UPBC Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
for the Academic Year 2009-10

What follows is a report from the University Planning and Budget Committee on their activities during the 2009-10 academic year. The report is divided into three sections, summary of activity, planning and budgeting.

Summary of Activity

The UPBC engaged in the following activities during 2009-10.

* Reviewed and approved a recommendation that the ITBD be designated a Center of Excellence in Workforce and Business Development.
* Reviewed and provided feedback on a proposed Program Review Process.
* Prepared a policy for Proposing Major Initiatives and provided a suggested framework for the proposals.
* Reviewed the University's strategic Goals, Objectives, Metrics and Targets, and proposed modifications to some of the objectives.
* Explored the how the UPBC could advance initiatives on the University's four distinctive elements or track and advance initiatives related to graduation and retention, advising, FYE, or Assessment.
* Developed a means to track the status of major construction projects and provide that information to the campus community.
* Reviewed budget 2010-11 budget proposals from the Division Heads and made recommendations to the President.
* Developed a policy on posting budget and financial information to the UPBC website and providing the means to field and respond to planning and budgeting questions from the campus community.

The most significant development is establishing the UPBC website as a source of information for the campus community on budgeted and actual revenue and expenses and on the status of major construction projects and as a channel of communication where budgeting and project status questions from the campus community can be posed and addressed by the UPBC. Preliminary information is currently available but the question and response mechanism will be added and the website will be redesigned for better information display and easier access this fall.

At the end of 2009-1010, the UPBC was exploring the possibility of adding information displays for major initiatives or key objectives. The status of performance on our four elements of distinction were considered, as well as reviewing or initiatives related to graduation and retention, advising, FYE, or Assessment. Determining what information to report, and which initiatives or objectives would most benefit from the added reporting and communication channel remains to be determined.

Planning

Context

The 2008 Strategic Plan for CCSU *is based on the University's Vision and Mission statements and four distinctive elements of CCSU's identity. The Plan comprises seven broadly defined goals and an extensive series of objectives aimed at realizing those goals and advancing the University.* http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=278

During 2008-09, the UPBC completed a revision of CCSU's Vision and Mission statements. The vision statement was substantially revised and it now identifies and incorporates four distinctive elements of CCSU:
- International Education
- Workforce and State Economic Development
- Community Engagement
- Interdisciplinary Studies and Cross-Cultural Initiatives

The Faculty Senate and the President approved the revised Vision and Mission in the spring of 2009, but they have yet to be approved by the CSU Board. The four distinctive elements have been incorporated into the plan despite the lack of official CSU Board approval. The plan already contained objectives related to international education (5.2 & 5.3) workforce development (3.2 and 3.3) and at least indirectly, community engagement (3.1 and 3.5). Currently there are no objectives specifically addressing inter-disciplinary studies and cross-cultural initiatives.

For each objective in the strategic plan the following are specified:
- The executive committee member with primary responsibility or oversight.
- A metric or metrics to measure performance.
- A baseline level of performance.
- A target level of performance (no target date specified).
- Progress to date (the most recent measured level of performance.
- A set of enabling activities.

Strengths. CCSU's current Strategic Plan provides direction, measurable targets and motivation for continuous improvement on each objective, assigns responsibility for each objective, and measurable outcomes to assess progress. Identification of four distinctive elements and their incorporation into the strategic plan have provided some focus.

Weaknesses. CCSU's current Strategic Plan is a set of goals and objectives. It does not prioritize the objectives; it does not specify a desired end state at a specific point in time characterized by target values of the objectives or a key subset of the objectives. Although it identifies enabling activities for each objective, it does not present a set of executable initiatives designed to achieve a desired end state over a specific period of time. As a result the strategic plan is not well suited to support the development and execution of high impact breakthrough initiatives.

<div align="center">

Actions Related to Planning

</div>

Recognition of the ITBD as a Center of Excellence

We reviewed a proposal by the Institute of Technology and Business Development (ITBD) for recognition by the Connecticut State University System (CSUS) and Connecticut Department of Higher Education as a "Center of Excellence in Workforce and Business Development" in the Connecticut State University System. We believed that such recognition was warranted, would further CCSU's workforce and state economic development goals, and would raise the University's profile on this distinctive element. We recommended the Senate approve the resolution. The Senate passed the resolution October 26th, 2009. (See appendix 1)

Program Review Process Proposal

The committee provided input on a draft proposal for a program review process presented By Braden Hosch and Paulette Lemma. The goals for program review process are to meet NEASC standards, monitor problems, improve curricular instruction and student success, and to better allocate resources. The desire was to do this in a low impact manner (building upon yearly annual reports for the 5-year renewal report). Every 5 years the program review will include a 10-page narrative, copies of the past 5 annual reports and be sent to an external reviewer. Two years prior to this there will be a "dry run" with the Provost's Council. 8 departments will do this "dry run" this year.

We expressed concern about lack of data on students after graduation. We expressed concern about the mismatch of an annual report being due in May while the assessment report is due in September. We noted that to be successful, the reports must be seen as "for the programs" rather than "on the programs."   We noted the reviews should be linked to the University strategic plan and to school-level plans as well. We suggested that we takeout section #3 of the annual report template: Contributions to the CCSU strategic plan, for it is too formulaic, replacing it with a broadened section #6 (part 1 addressing whether one met prior year goals— how did you meet goals and future plans from last year? Part 2 of this section noting plans and goals for next year).

Resolution on Policy Proposals

In 2008-09 the committee had worked on a Policy or Initiative Proposal Framework. The goal was to provide a framework that would help ensure that individuals or teams proposing a major initiative or policy change would have sought the appropriate feedback from affected parties and would have addressed resource questions earlier rather than later in the proposal development process. This should help achieve buy-in for worthy projects from the University Community, avoid proposals being derailed and delayed late in the development process and avoid having people spend extensive time developing proposals only to encounter insurmountable obstacles that could have been identified earlier. A draft of proposed framework was included in the 2008-09 annual report of the UPBC presented to the Faculty Senate in October. The President of the Senate requested we refine the framework and present it to the Senate for approval. We did so. The Faculty Senate passed a Resolution on Policy Proposals along with a suggested framework on December 7th, 2009 after being amended to provide clarification of the term "major project." (See appendix 2)

We also passed a resolution that major project proposals come before the UPBC. We did this not to create an obstacle in proposal development, but to encourage those developing proposals or initiatives to use us as a resource to obtain feedback early in the process.

Goals, Objectives, Targets, and Metrics Review

Having revised the Vision and Mission Statements in 2008-09, the committee decided to devote 2009-10 to fostering implementation. In the absence of specified priorities, the committee decided to review the Goals, Objectives, and Metrics in order to identify key objectives. We found that most of the metrics are reported annually. Annual reporting is too infrequent for the metrics to have much value in rapidly identifying problems and preparing countermeasures. We also were not clear on the rationale behind the target levels of performance on each objective.

