

### **Minutes of April 24<sup>th</sup> 2017 Meeting**

The meeting convened at 3:05 p.m. in room 817 Cathedral of Learning.

UPBC members present were: Livingston Alexander, Patricia Beeson, Richard Colwell, Natalie Dall, Beverly Gaddy, Tony Gaskew, Jerry Holder, Kathleen Kelly, Pat Kroboth, Doug Landsittel, Ron Larsen, Monika Losagio, Salim Malakouti, Kathleen Musante, Dean Nelson, Arthur Ramicone, Andrew Rose, Gregory Scott, Alex Toner, and Chad Zutter.

Also present were: Cassie Brenner, Amanda Brodish, Tom Crawford, David DeJong, Rich Henderson, Paul Supowitz, Kathy Tosh, Thurman Wingrove.

UPBC members not present were: Keith Caldwell, Larry Carr, Catherine Lamberton, Arthur Levine, and Frank Wilson.

### **Minutes of March 27<sup>th</sup> 2017 Meeting**

There was a motion to approve the minutes of the March 27<sup>th</sup> 2017 meeting. There was no discussion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### **Report of the Chair**

Beeson noted that Pitt is in a time of planning, with the enrollment plan and facilities capital plan currently ongoing. The current focus of the enrollment plan is undergraduate programs on the Pittsburgh campus; however the impact on graduate programs and the regional campuses is being considered. The facilities capital plan is focusing on the development of capital projects over a 10-year horizon. Pitt is also in the process of developing a campus master plan that considers how the university as a whole will develop over the next 30 years. Inputs into this plan include the enrollment plan, the facilities capital plan, a transportation plan, and a housing market study. In addition, Institutional Advancement is developing a new plan to build capacity for what is needed to lead a successful fundraising effort.

Planning also continues on the Titusville campus. Pitt-Titusville has seen dramatic enrollment declines from a high of 500 FTE 10 years ago to a low of 300 FTE today, a scale that is hard to sustain. These enrollment declines can be explained by the decline in high school graduates in western PA, the enrollment struggles of community colleges, and the enrollment struggles of liberal arts community colleges. The provost's office has been working with President Alexander and members of the Titusville community to determine a good path forward to make the campus an asset to the region.

In terms of fall 2017 admissions, the big admission driver is undergraduates on the Pittsburgh campus. Early indications suggest that we will exceed our admissions target, but it is unclear by how much. Exceeding the admissions target has positive financial implications, but has costs in terms of housing capacity and teaching space. To that end, staff in facilities, the

schools, and the budget office are working to address the variety of contingencies we could be facing.

### **Update on the FY2017 Commonwealth Appropriation**

Paul Supowitz noted that the budget bill that has passed the house and moved on to the senate has flat funding for the state-related universities. He noted that the appropriation chair is hopeful for the possibility of additional funding for the state-related universities, though this seems unlikely given that the state has a \$2.5 billion deficit to address. A big cost-saving strategy in the governor's budget is agency consolidation, and there have been a series of hearings about this consolidation. In general, Supowitz described the mood as cautiously optimistic and believes that the budget will be finalized on time or very close to on time.

On a related topic, Beeson noted that the federal "skinny" budget proposed large cuts to federal research funding, cuts that would have large impact on Pitt's budget. Pitt recently created a position in Washington DC to support advocacy efforts designed to enhance Pitt's profile and impact at the federal level. At the national level, Pitt is working with several partners, including the Association of American Universities and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, to advocate for federal research funding. One of the current challenges is that the budget cuts proposed in the skinny budget are so large that the implementation of smaller cuts would be perceived as a victory, in spite of the devastating impact such cuts would have on colleges and universities.

### **Parameters Subcommittee update and recommendation**

Dean Larsen, chair of the Parameters Subcommittee, thanked the hard work of Art Ramicone's team in providing the numbers that were critical to the activities of Parameters Subcommittee. Larsen presented the recommendations of the Parameters Subcommittee, assuming flat funding from the commonwealth:

- a. A 2.8% tuition increase for both in- and out-of-state students on all campuses.
- b. An allocation of \$2,000,000 for programmatic academic initiatives to provide important funds for investment in our most critical priorities.
- c. A 2.25% salary pool increase (1.5% to maintenance of salary, 0.5% for merit, market, and equity, 0.25% tax at the SVC level).
- d. An additional increase in the faculty salary pool of 0.5% to advance academic initiatives.
- e. Not cut to the Education and General budget.

Recognizing that the budget situation may be more positive than anticipated due to either positive enrollment numbers or an increase in the commonwealth appropriation, Larsen noted that the subcommittee recommended that the maintenance component of the salary pool be increased to 1.75% should additional funds be available. If the budget situation is less positive than anticipated, Larsen noted that the subcommittee recommended, listed in order of priority,

raising the proposed 2.8% tuition increase, imposing targeted budget cuts at the Senior Vice Chancellor (SVC) level, and reducing the proposed 2.25% increase in the compensation pool.

Beeson requested the committee's permission to explore whether the SVCs might want to eliminate the 0.25% tax at their level, or instead roll this directly into the merit, market, and equity component of the salary pool. Such an adjustment could enhance communication of the salary pool increase to the university community. In response, Rich Colwell asked how the salary pool increase will be rolled out and, for example, described in the University Times. Beeson noted that Cheryl Johnson and Susan Rogers are working to make sure there is a clear communication on the salary pool increase process. The permission Beeson requested was granted.

#### **Member vote on the Parameters Subcommittee recommendation**

A motion was made to approve the recommendations made by the Parameters Subcommittee. There was no discussion and the motion was passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

#### **New Business**

There was no new business to discuss.

The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.