

Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee
Friday, January 20, 2017, 2:00 pm
156 CL

Members in attendance: Tyler Bickford, Panos K. Chrysanthis, Beverly Gaddy (chair), Emily Murphy, Salim Malakouti (GPSG), Adriana Maguina-Ugarte (SAC), John J. Baker, Rich Henderson, Dave DeJong, Amanda Brodish, Richard Henderson, Arthur Ramicone, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes), Katie Fike (News Services), Bob Goga

Absent: Elia Beniash, Mackey A. Friedman, Wes Rohrer, David Rowe, Cindy Tananis, Samantha Jankowitz, Jessica Sevcik, Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Phil Wion, Stephen Wisniewski

Meeting called to order by Chair Gaddy (at 2:30 pm)

1. Approval of minutes of December 09, 2016 meeting
 - Minutes were not distributed ahead of time; they will be reviewed at the next meeting.
2. Matters arising, announcements, proposals for new business
 - DeJong suggested “budget helicopter” for this committee [needs clarification?], as it may be a good time to do it now that we are on planning mode.
 - Baker: asked when the mean and median report is due. At this time Robert Goga had not arrived yet, but he was the person to ask about this.
 - Bickford inquired if there will be budget cuts
 - Ramicone indicated that there was a 2.5% net [leftover funds? Needs clarification] from last year’s appropriation. The university will take it in and use it in the new budget planning.
 - Bickford: as per the budget process: can it account what to do with the “extra” in the year it was received?
 - Ramicone clarified that the parameters committee has procedures to cut budget in the year in question if the appropriation received is less than the expected, but none for when Pitt gets extra. Then the extra needs to be puts aside and planned/account for the next year.
3. Discussion of future meeting with newly-hired HR Director Cheryl Johnson. (Maguina-Ugarte)
 - Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte indicated that last month there were questions from the faculty in this committee to learn more about staff salaries, staff promotion procedures, and the job classification system, so an invitation to Cheryl Johnson, the new HR Director, has been extended to attend one of the BPC meetings this Spring to address those questions.
 - Gaddy read a few questions from an email Friedman sent her, since he could not attend as he was home recovering from a seasonal illness:
 - o It is extremely difficult to hire peer/indigenous workers, especially those that do not have preexisting work experience and associated references.
 - o It is extremely difficult to promote existing staff. What one must do instead is create a new position (with a higher classification), open a new applicant search, and etc. This can easily take 4-6 months—and if a better applicant applies, one

must hire them instead. It would be easier simply to reclassify an existing staff member into a higher classification, but in practice that is almost impossible to do. This has major ramifications for morale and retention.

- The job classification system is in practice quite rigid, making it difficult to successfully argue for the creation of new positions with unique but important skills sets to be compensated for equitably, because they are based on faulty comparatives (one Research III could mean extensive nights/weekends work with at-risk communities, while another one is a more standardized 9-5 office job—these are not as comparable as they might seem, for instance).
 - Gaddy was sorry not to see Wes Rohrer today as she knows that at some point last year he had a similar interest in this topic as well. She suggested that faculty with similar questions submit them to Adriana so that they can be forwarded to Johnson prior to her attending a meeting.
 - Chrysanthis indicated that he wanted to get back to his department to see if they had questions that they would like to submit.
 - For Ms. Johnson to attend the February or March meeting would be ideal. Adriana will follow up.
4. Old Business: Analysis of Salary Increases for Full-Time Continuing Faculty, FY 2015 to FY 2016: A revised version of the report from Dec 2016 meeting; the six-page table, “...by rank and salary range” which had been mislabeled has been corrected. (Goga)
- Goga started by indicating that the average salaries of faculty (minus librarians) is rather late this year, as delayed financials, in turn, delayed the report submitted to the AAUP.
 - This report excludes the School of Medicine, non-instructional faculty, and visiting professors.
 - But the AAUP has changed the definition of what constitutes “instruction”; it has been widened to include any faculty with overall effort in instruction greater than 0% (zero percent). Therefore, the report now includes a higher count of faculty.
 - All ranks, but lecturers went down in ranking from last year’s AAUP peer institution list.
 - All ranks, but lecturers went down in ranking from last year’s AAUP peer + Private institutions.
 - Regional campuses are in the middle deciles when compared to IPEDS peer institutions in the large region: DE, MD, NJ, NY, OH, PA, WV, & VA. This is: instructors/lecturers fall in the 6th decile when compared to IPEDS BA institutions.
 - Baker noted that the instructor/lecturer salaries on the main campus and the regionals are similar.
 - DeJong indicated that the Provost Office is still working on bringing up these salaries. For instance, the instructors/lecturers’ salaries are already higher; they want to provide opportunities for these faculty to go up in rank based on merit; maybe also by bringing them over to a tenure-track when they are regulars and performing well. There are also issues with faculty size in some departments (English simply has no more physical space to accommodate an increased TS faculty).
 - Murphy inquired about opportunities for faculty to get a larger salary increase beyond the salary pool.
 - DeJong indicated that this happens regularly where a faculty may get extra for special initiatives.
 - Murphy: and what is the process for salary reconsideration.

- DeJong: the Provost and Chairs identify who will receive the extra salary consideration; it is not for a faculty to “ask” for it.
 - Bickford inquired about whether there are policies to re-balance ranks by gender.
 - DeJong answered that yes, and no at the same time. Male professors are not extricated to bring female counterparts; but Pitt is promoting and mentoring women faculty.
 - Bickford also asked about assistant professor salaries.
 - DeJong responded that Pitt is trying to stay at the middle of the road in relation to peers; but negotiating where needed.
5. If time permits: Discussion on how to investigate salary appeals processes (Gaddy)
- Gaddy re-introduced this issue as she would like to follow a different procedure to request a salary reconsideration appeal. She indicated that every year she has appealed her salary increase with her Dean, the person who decided her salary increase, and she has always been denied a reconsideration. She feels that there should be an appeal policy where the faculty member can appeal to someone (or a committee) other than the individual who made the salary decision. An outside appeal. Appealing to the person who makes the salary decision is not an adequate appeal. There is no outside "check" on the salary decision process.
 - Baker felt that, in his experience, it was very difficult that an “above-Dean” level administrator (say, the Provost) can change a salary decision.
 - DeJong indicated that they look at every case very carefully, especially that the appeal procedures are followed.
 - Discussion ensued about what else can be done, that is not already done, for individuals to appeal their salary.
 - Chrysanthis noted that procedures are in place and are n=known to individuals to prevent reaching a preemptive entanglement.
 - Someone indicated that the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs deals with faculty cases. Nobody was sure about who is the equivalent for staff cases: the HR Director?
 - Baker insisted that a salary reconsideration can be done, but it is a long and laborious process; one needs to show one deserves it. There is no information on comparable cases or peers’ salary decisions to compare merit or other reasons for adjustment. And there is not much margin in the budget for those increases.
 - DeJong offered to look into procedures across schools.

Adjourned at 3:48pm

Next meeting:
 Friday, February 17, 2:00pm, location TBD
 Future meetings @ 2 pm on March 17, April 21, and May 19, 2017
 Location TBD