We solicited feedback from the University community on the goals objectives, targets, and metrics. The bulk of the comments we received were from or through the Provost's Council. There were no changes proposed for any goals. A number of changes were proposed for underlying objectives to goals 1 through 4, reflecting progress that had been made, a refinement of the scope of the objective, or rationalization. We discussed the proposed changes, rejected one, made minor changes to two or three, and accepted the rest of the changes as recommended. The proposed changes were presented to the Faculty Senate April 26th and a motion for approval will be discussed at the May 10, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting. (See appendix 3)

After the review of the objectives had been completed, the committee decided further review of targets and objectives was not likely to yield the actionable measures for high profile objectives we were looking for. We decided to leave it to the parties responsible for the objectives and to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to refine the metrics.

Key Initiative Identification, Monitoring and Support

Rather than look to the objectives for priorities, we elected to take a project-based approach. The object is to find key initiatives and major projects on campus, identify their resource needs, determine if their is any way the UPBC can assist their planning and reporting processes to promote successful execution, and monitor their progress to raise the visibility and the level of support they receive in the University community.

Since the distinctive elements have provided focus we first explored those areas. Braden Hosch provided reports that to date the University has not developed the taxonomies and/or frameworks for evaluating the distinctive elements, though some are in place for international education and community engagement. Thus the first step should be to develop such taxonomies and frameworks to better understand and assess the current state in order to determine where future investments or initiatives will have the highest impact.

In the coming year the UPBC could supporting the Office of Planning and Institutional Research and the "point people" for each distinctive element in developing taxonomies and frameworks for assessing the current state. The UPBC could also meet the point people to discuss other ways the UPBC may be able to assist their efforts in the coming year. The point people were identified by Braden Hosch as:

- Community Engagement
    - Faculty Member: Dr. Abigail Adams (Anthropology) [Dr. Sarah Stookey is interim while Abigail is on sabbatical]
    - Administrator: Richard Cheney (Assoc. Director of Continuing Education and Community Engagement)

- International Education
    - Faculty Member: Dr. Lilian Uribe (Modern Languages), co-chair of ACE Internationalization Laboratory
    - Administrator: Dr. Nancy Wagner (Director Center for International Education)

- State Workforce and Economic Development
    - Faculty Members: Dr. David Fearon (Management & Organization) and Dr. Sarah Stookey (Management & Organization)
    - Administrator: none identified

- Interdisciplinary Studies and Cross-Cultural Initiatives
  - Faculty Members: Dr. Felton Best (Philosophy), chair of Arts & Sciences Interdisciplinary Studies Committee; possible Dr. David Blitz (Philosophy)
  - Administrator: none identified

Along with furthering efforts related to the distinctive elements, the UPBC considered graduation rates another potential area to seek initiatives Braden Hosch presented data related to first year full time students showing an extremely strong association between first semester GPA and graduation rates. We have had major initiatives related to expanding the first year experience and centralizing advising for first year students (CACE). An early intervention notification program has been developed. The UPBC could seek to help monitor and support these initiatives on a stand-alone basis, or explore and report on their association with retention and graduation.

At the end of the Spring 2010 semester two discussion threads emerged on the faculty listserv: re-examining the general education requirements and writing across the curriculum. Either of these could lead to a major initiative that could benefit from UPBC support. Related to these is the more general issue of assessment of educational goals and objectives. The UPBC provided feedback on program reporting, the UPBC may be able to provide further support to CCSU's assessment and assurance of learning efforts.

Tracking Major Construction Projects

The UPBC also wanted to provide a means by which the campus community could be kept up to date on the progress of major construction (where a major construction project was defined as a project that would add a significant amount of usable space or that would remove a significant amount of usable space while renovations are completed). After some negotiation, Administrative Affairs created a University Project Status Summary.
http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=6334

The UPBC met with Richard Bachoo. We suggested the project cutoff could be a higher dollar amount, requested that the status label be simplified and standardized, and requested a column be added for expected completion date. Dr. Bachoo was concerned that a completion date implied a target or promise from Administrative Affairs. We assured Dr. Bachoo we were interested only in the best estimate for completion for planning purposes (roughly when might new space become available) that we realized such estimates were notoriously volatile prior to the construction phase, and that we agreed an appropriate disclaimer should be posted with the estimated completion dates. The UPBC plans to pull data on the major construction projects to post on the UPBC website along with a link to the more complete list (updated roughly every sixty days) that will be available at the Administrative Affairs website. Following the meeting a memorandum of understanding was sent to Dr. Bachoo documenting the agreement. (See appendix 4) The reporting should be available on the UPBC website by the middle of the Fall 2010 semester.

Budgeting

Context

CFO Larry Wilder provides the UPBC with a spreadsheet and "pie chart" of University revenues and expenditures. These are reviewed and discussed. Larry Wilder also provides the committee with periodic updates on developments in the legislature or the system office that may impact CCSU's current year or future budgets.

President Miller instituted a review process where division heads submit their budget proposals for review by the UPBC prior to submitting them to the President. The budget proposals presented in 2008 for 2008-09 were presented in enormous detail and varied formats, which made review difficult and made extra work for the division heads and their staffs. The budget proposals presented in 2009 for 2009-10 were in a standard format and focused on changes (one time expenditures, proposed additions to the base budget, cuts to the base budget, reallocations of the base or one-time savings). This approach greatly facilitated the review process, and we hope reduced the burden on the division heads and their staffs. The budget proposals presented in 2010 for 2010-11 also focused on incremental changes. They prioritized cuts that would be made in event the legislature cut our appropriations by various amounts (5 – 20%). They also prioritized their requests for additions.

Strengths: The budget process does an admirable job of dealing with contingencies. In an environment where the legislature can change funding at a very late point in the planning cycle, and the Governor can demand a rescission in an instant, the contingency planning embedded in the process helps minimize the damage of budget cuts, especially sudden cuts. Should anticipated (or feared) cuts not materialize, the contingency planning enables those "extra" resources to be spent with maximum impact. The process of allocating resources is transparent to the Division heads (and presumably the Deans of Schools), and to the UPBC, provided the UPBC receives a report on the final outcome.

Weaknesses: The budget process, at least to the extent of the review in the UPBC, looks at a year in isolation. Although there was an improvement from the previous year, the budget requests and the proposed contingent cuts were still not well linked to the strategic objectives. The existing environment limits the amount of long-term planning that can be done, so the budget process is largely an exercise in managing current expenditures and planning for one next fiscal year. The process is transparent to those involved, but not to the larger campus community.

