Members in attendance: Elia Beniash, Tyler Bickford (secretary), Anthony Bledsoe, Panos Chrysanthis, Mackey Friedman, Beverly Gaddy, Emily Murphy, Wesley Rohrer (chair), Maddie Guido (SGB), Adriana Maguina-Ugarte (SAC), Phil Wion, David DeJong, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate President), Steve Wisniewski, Thurman Wingrove

Absent: Laura Fenimore, David Rowe, Shreyas Vamburkar (GPSG), John Baker, Stephen Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Art Ramicone

Meeting called to order by Chair Rohrer at 2:08

1. Minutes from December 8, 2017 meeting approved
2. Rohrer: PBS oversight survey
    o November 2018 meeting created a subcommittee to draft new survey for PBS oversight, to supplement previous survey from 2012. Goal of survey is fact finding. Certain that planning is working well at upper levels. Less certain about how planning and budgeting process is working at lower-levels, hoping to find out. We did not ensure that we had administrative voice at the table.
    o DeJong: when we've done these in the past we've had somebody from our office contribute to ad hoc committee. What you came up with is a good starting point. I'd like Steve or myself to meet again, to calibrate a bit more towards giving us some insights into how we can improve our planning process. Today we will talk broadly about what we are going to do to help schools and units in their planning process.
3. Changes to agenda:
    o The originally scheduled presentation about the Total Rewards process by Cheryl Johnson, VC of Human Resources, has been postponed.
        ▪ Tentative plan to meet in April.
    o Originally scheduled report on university-wide enrollment plan report by David DeJong canceled. Plan is not completed due to changes in strategic planning approach.
    o Planning and Budgeting System oversight survey discussion postponed until subcommittee meets again with representative from Provost's office
    o Added to agenda: discussion of changes to strategic planning process.
4. DeJong: Strategic planning process improvement
    o With all responsibility centers we have an annual reporting process where units report on progress on long-range strategic plans. Over the years we have tried to work with units to make those plans more useful for planning (rather than as PR statements). "What are your goals, what are you doing to make progress, how can you measure your progress."

- New reporting tool: "Update on Strategic Plan Academic Year 2018" (available in BPC box folder)
- For first time since I've been here the Chancellor is presenting to the board an update on university-wide strategic plan, that follows this exact template. He collects updates from units, aggregates them. March 1 every year, units report to us, we evaluate them, and Provost's area PBC also reviews the plans. Results of reviews are conveyed back to the units in the form of a formal report that they share as a public document within their areas
- Chrysanthis: what are the units?
  - DeJong: Provost's area units are a school, a regional campus, a major research center, as well as some business offices, library
- We have been talking with every unit to walk through this new process. We have added section to planning updates on "Challenges and concerns": "Please include challenges/concerns you see on the horizon that may serve as an impediment to achieving your goals for the new year. Also include ideas for remediating these potential barriers."
- Rohrer: you are not seeing detailed plans below the school level, correct?
  - DeJong: in this process, yes.
- Update document Section 2: Measures of success
  - Unit specific indicators reflect reputation of unit: rankings (USNWR), major inputs into rankings (SAT profile of students)
  - Strategic indicators: organized around six major goals of Plan for Pitt.
    - Example: major initiative under Plan for Pitt is more discipline-based approaches to teaching and learning. For example we have a center in School of Engineering doing research on teaching engineering. We want to take that research and make sure that the practices it is pointing to are happening in our classes. Across schools we are trying to launch more of those centers. We want to be known for research in the education of these different areas and we want that research getting into our classrooms. So we want to measure the things we are trying to change—changes in student competency, achievement, etc.
  - Key performance indicators: things we really care about but not necessarily trying to change.
    - Graduation and retention rates (first-year to sophomore)
    - Enrollments
    - If we don't need to change an already high performance indicator, we report on that indicator here
    - One size doesn't fit all. If we have a unit with four programs, with strong retention in three, but fourth is declining, that should be in executive summary, and it should come up in the strategic indicator category.
  - This is a change because reports we have been getting are quantitative but they don't really show what a unit is trying to do.
- Section 3: strategic actions. Here units tell us what they are doing. Organized around goals of Plan for Pitt. Seven buckets: six for each of Plan for Pitt, seventh

shows us what you are doing outside of those categories. We think this should sharpen the plans and give coherence, we really want the units to be thinking strategically about what they want to change.

- We have been working hard with units to help them understand the aspirations that we had in mind when we built the Plan for Pitt. When Nordenberg became Chancellor, we saw that we were not doing very well when it came to teaching—the focus was on getting research done and teaching was second. So he organized our planning around going back to basics to recruit, retain students and get them a job. When Chancellor Gallagher came in to office, he had the luxury of now being a major research university, we want to take it to the next level, to stand out among research universities.
- For example, on educational level, we don't want students just to have a job, we want them to leading a life of impact, to have an impact in what they are doing, we want to prepare them for that success. We can't wait until students retire and ask if they had an impactful life, so we look at Gallup surveys, which say that people who say they led a life of impact were engaged (with communities, families, workplaces)—so let's give students opportunities to be engaged right now, give them opportunities to lead a club, engage in the classroom. We can measure how many people are completing OCC, etc. So we are not as focused on graduation rates, and more on next level questions.
    - o Beniash: this is powerful, but I don't see if filtering down to the level of faculty.
        - DeJong: leadership retreat just focused on that (PowerPoint document distributed today focuses on that).
    - o Beniash: what do you expect by March 1 this year?
        - DeJong: that is not a new deadline, so already built into their calendars. This is also not a major change to reporting, should be doable.
    - o Bickford: potential challenges for data when measures (eg Gallup poll info) become targets.
        - Wisniewski: we do evaluate measures to figure out what is causal or just correlative, we are doing secondary analysis of these measures to determine that they are good measures.
5. Closed session for presentation from Steve Wiesniewski about data reports (including sensitive data).
6. Closed session for presentation from David DeJong about enrollment plan (which is not complete).

Meeting adjourned at 4pm

Next meeting: Friday, February 16, 2–4 p.m., CL 817