

From: UPBC
To: President Miller
Re: Recommendations of the University Planning & Budget Committee following the Budget Presentations of February 15, 2012.
Date: March 9, 2012

UPBC key recommendations

Information Presentation: Efforts have been made in recent years to standardize the presentation of information to the committee and to your office. These efforts have created the above the line/below the line documents that most of us are now familiar with, attributing budgetary items to the strategic plan objectives, intended vacancies, the use of PCN's and specific reallocation mapping. There still remains an inconsistency in the presentation of this information among some of the divisions. The committee would like to see one additional clarification added to the itemized one-time & capital requests. That item would be a short statement explaining if the request is to "maintain" or "enhance" something. The distinction between these is often a topic for discussion during these annual presentations. The recommendation of the committee is for Fiscal Affairs to continue to work with the divisions to have them more closely follow the template model created in recent years and to include the requested one page narrative executive summary requested by the committee highlighting the major items that the division plans to make changes to through the next budget cycle.

UPBC review of base budgets: Many of the UPBC members are concerned that the inability to see into the base budgets of divisions hampers the efforts each year at budget presentation time to truly understand how a division is utilizing their "base funding" in relation to the one-time and capital increases and reduction scenarios presented to the committee. It is recommended that a breakdown of base budgets be presented to the committee in some template form that recognizes items such as fixed salaries, supplies, project specific items, DPS, etc. The example that will be referenced below in Administrative Affairs points directly to the issue of the committee needing to see deeper into these budgets.

Campus lock changes: As mentioned in the IT request below for wireless funding to assist with a wireless lock project, the committee continues to have concerns about how this is being rolled out and managed. It seems that each year a new proposal for locks comes forward. This year only half of a proposal came forward, wireless from IT, however nothing from Administrative Affairs to utilize the new wireless installs. Even if funding is to be utilized from within the base budget in Administrative Affairs, an expenditure of this nature should be brought through the committee for review.

Equipment Wish Lists: UPBC would like to encourage the administration to develop a strategy whereby annual "wish lists" for equipment, often taken directly from these budget proposals, are submitted to the Institutional Advancement division. We believe that the IA staff, specifically the gift officers, can utilize these lists to secure either the direct equipment, or targeted monies for the purchase of a listed item. Often businesses, alumni and others want to truly see the result of their goodwill. In doing this, we would offer the contact being solicited an opportunity to support CCSU in a very tangible way that will be immediately beneficial to the University.

Overall recommendations pertaining to most or all budget presentations follow. Following the overall recommendations we present recommendations related to the budgets presented by each division.

Overall Recommendations

Software & Technology requests

The matter of standalone, costly software purchases that track student data, require IT time investments, and lock the University into various upgrade and maintenance expenses is still a large concern for the UPBC. The following statement is verbatim from last year's formative feedback document and is being included to restate what the committee still feels was not addressed after last year's budget process.

"As the committee stated last year, any and all requests for large dollar proprietary software & technology items should be vetted through Information Technology (IT). Academic software needs have a working process through the Information Technology Committee however nothing exists on the administrative side to perform the same function. There is evidence, even in this year's IT budget presentation that these requests lead to support issues. These impacts can be anything from network, integration or even desktop computer power requirements. Integration requests with Banner and other existing University systems lead to unexpected increases in manpower and resource demands on IT. Much like the Administrative Affairs department is the physical backbone of the campus IT is the technological backbone and should be treated as such. For this reason, the committee has requested that Student Affairs vet their Judicial Affairs software request through IT for support needs. The committee does not object to the dollar amount being spent, but simply we would like to see a process created to provide a proactive means for dealing with these requests versus a reactive request to IT after purchase of the product." – *UPBC 2011 recommendations for FY12*

UPBC acknowledges that concerns do exist with the manner in which software is purchased through the ITC, creating similar support issues for the Academic Affairs department post-purchase. UPBC suggests that the ITAC committee in IT might be a useful mediation group for addressing a number of these issues before they are brought before budget advisory committees including ITC (academic software only) and the UPBC.

Departmental reliance on one-time funding

UPBC is concerned by a growing trend for divisions to produce one-time funding requests for items that should be captured in the operational base budget of the division. Many of the proposed budgets contain items that do not add to the base budget of that division. These items however return year after year as needed and necessary requests, with desperate pleas for why they cannot be cut, and in some cases, they can be attributed to mandated items such as federal reporting, safety or necessary contracted maintenance or replacement cycles. In this budget cycle, while the committee is not unilaterally endorsing denial of such important items, as individual departmental budgets are reviewed below, suggestions will be made for the types of items UPBC believes should migrate to the base operations of that division.