<div align="center">

Actions related to budgeting

</div>

Annual Budget Proposal Review

The Division Managers presented their budget proposals for the 2010-11 fiscal year on February 3rd. On February 23rd, we sent our review and recommendations to the President (see appendix 5). President Miller thanked us for our input and said he agreed with many of our suggestions and disagreed with a few of them. In a letter dated April 27th, and at our May 5th meeting, President Miller provided a more detailed written response to our budget recommendations (which will be posted on the UPBC website) and met with the committee to discuss his response. He also responded to our concern (which we relayed to him in an April 22nd memo) about CCSU being trapped in a system that severely limited our ability to budget for the long term. We asked for suggestions about how we might work over the long term to help change that environment. (The President's letter of April 27th is included as appendix 6.)

President Miller felt some addition to the base level of athletic scholarships was justified (the UPBC supported an increase in existing scholarships to cover rising costs, but not adding new awards) given the overall increase in financial aid being made available to all students. He approved a smaller amount than the budget request and required that some of the funding be raised externally. Increased Northeast conference scholarship guidelines and a commitment to maintain gender equality in athletic scholarship awards influenced his decision.

President Miller took exception to our assessment that we purchase software then "skimp on training" but noted he rarely sees software training in budget requests. He agreed with the overall recommendation to limit proprietary software but did not want to use one-time savings to hire programmers and noted that contract work is problematic. He felt the proprietary software requested by Institutional Advancement was justified. The UPBC agrees with President Miller. We believed in general proprietary software seemed to be the first option rather than the last, we wanted to see that bias change, and we felt one more hard look at the "Raisers Edge" software and other possible options was warranted before approving the decision.

Only the cost side of CCSU is presented in the budget reports we reviewed. The other equally important half of the picture is revenue. We need to devote more effort to the revenue side of the picture, especially where revenue can be increased without incurring significant incremental (marginal) cost.

Finally, we have already been stressed due to budget constraints, particularly the hiring freeze, but there is a distinct possibility the worst is yet to come. We need to be taking the steps now to work smarter, not harder, so that necessary tasks can be completed more easily and effectively at lower cost. The budget presentations are not the place where a discussion of process improvement efforts is likely to emerge, but in the long term real cost reduction can only come about by focusing on processes and finding better ways to perform, not by focusing on resources and ensuring we stay within specified spending targets.

Regarding presentation, the divisions did a good job tying their prospective additions to their budgets the strategic objective(s) impacted. The prospective reductions were not tied to the strategic objectives. It would be very helpful if the one (or two) strategic objective(s) most impacted by each prospective reduction were identified. This would allow us to see which strategic objectives are most likely to be affected by a given level of cuts. We would still like to see two or three year trends of actual in spending on personnel, DPS/OE, and one time or capital expenditures, and the base amounts for the current budget to provide context for the current budget for each division.

These presentation improvements would help the UPBC assess the effects of budget cuts and awards on strategic objectives and allow use to assess trends. This would address some of the weaknesses we identified in the budget process at least as it pertains to the UPBC review.

Budget Communication and Transparency

The budget process currently in place is transparent for those directly participating in the process, but very little information is available to the overall CCSU community. This is an increasingly serious problem as the Legislature and Governor struggle with difficult decisions and the level of anxiety about potential budget cuts rises on campus. When the UPBC reported the results of their budget review and recommendation to the Faculty Senate, the question was posed about the availability of budgeted and actual financial data. At the time, no data was available other than proportional revenues and expenditures in the most recent Annual Report and limited financial data in reports posted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. In addition, CFO Larry Wilder was receiving ad hoc requests for information and wanted an efficient and effective means of addressing the information needs of the campus.

In March the UPBC discussed what information could be made available and how to deal with requests for information. We agreed unanimously to post the following items on our website http://web.ccsu.edu/upbc/BudgetData.htm:

- FY09 Spending Plan (once board approved), which included current year update on FY10
- Mid-Year Update, filed in January (once board approved), which provide actual information of final FY09 budget and update on FY10, so far.
- The letter from the UPBC to President Miller about the proposed FY11 budgets.
- The President's formal response to the UPBC.
- Short periodic updates from the UPBC committee (including Wilder's September report on action items).

We also decided the UPBC should be the channel for communications to field all requests for budgetary information from the campus community. We decided the UPBC website would include a web form that could be used to submit a question, which would then be brought to the Committee, and then the chair or designee would send a response to the person who posed the question, or post answers to the questions on the website. This should be operational early in the fall. In the future, posting additional information should be considered.

Strategic Planning Initiative Grant Reports

During 2008-09, eleven strategic planning initiative grants were awarded. The grantees had been chosen from twenty-two grant applications linked to one or more goals of the strategic plan, with preference given to proposals that focused on one of the four distinctive elements (elements of distinction) or involved cooperation between and among multiple units of the university. Reports were due in Fall 2009. The committee received 9 reports, a brief summary of activity on a tenth project. We did not receive a report on the eleventh project although that project was featured in the President's opening address for the 2009-10 academic year.

Many of the grant activities involved community engagement, and they provided excellent learning opportunities for CCSU students and enrichment activities for middle school and high school students. Some part-time employment was also made possible for CCSU students.

The grant recipients were parsimonious with the funds with two projects well under budget and only one project exceeded the budget (and that by only a small amount). Most of the money went to pay for supplies, compensate student workers for their time, and for providing food for students during day-long activities. Some projects drew funding from other sources to supplement the funding provided by the grants.

We believe the evidence suggests the Strategic Planning Initiative Grants were money well spent. The grants seemed ideally suited to covering the expenses of relatively small-scale community engagement projects. Perhaps some of these could be seen as pilot projects, developing evidence and experience that might secure external funding for larger scale or continuous application.

Due to the one-time nature of the initiative, it seems likely that the grants enabled implementation of activities that were already planned. Many of these activities would probably have been done even in the absence of the grants, though their implementation might have been delayed or reduced in scale. The program might stimulate new project ideas if it were available on a continuing basis. Continued funding of strategic planning initiative grants should be considered as the State emerges from the current financial crisis.

Appendix 1: CCSU-ITBD Center Of Excellence Resolution

Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) Institute of Technology and Business Development (ITBD) is completing its fifteenth year in June of 2009 and wishes to be recognized by the Connecticut State University System (CSUS) and Connecticut Department of Higher Education as a "Center of Excellence in Workforce and Business Development" in the Connecticut State University System. ITBD provides the following information for consideration for this distinction.

