

Minutes
Senate Budget Policies Committee
Friday, February 16, 2018, 2–4 p.m.
CL 817

Members in attendance: Tyler Bickford (secretary), Panos Chrysanthis, Laura Fennimore, Emily Murphy, Wesley Rohrer (chair) Adriana Maguina-Ugarte (SC), John Baker, Phil Wion, Beverly Gaddy, David DeJong, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate President), Katie Fike (UTimes) Steve Wisniewski, Thurman Wingrove, Brian Smith (SC)

Absent: Elia Beniash, Anthony Bledsoe, Mackey Friedman, David Rowe, Maddie Guido (SGB), Shreyas Vamburkar, Art Ramicone

Meeting called to order by Chair Rohrer at 2:01pm

1. Minutes from January 19, 2018 meeting approved

2. Discussion of draft Planning and Budgeting System oversight survey developed by subcommittee of Rohrer, Bickford, Maguina-Ugarte, Murphy, Wion, and DeJong (final survey attached to these minutes and available in BPC box folder)

- Baker: No mention of Attribution study in draft survey
 - Wion: Attribution study is useful for educating PBC members
 - Gaddy: PBC members may not even know attribution study exists, question on survey informs them
- Motion to include “most recent Revenue and Attribution Study” as item in question 7.
 - Motion passed
- Fennimore: When we have this data, what will we do differently?
 - Wion: Senior administration provides guidance to unit heads about PBS process, if the survey shows problems they will address it.
 - Fenimore: I am trying to discern whether this is an audit process or a satisfaction survey. If it is an audit process the individual units would get immediate feedback
 - DeJong: Where we see issues we will need to follow up.
- Chrysanthis: Is expectation that each department has a Planning and Budgeting Committee? If not we need to inform faculty more widely. Computer Science did not have a PBC.
 - Bickford: PBS only requires schools and senior vice chancellor areas to have PBCs. Lower-level PBCs are discretionary. Unit head survey includes a question about decision-making process for establishing lower-level PBCs or not.
 - Rohrer: Public Health only has one for whole school.
 - DeJong: A&S has expectation of department level PBC, surprising that CS did not have such a committee.
 - Baker: When PBS was formed the Dental School started with department-level PBCs, but they were discontinued. Not practical.

- Wion: Original PBS document required PBCs in units at all levels, this was revised to be more practical.
- Gaddy: How will this be distributed?
 - Bickford: First a survey (page 4 of draft) will go to responsibility center unit heads to collect information about PBCs, including contact information for all PBC members. We will use that information to directly survey individual PBC members.
- Gaddy: What is the timeline for implementing the survey?
 - Wingrove: We should be able to have information back by May.
- Motion to approve PBS survey.
 - Motion passed.
 - Bickford will work with Wingrove to implement.

3. Closed sessions for presentation from David DeJong on issues affecting University business plan and regional campuses.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50pm

PHASE 1
PBS Survey of Unit Heads
Senate Budget Policies Committee
February 23, 2018

Planning and Budgeting Committees for FY18 planning cycle

Please provide information about each of the PBCs in your responsibility center.

1. Responsibility Center of PBC [text] [need option to enter multiple unit names if RC has multiple PBCs]
2. Information about PBC members for this unit [need option to enter information for multiple PBC members]
 - Name of PBC member [text]
 - Elected/Appointed [choose one]
 - Ex-Officio [y/n]
 - Ex-Officio with Voting Rights [y/n]
 - Number of Years served on Committee [number]
 - Email address for PBC member [email address field]
 - Title and position of member (assistant professor, dean, chair, program director, etc) [text field]
3. During the planning cycle leading up to FY18, how many times did the PBC in this unit meet? [number]

Additional questions for unit head:

1. Does your responsibility center have PBCs for lower level units (e.g., departments, divisions)? [y/n]
2. What is the process for deciding what lower-level PBCs are appropriate in your RC? (from PBS document section 1.3.1) [text response]

PHASE 2
Survey of FY18 Planning and Budgeting Committee Members
Senate Budget Policies Committee
February 19, 2018

[Survey of individual PBC members, to be sent to individual PBC members identified in Phase 1 survey. Survey should anonymize respondents.]

