

**Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee Meeting**  
**April 15, 2016**  
**2:00 pm in 1817 Cathedral of Learning**

**Members in attendance:** Elia Beniash, Tyler Bickford, Beverly Ann Gaddy (chair), Wesley Rohrer, Jessica Sevcik (CGS), Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SAC), Phil Wion, David DeJong, Amanda Brodish, Richard Henderson, Arthur Ramicone, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes)

**Absent:** Mackey Friedman, Hiro Good, Emily Murphy, David Rowe, Cindy Tananis, Nick Reslink (SGB), Timothy Folts (GPSG), John Baker, Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Stephen Wisniewski.

Meeting called at 2:04 pm by Chair Gaddy

1. Approval of the minutes of Friday, April 15, 2016 meeting. *Draft minutes was sent to the SPBC members prior to the meeting. John Baker submitted edits. Minutes were approved with edits.*
2. Matters arising, announcements, proposals for new business.
  - A. None.
3. Report on results of Faculty Assembly's consideration of PBS revisions.
  - A. As expressed during the Faculty Assembly this week, many faculty indicated that they haven't seen budget numbers. But report was passed and that it has gone to the Council of Deans
  - B. Wesley Rohrer proposed that BPC makes sure that PBCs are getting the budget data.
  - C. Frank Wilson hopes that BPC can do this; that is to go over the process and make sure that PBCs are following the guidelines and are getting the budget numbers. Senate Council has it in the agenda for review and/or approval. He also thanked David DeJong , Beverly Gaddy and Rohrer for the efficiency of the review process.
  - D. Gaddy agreed as the revised PBS document is just "a piece of paper" if it is not followed.
  - E. Tyler Bickford said that since he is new to the BPC, he wanted to ask whether there is such an overseeing process in place.
  - F. Philo Wion answered that yes, there is, although BPC has not done it in long time. He recalled a time when BPC used to put a note on the UTimes drawing attention to the PBS and encouraging participation.
  - G. Wion also asked that the Attribution Study be "public information" again, as it is rather important to understanding how the university works.
  - H. Arthur Ramicone confirmed that the attribution study is updated every year; but presented every 3 years or so.
  - I. Wion shared that, as an example, the English Department would go through their budget and allocate funds accordingly, depending on the needs of the particular year(e.g., funds for Grad students going to conferences; how much, how many would depend on the funds available).
  - J. Gaddy read a comment from John Baker (who could not attend): PBCs should also have access to historical data, not just the current year's budget.
  - K. Richard Henderson shared that Health Sciences gets the historical data (5 years' worth),

- but he was not sure if departments get to see.
- L. Wion wondered if local administrators made decisions about whether to share the historical data or not. It is good to have access to it for the better sense of the larger picture.
  - M. Gaddy then asked the committee about how the BPC can ensure that the PBCs follow the guidelines and are getting the data? Can Kathy (*last name?*) send surveys and reminders?
  - N. Bickford was of the opinion that, since people are elected to PBCs, they need to follow procedures and have data.
  - O. Wilson agreed as BPC needs to encourage and promote PBC-level involvement; and then those who become involved need the data.
  - P. Elia Beniash asked who will package the data prior to it being sent “down” to the committees.
  - Q. Ramicone indicated that data can be queried as needed.
  - R. Wion would like to see the BPC to start the follow-up in the fall by sending surveys and reminders.

*Note: a related article (<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=39129>) was printed on the April 28, 2016 issue (volume 48, issue 17) of the University Times.*

- 4. Further analysis of PBS survey results.
  - A. BPC members unanimously indicated that they would like to see the raw data
  - B. DeJong approved it, and Amanda Brodish will eliminate personal information to preserve anonymity prior to sharing it in the next meeting.
- 5. Report on status of freshman recruiting efforts.
  - A. DeJong provided the report as follows: Pitt receives visitors (prospective students/families) at a rate of 900-1000 per week this time of the year. Enrolment is shooting for a 5% smaller class of freshmen given that last year’s class was too large. The target this year is for 3,850 freshmen, which is manageable. Each year is getting worse in the sense that decisions are coming later and later into the year. Prospective freshmen are doing multiple deposits. That said, the quality of students is great as is the diversity in the group. Currently (April 15) there are 488 paid admits.
  - B. Beniash asked that, assuming housing was not an issue, why the limit in the number of freshmen?
  - C. DeJong said Pitt is lacking lab and class space, particularly the former is at a “pinch” point [sp?]
  - D. Beniash also asked about the rate of applications vs. admissions
  - E. DeJong said it was at about 50% which is high. But this year application process was more arduous for kids because we want to make sure that they really want to come, that we are a good match.
  - F. Rohrer asked if Pitt is hurting from the high out-of-state tuition and tuition in general? Do we know why they don’t come? Do they say that’s because of tuition?
  - G. DeJong said that we do not capture that information, but that Pitt knows where they are going instead and not always it is to a cheaper institution. This data can be shared.
  - H. Beniash asked about how graduate students fare.
  - I. DeJong clarified that this is a school-by-school and that it really depends. Pitt continuously benchmarking.

- J. Bickford asked who benchmarks undergrads student class size/tuition?
  - K. DeJong said that there are four undergraduate programs: A&S, CGS, Nursing and Engineering. A group composed of Admissions office, Manfredi's Undergraduate Studies office, and Provost Office personnel meet to learn about target numbers. Decisions are back and forth depending on how the previous year fared, long-term planning, space, dorms, class-size, etc.
  - L. Wion asked about the rates of retention. DeJong said it was 94% from freshman to sophomore
  - M. Rohrer asked about the retention rate from freshman to graduation, to which DeJong explained that it varies greatly by school, but that Engineering's rate is worse than A&S, and A&S rate is at about 84%
  - N. DeJong also mentioned that the regional campuses numbers are lower due to their target audience and going up against Penn State
  - O. DeJong also shared that reducing enrollment directly affects revenue/budget. He will share with organized data for BPC for a closed session.
6. AAUP Salary Report. Link to the most recent AAUP salary report:  
<http://www.aaup.org/report/higher-education-crossroads-annual-report-economic-status-profession-2015-16>
- A. Pitt is not in the report mentioned above because the budget was not completed due to the delay in PA's budget which passed after the AAUP deadline. Other universities also are missing. But today (April 15, 2016), Pitt submitted the data. It includes part-time instructors for fall term only.
  - B. Wion asked if we (BPC) would see the full report and if it would be a yearly report?
  - C. DeJong clarified that it currently is on a 3-year cycle
  - D. Gaddy asked about the continuing faculty (cohort) report, whether it was a yearly report too?
  - E. Brodish clarified that it also was on a 3-year cycle, as well as the gender gap report.
  - F. DeJong said that the Gender gap report will present it in the fall, the cohort/continuing faculty report is due the fall of 2017, and the part-time faculty report is due in 2018.

*Adjourned by 3:24 pm.*