WHEREAS;   the Institute for Technology and Business Development (ITBD) had its origin in the CCSU School of Engineering and Technology as the Center for Industrial and Engineering Technology (CIET) starting in 1986 with a mission of supporting the development of Connecticut's manufacturing workforce and,

WHEREAS;   in 1993 the role of CIET was expanded to include the Manufacturing Applications Center, Flexible Manufacturing Networks Center, CT Procurement Technical Assistance Center, Conference Center, Technical Training Center and Business Incubation Program changing the name of CIET to the Institute of Industrial and Engineering Technology (IIET) and,

WHEREAS;   in 2002 the role of IIET was redefined to serve multiple industries in Connecticut and renamed the Institute of Technology and Business Development focusing on workforce development training, conferencing, business incubation and community business development and,

WHEREAS;   ITBD, reporting to the President of Central Connecticut State University, and its past affiliates has received statewide and national recognition for its programs and practices in serving Connecticut's business community and has been reauthorized by the CSUS Board of Trustees for five consecutive five-year intervals and,

WHEREAS; ITBD has contributed to delivering over 100 workforce development programs annually, supported award winning youth workforce and career development programs for the past five years in partnership with the Consolidated School District of New Britain, supported over 400 conferencing activities annually, assisted companies in obtaining significant dollars in government contract awards and assisted over 70 business incubator companies in new business start ups to date and recently brought the United States Small Business Administration Small Business Development Center to CCSU and the CSUS and,

WHEREAS; ITBD receives funding from federal sources, private sector and public sector organizations and is recognized as a champion in supporting small business development, process and productivity improvement; is considered a trusted advisor in business issues by organizations such as the Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology – CBIN & ADI programs, Connecticut Light and Power – PRIME program, Connecticut Department of Transportation – DBE Program, Connecticut Development Authority – ITS Loan Program, Connecticut Department of Labor- Business Services Program, Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development – Lean Implementation Program, KPMG – Executive Breakfast Business Series program and five State Workforce Boards initiatives, the National Governor's Association – Training Programs, and ITBD has been the recipient of many Not-profit Foundations awards to provide community learning services, and

WHEREAS;   ITBD is the only self-supporting public or private Institute in Connecticut dedicated to supporting Connecticut's business community through the interaction with an independent Advisory Committee, University faculty and students working on real-time business challenges impacting Connecticut's competitiveness in the global economy while enriching faculty and student learning experiences within the CSUS over the past twenty-two years, and

WHEREAS; the ITBD has been authorized by the CSUS Board of Trustees to receive contracts and grants from public and private organizations and may charge fees for services related to the purposes stated above that all applicable state and University regulations are observed, all funds being received be deposited by the ITBD in the Operating Fund at CCSU in the accounts established for ITBD and such funds shall be used for the purposes of the ITBD and the appropriate University support functions rendered to ITBD and,

WHEREAS; the President of CCSU is directed to periodically evaluate the functioning of the ITBD, and shall no later than December 31, 2013 report the results of the evaluation to the Chancellor of the CSU System who will in turn share this information with the Board of Trustees, and,

WHEREAS; Section 10a-25h(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes provides that the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System is "hereby authorized to establish and administer" centers to be known as Connecticut higher education centers of excellence, ITBD respectfully requests in preparation of its 16th year of service to the State of Connecticut that CCSU ITBD be recognized as a "Center of Excellence in Workforce and Business Development" in the Connecticut State University System.

Appendix 2: Resolution on Policy Proposals from UPBC

The Faculty Senate recommends that resolutions for major policy or project initiatives at Central Connecticut State University be accompanied by a more detailed proposal. Major projects are any project that:

- is estimated to cost over $100,000.00 per year or in one-time expenses;
- moves more than two individuals from one administrative unit to another;
- requires hiring two or more full time employees.

The major policy or project initiative proposals should be in the following format.

A. Brief Statement of Proposal
Provide an abstract that summarizes the proposal (150 words or less).

B. Rationale/Problems to be Solved
State the problem(s) that this proposal intends to address. State the strategy to be used to address the identified problem(s).

C. Implementation Plan
Describe stages of implementation. Include if or how long a pilot will be conducted. Consider obstacles that may have to be overcome in implementing this proposal. Indicate who is responsible for each phase of the project.

D. Proposal Details
Provide a detailed explanation of what will be done and who will do it for major tasks

E. Resources Required and Budget
For the first year and up to subsequent year identify the resources that will be required to implement this project. This should include hard costs (direct funding, budgets, reassigned time, or other amounts of money that will be required) as well as soft costs (faculty and staff time, unit resources, space requirements).

F. Impact on Other Programs and Units
Describe how this proposal affects other programs either positively or negatively.

G: Approval Process
Indicate which stakeholders and governance committees have been consulted and/or have approved the proposal.

H. Outcomes and Assessment
Describe the outcomes of this proposal. Outcomes are best stated in terms of what people who are the object of this program will do or know or how they will behave. Also provide a plan for how the extent to which these outcomes are accomplished will be measured and evaluated.

An electronic form with suggested tables is available on the UPBC website.

(see below)

5. Policy Proposal Format

A. Brief Statement of Proposal
Provide an abstract that summarizes the proposal (150 words or less).

B. Rationale/Problems to be Solved
State the problem(s) that this proposal intends to address. State the strategy to be used to address the identified problem(s).

C. Implementation Plan
Describe stages of implementation. Include if or how long a pilot will be conducted. Consider obstacles that may have to be overcome in implementing this proposal. Indicate who is responsible for each phase of the project.

Phase of Project	Description of Phase	Timeline/Milestones/Obstacles	Who is responsible

D. Proposal Details
Provide a detailed explanation of what will be done and who will do it for major tasks

Task	Phase	Importance/Priority	Who is responsible

E. Resources Required and Budget
For the first year and up to subsequent year identify the resources that will be required to implement this project. This should include hard costs (direct funding, budgets, reassigned time, or other amounts of money that will be required) as well as soft costs (faculty and staff time, unit resources, space requirements).

Item/Costs	Initial Year (Include start-up costs)	Second Year	Third Year
Hard Costs			
Soft Costs			

F. Impact on Other Programs and Units
Describe how this proposal affects other programs either positively or negatively.

G: Approval Process
Indicate which stakeholders and governance committees have been consulted and/or have approved the proposal.

Stakeholder/committee	Approval/Disapproval	Reasons	Date

H. Outcomes and Assessment
Describe the outcomes of this proposal. Outcomes are best stated in terms of what people who are the object of this program will do or know or how they will behave. Also provide a plan for how the extent to which these outcomes are accomplished will be measured and evaluated.

Desired outcome	Measuring instrument	Actual outcome	Explanation/Comments

Appendix 3: Annotated Proposed Revisions to CCSU Objectives

Goal 1	**Promote student learning.**
Objective 1.1.	~~Identify student learning outcomes for General Education, undergraduate majors and graduate majors; establish their integration in the curriculum; and implement outcomes-based assessment for all courses, programs, and student academic support services to promote continuous improvement.~~
Objective 1.1	Implement outcomes-based assessment for all degree programs, general education, and student support services to promote continuous improvement.