Revenue enhancement

UPBC is pleased to see the developments in the transition of the Continuing Education area into the Institutional Advancement division. The focus on somehow tying our continuing education efforts to revenue enhancement for the University is a move in the right direction.

Recommendations Specific to Departmental Budgets

Academic Affairs

The committee is supportive of the proposals put forward by the Academic Affairs division. Many smaller items that are requested and prioritized UPBC trusts have been vetted by the department chairs, Deans and Provost to the point where none stand out to us as needing further review. The proposal by the Provost to utilize his discretionary funding to retain the first 30+ items of proposed reductions is admirable and we are pleased to see the Provost stand behind these important initiatives.

The concern for the committee and we know one of the Provost's concerns as well, is that in the event the most dire of reduction strategies is reached, all allowable salary savings will be used and unavailable for the future. While this reiterates the committee's statements throughout this document about reliance on one-time funding, we all agree that our one-time funding has primarily occurred in the salary savings from Academic Affairs and if the time has come that Academic Affairs needs to utilize those funds to maintain services and prevent the loss of staff, then that is what needs to be done.

Administrative Affairs

UPBC has communicated to the CAO to reconsider some of the unit prioritization of the items requested. Items we pointed directly to include the CALEA Accreditation and Clery Act requirements. These items should rank higher in priority due to the fact they are mandated. The CAO agreed to revisit these rankings.

Football turf replacement - \$500,000. We recommend this not be funded. UPBC still maintains that the rationale for funding has not been met. An argument has been made to suggest that the gap between recreational use of the field v. intercollegiate use of the field has narrowed. We were not presented with that data. Is the field unsafe, or are we aligning this replacement to the life expectancy the vendor suggests? The committee, which has received a different request for funding each year for this project, was told that the actual cost is \$750,000 with Administrative Affairs funding the balance. This is the example mentioned above of not knowing what is in the divisional base budgets. If Administrative Affairs has the ability to migrate \$250,000 of their budget funding toward this, what else is the committee not seeing within divisions that choose to reprioritize their base budget expenditures? Finally, if all of the concerns above were met, the committee recommends that we not be tied to a certain vendor for this project and competitively bid the replacement to provide the lowest cost to the University. UPBC recommends that the University consider utilizing the athletics/recreation fee that was created years ago and used to fund the field renovations. UPBC was told that we had a "moral obligation" to utilize the funds in this manner, those that were already being banked in the reserves, and those that would come in later years to pay for the balance of the field project. Post-field project, the funds should still be targeted for use in this area to address this field issue and other large athletics/recreational funding needs.

Touchscreen Informational Signs - \$240,000. While many on the committee believed these would be nice to have, niceties in this budget climate are something that need to be looked at more closely. At this time, the informational sign request is not something supported by the UPBC.

Founders camera systems - \$18,000. UPBC was not convinced that additional dedicated cameras need to be placed into this event space. If Davidson Hall is properly secured with cameras the space itself should be secure. The argument was made that event spaces are being targeted for camera systems. If liability concerns or other arguments can be made to support this need, UPBC would reconsider this item next year.

Torp sound & Welte Hall dimmer systems - \$18,000 & \$115,000. UPBC is not entirely against these systems however the summary of impact statements in this presentation seem to provide little detail beyond the one to two words in many of these requests. The fact that both of these requests are tied to safety is not something the committee completely understands. With both venues having working systems right now, is safety truly a concern, or should it simply be said that the systems are old and it is time for their replacement? UPBC would like to see these impact statements more honestly reflect the need versus a simple catch all phrase like health and safety, both of which are used throughout the proposal.

The committee is supportive of the remaining one-time and capital funding requests.

The committee continues to be pleased by the strong effort made to recognize cost savings from personnel control (PCN) before any proposals to eliminate positions.

Student Affairs

Judicial Action software (Base budget addition) \$15,920 is supported with the expectation that IT will sign off on this purchase knowing the impact to their operation.