Dear colleague,

You were a member of a Planning and Budgeting Committee at the University of Pittsburgh during FY 2017, from July 2016 to June 2017, planning toward FY 2018. The Senate Budget Policies Committee is charged with reviewing whether the procedures described in the Planning and Budgeting System document (<http://www.academic.pitt.edu/pb/>) are followed and whether all constituencies involved are provided adequate opportunities to participate in the process and to be informed of its outcomes.

This survey is part of our oversight efforts. Please answer the following questions about your experience on your unit's Planning and Budgeting Committee during the FY18 planning cycle. Your responses will be kept anonymous unless you choose to disclose your identity.

1. Please indicate the academic area in which your PBC resides:
 - a. Arts & Sciences (including CGS and Honors College)
 - b. Health Sciences
 - c. Professional Schools (Business, Education, Engineering, Law, GSPIA, Social Work, Computing and Information)
 - d. Regional Campuses
 - e. Major academic centers and ULS
 - f. University

2. What level unit does your PBC represent?
 - a. Department
 - b. School, Center, or Regional Campus
 - c. Senior Vice Chancellor area
 - d. University

3. What was your role on the Planning and Budgeting Committee?
 - a. Administration
 - b. Faculty
 - c. Staff
 - d. Student

4. Were you the committee chair? [y/n]

5. How many times was your committee scheduled to meet during the last academic year (July 2016–June 2017)? [number]

6. How many times did your PBC meet during the last academic year? [number]
7. Of those meetings how many were primarily conducted:
 - a. In person [number]
 - b. By video or phone conference [number]
 - c. By email or other non-synchronous medium [number]
8. Estimate by percentage (%) the approximate time the Committee spends on the following:
 - a. Budget [percentage]
 - b. Strategic planning [percentage]
 - c. Program development [percentage]
 - d. Other [percentage]

Please specify [for d require text answer]
[text field for optional comment]
9. During your time on the PBC, were you provided relevant data on any or all of the following areas (as specified by the PBS document section 3.3.2):
 - a. Budgets (including sources and uses of funds) [y/n]
 - b. Staffing levels for faculty and staff [y/n]
 - c. Planning assumptions and outcomes [y/n]
 - d. Enrollment patterns [y/n]
 - e. The most recent Revenue and Cost Attribution Study [y/n]
 - f. Other data requested by PBC members [y/n]

Please specify [for e require text answer]
[text field for optional comment]
10. For the most recent operational planning and budgeting cycle, were the members of your PBC provided information about assumptions and projections concerning external circumstances which impact upon the University's planning, such as inflation, demographics, the Commonwealth appropriation, endowment and gift income, and costs of services and supplies? (PBS document section 3.3.3)
[y/n]
[text field for optional comment]
11. The Planning and Budgeting System document states, "Department chairs, heads of the responsibility centers, and senior vice chancellors are responsible for forwarding their areas' proposals to the next higher level, noting any significant alternative recommendations supported by their PBCs and explaining why they have not been incorporated. They shall provide every member of their PBC a copy of the documents forwarded" (PBS document section 1.3.4).

Did you receive a copy of the final recommendations that were forwarded from your area to the next higher level?

[y/n]

[text field for optional comment]

12. Did you have access to the strategic plans of your department/academic area and higher level areas?

[y/n]

[text field for optional comment]

13. To what extent are you as a Committee member satisfied that you have adequate data/information to make informed recommendations?

- a. Considerably satisfied
- b. Moderately satisfied
- c. Somewhat dissatisfied
- d. Considerably dissatisfied

If c or d please explain [for c or d require text response]

14. To what extent are you as a Committee member satisfied that you have the opportunity to ask questions necessary to make informed recommendations?

- a. Considerably satisfied
- b. Moderately satisfied
- c. Somewhat dissatisfied
- d. Considerably dissatisfied

If c or d please explain [for c or d require text response]

15. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the planning and budgeting process in your unit?

- a. Highly effective
- b. Effective
- c. Ineffective
- d. Highly ineffective

If c or d please explain [for c or d require text response]

16. What changes would you suggest in order to make the planning and budgeting process at your level more useful or effective?

[text response]

17. Please provide any comments you have about your perceptions and experiences while serving on the PBC relevant to improving the University's Planning and Budgeting processes.

[text response]

18. Optional: What responsibility center (department, division, school, etc) does your PBC represent?

[text response]

19. Optional: Provide your name and title.
[text response]