Rationale or explanation

- Material about <u>identification of learning outcomes</u> is deleted because this activity is a pre-cursor to meaningful assessment activity; it is accomplished for academic programs, and will be completed for student services programs before the end of 2009-10.
- Material about outcomes based assessment in <u>all courses</u> is deleted because it is beyond the scope of current resources and policies.
- The word "academic" is struck to acknowledge student learning occurs in all student support areas

Objective 1.2.	Improve student perception of instructional effectiveness and of their own learning in and out of the classroom.
Objective 1.3.	~~Increase the number of courses that incorporate educational technologies to promote student engagement, learning, and academic success, including developing strategies for online courses and programs, and for the prototyping of blended courses.~~
Objective 1.3	Following a well thought-out strategy, increase the number of courses that incorporate educational technology to promote student engagement, learning, and academic success, including developing hybrid/blended-learning courses and online courses and programs.

Rationale or explanation

- Changes except the phrase in blue were proposed by C. Lovitt. The UPBC felt that the original wording of the objective and the amended wording carried the implicit assumption that more technology was better. The UPBC felt that judgment should be context specific, and needed to consider the course, program, and students being served. We don't want to be adding technology for the sake of adding technology. We don't want instructional technology to be an answer in search of a question, an end in itself. Given scarce resources, we'd like a more carefully considered strategy to get the maximum benefit from our investment in instructional technology.

Objective 1.4.	Increase the number of students involved in undergraduate and graduate research and the level of funding for that research and creative activity.
Objective 1.5.	Increase the number of faculty who participate annually in campus-based professional development activities focused on student learning outcomes.
Objective 1.6.	Increase collaboration and partnerships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to promote student learning.
Objective 1.7.	Increase instructional design assistance for faculty to support teaching and learning.

Goal 2	**Increase persistence, satisfaction and success rates for students.**
Objective 2.1.	Improve the retention rate for first-time, full-time students between their freshman, sophomore, and junior years.
Objective 2.2.	Improve six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time students.
Objective 2.3.	Improve the graduation rate for transfer students.

Objective 2.4.   Maintain an APR score for all intercollegiate athletic teams above the NCAA cut score.

Objective 2.5.   ~~Establish standards for the quality of academic advising, and promote their adoption and evaluation throughout the university.~~

Objective 2.5   Increase effectiveness of academic advising

Rationale or explanation

- C. Lovitt proposed increase student satisfaction with academic advising. The UPBC felt the objective should go beyond student perceptions and include objective measures of effectiveness.

Objective 2.6.   ~~Increase the participation of first-time, full-time students in the First Year Experience program.~~

Objective 2.6   Increase the effectiveness of the First Year Experience program.

Rationale or explanation

- Original objective was deleted because we have achieved virtually 100% participation

Objective 2.7.   Improve safety, health and security on campus.

Objective 2.8.   Reduce student legal offenses and non-academic misconduct cases.

Objective 2.9.   Increase student participation in co-curricular activities.

~~Objective 2.10.   Ensure course scheduling that facilitates students' academic progress.~~

Rationale or explanation

- Delete. Isn't this objective an enabling activity for improving graduation rate? [C. Lovitt] The UPBC agreed.

Objective 2.11.   Increase the total amount of financial aid awarded.

~~Objective 2.12.   Increase the ratio of full-time to part-time students.~~

Rationale or explanation

- Delete. . It's not clear why we want to do this. [C. Lovitt] The UPBC agreed.

Objective 2.13.   Increase the average entry level SAT score and Class Percentile for first-time, full-time students.

Goal 3   **Prepare students for productive lives as professionals and citizens and support economic development.**

Objective 3.1   Increase the number of students who are involved in applied or experiential learning (e.g., service learning, projects for external audiences, co-ops, internships, etc.).

~~Objective 3.2.   Increase the delivery of customized, non-traditional credit, and non-credit instruction to meet professional advancement needs.~~

Rationale or explanation

- Delete. This becomes an enabling activity for revised 3.3. [C. Lovitt] The UPBC agreed.

Objective 3.2   Promote and support increased community engagement by faculty, staff and students.

Rationale or explanation

- Proposed by C. Lovitt. The UPBC felt it was important to have an objective related to the "Community engagement " distinctive element under Goal 3, and agreed with the proposed wording.

Objective 3.3.   ~~Recognize and respond to the state workforce needs in engineering, nursing, and other critical need areas by adding new programs.~~

Objective 3.3   Identify and respond to state workforce and professional development needs through credit and non-credit course offerings and programs.

Rationale or explanation
- Proposed by C. Lovitt. The UPBC felt the alternate wording reflects our commitment to workforce development on an ongoing basis and as a distinctive element of CCSU. Specifying Engineering and Nursing gave the appearance of too narrow a focus and too much of an emphasis on the recent past rather than the future.

Objective 3.4.   Increase opportunity for on-campus work for students.

Objective 3.5.   Create and build a magnet high school with the mission of 100% post-secondary participation for graduates.

Objective 3.6.   ~~Increase the~~ Maintain quality of acquisition, support, and upkeep for instrumentation, software, and technology needed for the professional development of students.

Rationale or explanation
- C. Lovitt proposed deleting the objective reasoning that the IT department and academic departments are already committed to doing this. The UPBC felt it was important, especially in the current financial crisis, to keep the objective, but proposed changing Increase to "Maintain" to reflect the existing level of commitment and support for instrumentation, software, and technology.

Objective 3.7.   ~~Ensure students have appropriate proficiencies for IT-based tasks.~~

Objective 3.7   Identify and assess IT-based learning outcomes for students.

Rationale or explanation
- C. Lovitt proposed changed wording. The UPBC felt the changed wording clarified the objective and recommended adoption.

Goal 4   Enhance and sustain faculty and staff satisfaction and success.

Objective 4.1.   Initiate a dialogue that can lead to a redefinition and redistribution of faculty work including reassigned time for research-active faculty.

Objective 4.2.   Improve faculty and staff satisfaction.

Objective 4.3.   Increase internal resources to support faculty scholarship and creative activity.

Objective 4.4.   Increase external funding received through grants and contracts.

Objective 4.5.   ~~Provide faculty and staff with the technology, support, and professional development necessary to work efficiently.~~

Objective 4.5   Increase faculty and staff satisfaction with the availability of IT resources and support.

- C. Lovitt proposed either deleting the objective, reasoning as in objective 3.6 that the IT department and academic departments are already committed to doing this, or adopting the revised wording shown above. The UPBC felt it maintaining the goal would help maintain or even improve the level of support and agreed on the suggested alternate wording.

~~Objective 4.6.   Implement and maintain a life-cycle funding model to ensure adequate technology refresh to allow the University to meet its academic and administrative technology needs.~~

Rationale or explanation
- Delete. We already do this. No need for a separate objective. [C. Lovitt] The UPBC agreed this objective was made superfluous by objectives 3.6 and 4.5.

There are no changes to the objectives for goals 5 through 7.

