Minutes
Senate Budget Policies Committee
Friday, December 10, 2021, 2pm
Remote Meeting by Zoom

Attendees:
Tyler Bickford, Autumn Greba, Panos Chrysanthis, Frank Wilson, Steve Wisniewski, Robin Kear, Amanda Brodish, Thurman Wingrove, Vaishali, Adriana Maguina-Ugarte, Emily Murphy, Richard Henderson, Susan Jones, Brian Smith, Gong Tang, Mackey Friedman, Gary Hollibaugh, Reed Douglas, Ryan Yeager, Juan Taboas

Call to order 2:02pm
1. Approve November minutes
   a. Minutes approved after small correction added
2. Matters arising
   a. SharePoint is set up and members are added. Inform Tyler if you are unable to access.
   b. Reminder, we will need a new chair and secretary for next year. Reach out to Tyler if interested in either.
   c. Desire for SBPC to be included in its advisory and guidance capacity in conversations related to the refinement and implementation of the RCM budget
      i. Will continuously touch base to keep this on members’ minds as questions about how to proceed in light of unionization develop.
3. Plan for spring meetings
   a. Continue remote for the spring
4. Changes to annual survey of unit-level Planning and Budgeting Committee members
   a. Priority to have results broken down by school rather than large area
      i. This is being added
   b. Include roster information
      i. Both provided in SharePoint by Thurman
   c. Desire for insight on how are PBCs formed, and at what level do they operate
      i. Election and appointment already accounted for in survey, does not indicate what level the PBC is at. Answered with question #2 in survey
   d. Can we add a question to assess whether PBCs currently feel meaningfully involved in the planning for the RCM model
      i. Deans have not yet received feedback on what is going on in the parallel model. Surveys are on last year’s PBCs who would not have that knowledge.
      ii. May be an interesting question for next year to add when it is more appropriate.
   e. Can committee level take the survey rather than individuals?
      i. Could become an agenda item for the committee itself.
5. Faculty Salaries Peer-group Analysis and Cost-of-Living Adjustments (OTP) (including timeline and plan for meeting faculty salary targets from September and discussion of salary targets for faculty librarians) (Given by Amanda Brodish)
   a. Access to document through SharePoint if one desires to reference later
b. Methodology for parts 1 and 2
   i. Data from annual report from AAUP, based on salaries in Fall 2020 (last year)
   ii. Cost of living in this report: Pittsburgh in middle of pack for COL 17th of 30th.

    c. Tables (Goal is to be the median of the AAU publics, and may become part of union collective bargaining. TBD)
    d. We did not adjust for COL for all AAUs, just the public AAUs in Part 2
    e. Regional campus data in Part 3
      i. Data lagged by 1 year. From 2019–20 because federal IPEDs database itself is lagged.
      ii. Peer group decided upon in 2016 by the SBPC, baccalaureate colleges w/o professional focus in PA and surrounding states plus VA. Excludes NYC schools because of exceptionally high cost of living
      iii. IPEDs handle salary conversions slightly differently, and IPEDs allow us to report visiting faculty at their rank rather than the instructor bucket.
         1. Decile 1 = highest faculty salaries
         2. Decile 10 = lowest faculty salaries
         3. Goal is bottom of 5th or top of 6th decile (median)

    f. Two lingering items:
      i. Pitt target average salary policy for middle of AAUs, though it is generally agreed that this is the middle of the public AAUs.
      ii. Last year, resolution laying out facts that ranks below professor not hitting goal of median
         1. Resolution: make demonstrable progress, and admin put forward plan for full compliance
            a. Unionization now means duty to bargain, so this resolution item is to be tabled for this process.
         iii. Should be a target for faculty librarians. Up to 2015 included this group, but ARL was reporting both faculty and non-faculty librarians which was not the intended scope.
            1. Question about whether we can in the future benchmark librarians again because of definition of peer groups

Meeting adjourned at 3:27pm