of state students have been variable. In 2017 there were 38.2% out of state students and in 2018 they represented a 40.4% of the student population. Percentages of international students have remained similar; in 2017 there were 4.3% and in 2018 there were 4.7%.

Bickford inquired about the experience using the (new) student application system (which allows student to apply once to a number of institutions which made it difficult last year to predict how many were seriously interested in Pitt). Wisniewski indicated that the yields in the end did not fluctuate.

Panos Chrysanthis commented that this application system ought to make Pitt more visible.

4. Salary and rank by race

Amanda Brodish presented this report. It is the 1st year that it is presented. She offered that the Gender report (due in January) draws from similar data and that these two reports could be combined in the future if this committee would agree.

Brodish reiterated that this is the first time this analysis is done. A copy of the presentation is found in Box (<https://pitt.box.com/s/6kqexhpowvhs533clqqi0h73g4sj3uzj>). A UTimes report published on 10/24/19, summarizing the presentation can also be found at <https://www.utimes.pitt.edu/news/faculty-racial-equity>.

Questions looked into are: how does racial makeup of Pitt faculty compare to peers? How salaries of Underrepresented Minority (URM) faculty compare to non-URM faculty.

Faculty self-identified race/ethnicity. URM include: Black, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, American Indian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Non-URM are: White, Asian, Other, and Unknown (this are formal federal categories).

To answer question of if Pitt is in line with Peers in terms of racial/ethnic make-up faculty, used IPEDS data for Fall 2017 (last reported/available to date) for the Pittsburgh Campus only. Pitt, as other institutions do, submitted information by rank and tenure status. Pitt reported n=4,083 instructional faculty.

We need to keep in mind that IPEDS considers international faculty a separate group, as another race/ethnic group, even when Pitt has data to classify international faculty by racial/ethnic categories.

In the Tenure Stream (TS): non-URM full professors are distributed as follows 71% white, and 18% Asian; associate professors are 65% white, 20% Asian, and 3-4% internationals; while the assistant professors are 58% white, 20% Asian, but 10% internationals. Across the tables, Pitt compares with other institutions by being about in the bottom third of the pack.

In the non-Tenure Stream (NTS): instructors/lecturers place Pitt in the upper 2/3rds.

Mackey Friedman expressed interest in seeing finetuned data to guide initiatives.

Wesley Rohrer inquired whether we did know this make-up, or did we learn something new?

Wisniewski indicated that it confirms what we knew, and it helps guide initiatives. There is a clear opportunity for improvement with hiring initiatives.

Brodish continued the presentation with data from Pitt's data warehouse. She indicated that the number of faculty include the SoM but not the clinical faculty (non-teaching which are about 1,000 on the main campus). On the Pittsburgh campus, the numbers show a higher percentage of URM faculty in the assistant professor category (11.6% in TS, and 7.7% in NTS), and lower percentages of URM faculty in associate (7.2% in TS; 5% in NTS) and full professors' categories (4.2% in TS; and 2.2% in NTS). URM instructors and lecturers (NTS) are 6.1%. On the regional campuses, the higher percentage of URM faculty are concentrated in different categories. For the TS faculty, the higher percentage of URM faculty is in the associate professor category (5.8%) followed by assistant professors (4.2%) and full professors (3.4%). For the NTS faculty, the higher URM faculty are the instructors & lecturers (9.8%), followed by assistant professors (1.6%). NTS faculty at the associate level, who self-identified as URM is 0%

Chrysanthis inquired whether the data can be segregated by school in an effort to see if there needs to be different hiring initiatives.

John Mendeloff and Friedman were interested in seeing if there was data for earlier years that could be retrieved. Wisniewski indicated that the preference was to measure the future impact of the initiatives that are being initiated, instead of looking at past trends.

John Baker sees similar patterns than in the gender equity study.

Bickford asked what the normal rate of attrition is. Could it explain why the rate of URM full professors is lower than that of assistant professors?

The URM versus non-URM faculty salary comparison at Pitt, by rank, included covariates: gender, TS status, school affiliation. The dependent variable is 9-mo equivalent salary. A regression-based approach was used, as the number of URM faculty is very small. Results revealed no significant impacts for URM status on salary for either the Pittsburgh or regional campuses. However, for both the Pittsburgh and regional campuses, the ratio of salary for URM to non-URM faculty is less than 100% for full professors, perhaps due to the small sample of full professors who are URM.

Brodish suggested a combined gender and racial equity studies (one instead of two), at 2-yr interval, starting next April/May.

Concern about how to go about this was discussed at large. In the end, it was agreed to keep them separately; as they lead to different conversations.

Friedman appreciated this groundbreaking report! And wondered whether taking it beyond, in 5-year time, if an LGBTQ+ equity study could be implemented, although he was unsure about how to gather the needed data. Inquired whether a “data field” could be added to. Brodish indicated that maybe it can be. Friedman agreed that it is very hard for this population to self-identify due to a higher risk of violent acts against them. But COACHE could work.

Bickford asked if the Gender Equity report could be delivered later (currently slated for January). Brodish agreed because the faculty survey is collected by Nov. 1 and her office is busy processing the data.

5. Salary increase and appeals policy oversight—discussion

Bickford introduced university policy 07-09-01 to the committee as one that was identified over the summer as falling under the oversight purview of this committee. It ties in with the staff annual performance appraisals to be directly used/considered when giving raises.

David DeJong, as new Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, indicated that he wants to have 100% compliance of the annual performance appraisal by the next cycle (spring 2020). Acknowledged Dietrich School as a school to model, and currently he is working closely with Michelle Montag, chief of staff for the school. There are several issues with this, but in relation to performance appraisals, how to compensate outperforming staff? Also, the Chancellor wants to see stronger performances across.

Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte confirmed that the DS performance appraisal process is always consistent and on time, open; but she also indicated that while the interest in 100% compliance is more than welcomed, but that the annual performance appraisal is covered in a different university policy (07-05-01).

Conversation then centered around the oversight function of this committee of policy 07-09-01: how to go about it? How to measure? What documents to review? Job descriptions? Appeals? Are the “standards-to-meet” explicit?

Maguiña-Ugarte provided the example of how in the DS, where annual performance appraisals are the standard, there is no review of what the expectations to meet are. Assumption is that I need to follow job description, but it is not explicit.

Bickford: what about faculty? What guidelines does a faculty person have?

DeJong/Baker: the Maher letter set the guidelines that work for faculty; they are not tailor for each discipline, so units need to fine tune accordingly. Laurie Kirsch's office (Faculty Affairs, Development, and Diversity) oversees faculty matters.

For staff matters, DeJong's HR office will be looking into this.

Adjournment at 3:51 pm