Goal 5	**Promote global awareness and respect for diversity.**
Objective 5.1.	Increase the diversity of students, faculty and staff.
Objective 5.2.	Increase the number of courses that integrate an international component.
Objective 5.3.	Increase faculty and student participation in international teaching and research experiences.
Objective 5.4.	Provide training for faculty and staff to aid in understanding cultural, social, personality and learning differences.

Goal 6	**Gain financial support necessary for a highly regarded public university.**
Objective 6.1.	Increase the number of full-time faculty.
Objective 6.2.	Reduce the ratio of credit hours taught by part-time relative to full-time faculty.
Objective 6.3.	Increase the number and amount of annual gifts.
Objective 6.4.	Increase the value of the endowment.

Goal 7	**Initiate and sustain environmentally sound capital projects.**
Objective 7.1.	Increase the square footage of academic space for classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices, library and research, and student support.
Objective 7.2.	Increase the square footage of space for student support services.
Objective 7.3.	Increase the number of students accommodated in residence halls and square footage of residence hall space.
Objective 7.4.	Create campus transportation and parking system which interfaces with public transportation.
Objective 7.5.	Improve both outdoor and indoor space for co-curricular activities.
Objective 7.6.	Develop and implement a plan resulting in energy use reduction, recycling and green space preservation.

Appendix 4: Memorandum of Understanding for Reporting on University Project Status

To: Richard Bachoo
From: Lawrence Grasso, Lawrence (Accounting Academic)
Subject: Memorandum of Understanding for Reporting on University Project Status
Date: April 19, 2010

This is to summarize my understanding of what we agreed upon at the April 7th UPBC meeting as the process going forward to report on the status of major construction projects on campus.

Project List – The UPBC would like to focus on projects that will either create a significant amount of usable space, or will cause a significant amount of usable space to go off-line while construction takes place. The UPBC can draw on information supplied on the University Project Status Summary, and supply a link to that summary, which will be a more comprehensive list of projects.

Total Estimated Cost – The University Project Status Summary currently lists as major projects as all projects having a projected cost of $70,000 or more. We believe that threshold could be increased to $500,000. The total estimated cost is the best estimate of the total cost based on information available at the time of the report. A statement to the effect that this estimate is a forecast based on the best information currently available and not a performance target for Administrative Affairs will appear below the table of information appearing on the UPBC website.

Status – To simplify reporting and make it easier for the campus community to understand, the status should be restricted to the following phases (listed in order from start to completion): **Program, Design, Pre-Construction or Bid, Construction, and Completion**. A legend describing the meaning of each of the phases will be attached to the end of the project status summary, and will also appear below the major project summary appearing on the UPBC website. Administrative Affairs will provide the legend. Administrative affairs can modify the labels of the phases or add more phases if they believe that will either be more meaningful to the campus community or more in conformance with reporting already required. Once chosen, however, the phases should be explained in the legend and consistently applied to all projects.

Estimated Completion Date – A column reporting the estimated completion date should be added to the summary. As with total estimated cost, the estimated completion date is not a performance target for Administrative Affairs but the best estimate of completion based on information available at the time of the report. A statement to the effect that the estimate is designed to give the campus community a feel for when new space may become available, and is not a performance target or deadline for Administrative Affairs will appear below the table of information appearing on the UPBC website. Target dates should be Fall 20XX for projects estimated to be completed in time for the beginning of a given Fall semester and Spring 20XX for projects estimated to be completed in time for the beginning of a given Spring semester.

Updates – The project status Summary will be updated every thirty to sixty days. Or, if Administrative Affairs prefers a set schedule, say, three times per semester (within a week of beginning of classes, within a week of mid-term, within a week of the last day of finals).

**Appendix 5: Recommendations of the UPBC Committee
following the Budget Presentations of February 3, 2010**

From: UPBC
To: President Miller
Re: Recommendations of the UPBC Committee following the Budget Presentations of
       February 3, 2010.
Date: February 23, 2010

Summary of key recommendations

Locknetics - $1,200,000. (Administrative Affairs). We recommend that every effort be made to pursue remedies against Ingersoll Rand for their decision to discontinue support of this product. Hiring workers to provide in-house support should be considered. If new locks must be installed, we must ensure at the very least that we are not leaving ourselves open for this same process to be repeated if the new vendor withdraws support for the new lock systems a few years down the road. We recognize the new locks will have added features, but to be forced into such an expensive change is terrible, especially in a time of financial crisis.

Additional athletic scholarships - $345,000. (Administrative Affairs). We were surprised additional scholarships that would require an increase to the base budget on the list of requests during a period of financial crisis. We recommend against funding these scholarships.

Football turf replacement - $750,000. (Administrative Affairs). We recommend this not be funded.

Software requests. (Institutional Advancement and Student Affairs). We see a general trend toward asking for special purpose software because it is viewed as largely a one-time cost more likely to be funded. Training, integration with existing databases and ongoing support costs, are very likely underestimated. At the same time we skimp on programming and training and our existing software is underutilized. We recommend looking first to more fully utilizing existing software, and where new software is required for new capabilities, considering open source software as a more cost effective alternative to proprietary.

Overall recommendations pertaining to most or all budget presentations follow, including a more detailed discussion software acquisition under the broader issue of unmet information needs. Following the overall recommendations we present recommendations related to the budgets presented by each division.

Overall Recommendations

Unmet information needs

We see a pattern of requests for specialized proprietary software to meet information needs not currently satisfied by Banner. In each case the software requires a substantial initial investment, significant annual maintenance or licensing fees, and leaves us at risk of the providers deciding to force upgrades or discontinue support of existing software in the future. In addition, each of these packages will have to effectively capture student data from Banner on an ongoing basis or they will create unnecessary duplication of effort and increase the level of errors in student data.

Banner is our existing database system and that is not going to change for the foreseeable future. Moreover, it is a powerful system with a powerful reporting tool (Hyperion) that is

underutilized due to lack of end-user training and lack of programming services to design the needed queries, dashboards, and reports. There are no plans to acquire more programming services in any request list.

The hiring freeze, supposedly a cost saving measure, discourages hiring programmers and encourages the purchase of proprietary software (viewed as largely a one-time expense) should spare funds be available at the end of the fiscal year.

Our recommendations:
1. First, use what we have. Can Banner/Hyperion provide the information needed in the way it is needed? Can the extensive IT resources at the system office provide development help?
2. Hire additional programmers. It would be helpful to have in-house programmers that develop institutional knowledge of CCSU's system and our unique needs and circumstances. These programmers could develop system capabilities user-friendly interfaces, and dashboards and reports that could significantly reduce workload for faculty and staff, and increase student satisfaction.
3. If hiring programmers is not possible, hiring programmers on a contract basis is another alternative worth exploring. A long-term relationship with outside programmers could be as beneficial as having a programmer on the payroll. There may be union issues related to sub-contracting programming work and there may be transaction costs and delays if each job has to be separately bid, but contracting for outside programmers may be a more effective solution than buying new software for many of our information needs.
4. If our existing system cannot provide the information needs, consider open source software. Open source software is generally much less expensive, it can be modified and adapted to suit our needs, and we do not run the risk of being beholden to a single company that may withdraw their support.
5. If proprietary software packages still appear to offer the best solution, we need to be sure that data exchange with Banner, and the risk future upgrade costs and withdrawing support are taken into consideration in reaching that decision.

Mode of information presentation

There was more than one instance where the issue of online versus printed data arose. Online data is easier to update and has obvious benefits from a cost and sustainability standpoint, but there are cases where working with a printed document is more efficient than scrolling through a long on-line document, and there are some users that prefer printed documents. A challenge going forward is to be better at identifying where printed documents are worth their cost, and where electronic documents or displays approach or exceed the benefits of print. A way to address user preferences is to allow users to opt in or opt out of printed copies and use this to reduce the number of printed copies required.

Furniture and Equipment

In the spirit of first using what we have, those making requests for furniture should first check the "boneyard" at East Hall, to see if suitable furniture is available before looking to buy new furniture. Similarly IT may have computers, projectors and other equipment that, while not new, may represent a significant and sufficient upgrade over existing equipment units are looking to replace. This practice is environmentally beneficial as well as cost effective.

Long-term efficiencies

We have already been stressed due to budget constraints, particularly the hiring freeze, but there is a distinct possibility the worst is yet to come. We need to be taking the steps now to work smarter, not harder, so that necessary tasks can be completed more easily and effectively at lower cost. The budget presentations are not the place where a discussion of process improvement efforts is likely to emerge, but in the long term real cost reduction can only come about by focusing on processes and finding better ways to perform, not by focusing on resources and ensuring we stay within specified spending targets.

Growing resources

Only the cost side of CCSU is presented in the budget reports we reviewed. The other equally important half of the picture is revenue. We need to devote more effort to the revenue side of the picture, especially where revenue can be increased without incurring significant incremental (marginal) cost.

Budget presentation

Departments did a good job tying their prospective additions to their budgets the strategic objective(s) impacted. The prospective reductions were not tied to the strategic objectives. It would be very helpful if the one (or two) strategic objective(s) most impacted by each prospective reduction were identified. This would allow us to see which strategic objectives are most likely to be affected by a given level of cuts.

An overall summary of the base level of DPS/OE funding was provided by Academic Affairs. This was helpful. We would still like to see two or three year trends of actual in spending on personnel, DPS/OE, and one time or capital expenditures, and the base amounts for the current budget to provide context for the current budget for each department.

Recommendations Specific to Departmental Budgets

Academic Affairs

We would like an overall assessment of the impact of cuts at specified levels. We would also like to know if there is a point in prospective cuts at which we would need to begin looking at cutting majors or programs rather than individual positions.

Strategic objectives impacted were provided for most, but not all items and for none of the salary reductions. Arguably replacing a person with an emergency at lower pay (or even higher pay) has some impact (the emergency appointment is less likely to provide institutional service and (for faculty) CCSU program advising. When the cuts eliminate positions or fail to fill a position, surely there's an impact on a strategic objective.

Two items, Seps-Teacher Ed and Seps-Nursing in prospective additions (page 2) appear to be duplications of higher priority items where the same department was listed without the dash in the name. (We immediately moved to ensure that our department names do not have dashes in them, as it apparently reduces your priority level).

The level of detail was a little "over the top."   We recognize that Academic Affairs is a huge enterprise comprised of many smaller units operating with some autonomy, and considerable detail is required to allow both requests and cuts to be prioritized, but $150 for a foot pedal?

$599 for a fax machine? $654 for 6 calculators? At some point (certainly items costing $1,000 or less) these are purchases to be made or not made out of a unit's operating expense budget and the decision at the budget level is to make more or less operating expense money available to a unit.

It would be better to have a separate running total for FY10 and FY11 prospective additions.

Item 18 SA&S Academic Advising appears to address issues that are under the purview of CACE. The explanation/description of the impact needs to be clarified.

Administrative Affairs

Strategic objectives impacted were not provided for the cuts.

Locknetics - $1,200,000. This is an instance where due to hardware which requires proprietary software we are being held hostage by a company discontinuing support of its own product. Apparently the only remedy Ingersoll Rand is offering is the opportunity to buy their new product at an exorbitant price. We recommend the contract be reviewed to see if there is any further remedy. We further recommend that the attorney general be contacted to see if Ingersoll Rand is engaging in abusive business practices for which there may be some legal remedy. Finally, we believe a publicity campaign ("Cash strapped State University forced to change its locks at a cost exceeding $1 million because Ingersoll Rand's Locknetics Division will no longer support its existing products.") might persuade the company to do more than the minimum required by law. We note we could hire a person at a considerable salary who is expert in the existing Locknetics product to provide continued support for a decade or even a generation and not exceed the overall cost of changing out the locks.

If and when we go to a new locking system, we must ensure that we are not setting ourselves up for a similar problem to appear in the future.

Additional athletic scholarships - $345,000. We recommend the additional athletic scholarships be removed from the list and we were astonished that additional athletic scholarships (which increase the base budget) would be ranked fourth on a list presented at a time of financial crisis. Additional athletic scholarships should be funded through outside support.

Football turf replacement - $750,000. We recommend this be eliminated from the list or pushed below all health and safety related items (for example the 45 year old Welte Symphony Shell). We recommend it be funded only after all requests from other divisions are funded unless it is demonstrated in an objective assessment (not the football coach, not the turf company looking to sell us a new field) that the current condition of the field creates hazardous conditions for the students using the field. This is another opportunity to raise outside funding for a relatively high profile project. We unfortunately cannot offer naming rights because the field is already named.

The pie charts showing the impact of proposed cuts were very helpful.

Student Affairs

Judicial Action software (Base budget addition) $15,600. Housing software (One-time request # 6) $60,000. Refer to our overall comments regarding software under unmet information needs.

Recreation and fitness student labor $85,000. We recommend this be partially funded by charging faculty and staff (but not students) a modest fee for use of the facilities. The fee should be modest, and it should be understood that the total amount collected will go to support student labor to keep the facilities open extended hours.

We recommend considering adopting the additions to the baseline budget that directly impact students (e.g., Nurses, counselors, the UA for Veterans, the orientation weekend and the alcohol education) even if this requires adopting below the line reductions in administrative support. This would include filling PC# 53198. Administrative burdens can be streamlined and reduced with less direct impact on the value provided to students.

2 TB External Raid Storage system (one-time request priority 8) violates records security policy and should be removed from the list. Health services should contact IT to discuss secure storage alternatives.

AV equipment, computers and printers (One-time items 9,10,12, 14 & 15). Certain members of this committee are increasingly sensitive to the idea that replacement should be automatic merely because an item (or person) has been in existence for a certain length of time. If equipment is failing or is technically obsolete for most requirements perhaps it should be replaced. If equipment is still working and can handle 80% or more of the demands on it (cutting edge technology is not required to display 95% of PowerPoint and other presentations) there's no reason to replace the equipment. Perhaps cutting edge technology could be available in one or two rooms. Equipment available in IT may be adequate to replace failing equipment or it may represent a significant upgrade over existing equipment, particularly on items 9 & 12.

Replacement of desk and chair $1,000. $1,000 for a desk and chair?! Go to the boneyard!.

Semesters Staging $42,000. The price seems high. Can't safety and access issues with the existing staging be addressed at a lower cost?

College readership program $10,000. Can we have the Hartford Courant replace USA Today? Anecdotal evidence suggests USA Today is the least popular and the Courant along with the New Britain Herald provide state and local news coverage encouraging greater community involvement.

Information Technology

Bob Cernock reiterated his contention that priorities for IT projects and enhancements to IT capabilities should be decided collectively by the users, not the CIO or more generally the IT department. The committee he set up to establish these priorities has been ineffective. In this vacuum, project proposals continue to be brought to IT by individual units or departments and by default decisions are made in IT. We recommend that this situation be discussed with candidates for the CIO position, and that a committee representing administrative and academic users be created chaired by an administrator be established to evaluate proposed IT projects in the context of their overall impact on CCSU strategic objectives.

We recommend considering additions to programming capabilities (either additional programmers our outside contractors) to improve our utilization of the Banner Database and the Hyperion reporting system to provide better information to users.

We recommend considering additions to Banner and Hyperion programming and training to improve our utilization of the Banner Database and the Hyperion reporting system to provide better information to users.

We should explore the availability of resources from the System office for Banner/Hyperion programming and training support.

Proposed additions were listed only in the "total" column. They need to assigned or allocated to base budget, one-time, or capital expenditures. For example, see Applecare for Macs.

Applecare for Macs $7,200. Is part of the base budget needed on an ongoing basis, a one time expense associated with purchase of Macs this year, or part of the capital cost of acquiring a Mac?

Furniture for help desk personnel $4,000. First check the boneyard.

List strategic objective impacted by reductions.

Continue to seek ways to streamline processes to provide necessary support services with reduced staff.

Institutional Advancement

Raiser's Edge Software $365,000 one-time plus $22,000 annual. See our earlier overall comments under unmet information needs.

University Printing $40,000 (below the line reductions). Online publications support sustainability. Offering Alumni the opportunity to opt for online delivery and using online delivery for Campus-based recipients would reduce environmental impact and printing & mailing costs while maintaining print copies for Alumni who desire it.

Consider funding for additional athletic scholarships and field turf replacement as targets for external fundraising.

Fiscal Affairs

List strategic objective impacted by reductions.

No additional specific budget recommendations. Continue to seek ways to streamline processes to provide necessary support services with reduced staff.

Human Resources

List strategic objective impacted by third level of reductions.

If push comes to shove is a picnic for employees (those that remain) a higher priority than work hours in HR? List strategic objective impacted by third level of cuts.

No additional specific budget recommendations. Continue to seek ways to streamline processes to provide necessary support services with reduced staff.

Appendix 6: President Miller's Response to the UPBC Budget Recommendations

Date: May 5, 2010

To: Larry Grasso, Chair
              University Planning and Budget Committee

From: Jack Miller
              President

RE: Budget

       I believe our budgetary process is improving every year. Our knowledge level, transparency, position control, etc. have all improved by huge margins. I appreciate the time the UPBC takes to help make these improvements. Your thoughts genuinely impact my decisions and I appreciate your work. In keeping with a sharing of views, I forward the following thoughts.

In response to your April 22 memo:

1. I believe we are well positioned for FY11 and will be vigilant during this coming year in preparing for FYs 12 and 13.
2. We <u>are</u> rolling funds into next year and the following year to deal with items such as the 27th payroll, salary increases, etc. (See Pamela Kedderis' letter, attached)
3. There is a limit to the reserve we can carry over.
4. There are union "rules" which require a system-wide "trigger." This could make the proposed strategy problematic.
5. Our cautious approach to filling vacancies can now be modified slightly. We will be filling more positions and have less surplus. Thus, many of the vacant lines are only temporarily vacant, creating only one-year of temporary "surplus."
6. Many one-time items, which are being purchased now or are committed for purchase in the next year, are important needs, e.g., student employment, equipment for laboratories, etc. These items would already have been purchased in "normal" budget years.
7. My belief is that ongoing costs should be funded from ongoing revenue, not temporary revenue which creates a short-term fix and doubles the problem in the longer term. This is part of the problem the state finds itself in for FYs 12 and 13.

In response to your February 23rd memo:
<u>Key recommendations</u>:

       On Locknetics, I agree – no funding is allocated. I also agree on turf replacement, and no funding is allocated. On additional athletic scholarships, I partially agree – I will reduce the

Larry Grasso, Chair   -2-   May 5, 2010

funded amount from the request. The reason I only partially concur is because we are committing over $1.6 M to increased student support. This includes need-based financial aid, other financial aid, student employment, graduate internships, etc. Since the Northeast Conference has increased guidelines for financial aid and because we are committed to equal increases for men's and women's sports, we will be adding some support, but not the requested amount.

Regarding Institutional Advancement software support, I disagree and think this investment in our long-term ability to raise funds is a worthwhile investment of salary savings from the division in which the savings occurred. Further, I do not think we "skimp" on training, but I do rarely see it in a budget request. Perhaps a greater effort to create more interest in training is warranted.

In response to overall recommendations:

I tend to agree with your overall recommendations on trying to limit proprietary software, and perhaps our finances will give us strong impetus to do that. On the other hand, using one-time savings to "hire programmers" may not be the best way either. Contract work is also called into question in this financial environment. Your later recommendations on preparing the new CIO to examine these issues carefully seem to be the way to go, remembering that we want the users to have a strong voice.

Information and efficiencies, paper/on-line, used furniture, and different presentations of information all seem reasonable. I am satisfied with what I am getting, but you may need it in a different form. Perhaps the committee can begin its work early in the Fall to get information from division heads in the form needed.

In response to recommendations specific to departmental budgets:

I have already addressed most of the major issues here in previous sections. I will add only a few brief points. Maybe the detail is a "little over the top" but this information is used for other purposes than a presentation to your committee and is needed for those purposes. I see no reason for us to engage in a protracted discussion of items to which I assume you were referring when you commented on too much detail, e.g., your responses to items such as a desk and chair.

Again, thank you for your input. As we wait for more information which will help shape our spending plan, I will take all thoughts into account.

JWM/rcw
Attachment