Recreation and fitness student labor \$108,000. This is an increase of \$23,000 over last year's requested funding for this one-time item. UPBC would request that Student Affairs examine this increase and include more detail about the additional time and activities to be funded. UPBC recognizes that SA had no funding migrated to their operation when responsibilities were transferred to this division for recreation activities. Therefore, the labor and maintenance support for recreation should be migrated from a one-time request to a base budget increase and the responsibilities truly operationalized in this division. The same thought applies to Fall Orientation activities. This is an annual event necessary to indoctrinate new students to their campus. As part of a strong retention effort in recent years, UPBC believes that CCSU needs to continue to start off on the right foot with our new cohorts by offering this program. The fact that the program is annually at risk due to the funding mechanism is not practical and again this item should be moved to the base budget. Acknowledging that all of these base budget increases cannot be accomplished in one year, one-time funding, should it be available, is supported.

Revenue enhancement: Student Affairs has produced a modest proposal which UPBC was thankful to consider. It was born out of suggestion to your office in last year's UPBC feedback document. Upon review, the committee believes that enacting a modest fee for faculty and staff to utilize recreational facilities to offset some maintenance expenses is worth trying. The suggestion was made that \$100/semester might be a reasonable amount in comparison to externally provided fitness alternatives. Additionally, a freshman orientation fee might be of good consideration as well. UPBC has learned that this type of fee, while not presented by SA, is not uncommon at other institutions. Any support of fees comes with one caveat from the UPBC. Operational responsibilities are to be formalized in the SA area that will run the program

(namely orientation) and an internal strategic plan developed to fund these areas. The modest fees would provide a positive return to the University from Student Affairs. We suggest an overall increase to the SA budget for these two areas with the understanding that this will eliminate the reoccurring one-time needs.

Information Technology

The committee supports the requests by the CIO for funding all of the requested positions. UPBC is supportive of the plan to utilize almost entirely reallocated funding to offset the seemingly large and diverse personnel gaps in IT. Many of these gaps are long standing and need to be addressed to ensure the successful operation of the various IT groups under the guidance of the CIO.

A base budget increase of \$42,000 for software seems inevitable as it was passed down to the campus by the system office (SO). UPBC is concerned with this practice. The question needs to be asked, "Is one manner of cost savings for the SO simply to push expenses down to the campuses reducing the overall costs of operating the SO, however not reducing the overall operational costs of the Board of Regents (BOR) as promised in the higher education merger of 2011?" UPBC finds this unsettling and reluctantly supports CCSU dollars to be expended on this SO mandate.

The next item of security evaluation, software and hardware is recognized as seriously needed by UPBC in light of the recent data breach and virus concerns on our campus. Again though, will this be a CCSU or SO project when it comes time to fund it? That is a question UPBC would like to see communicated back to the campus community when the decision is made. SO scrutiny of the individual campuses IT departments seems to have increased under the new BOR while many other aspects of campus operation and academic oversight by the SO have relaxed. It is warranted to say that IT responsibilities to both our campus, and that of the demands of the SO, need to be continually monitored for proper funding support.

Campus wireless proposals. The general campus wireless proposal presented by IT for \$300,000 is a supported project by UPBC. The wireless proposals tied to infrastructure improvements command a few questions. UPBC has, for the last two budget cycles, been asked to consider large Andover lock requests in excess of \$1 million by the Administrative Affairs division. Each year that request has been denied. This request for \$800,000 for a wireless upgrade to support a third locking system on campus has raised a few concerns. UPBC does acknowledge the overall benefit the campus will receive through these wireless deployments, that goes without saying. And UPBC understands that the proposal can be rolled out in smaller pieces over multiple years. The committee has not seen the data to suggest that the implementation of a new lock system (additional to legacy Locknetics, Andover wired doors and traditional hard keys) will provide greater efficiencies. The recent concern over network security also brings forward the question of how secure another wireless system is running throughout the campus. While no one believes that the door will need to log into Cisco Clean Access to talk to the network (excuse our moment of levity), the wireless portal used by the locking systems to the network is a concern for some on the committee. The recommendation is to fund a pilot of this new lock system off of 25% of this wireless proposal for the campus. The theory being that the wireless expansion can occur in a building(s) and/or physical area of the campus conducive to needed wireless door locks.

UPBC agrees with the IT reduction strategies, should they be deemed allowable by the President, to address shortfalls in funding for the remainder of FY12 and FY13.

Institutional Advancement

Institutional Advancement is requesting base budget increases for reallocated personnel from Academic Affairs (\$100,000), a replacement for their departing Assistant Director (\$70,000) and an Assistant Director of Annual Giving (\$50,000). UPBC supports the move of the director into IA and the rehire of the University Relations Assistant Director. SUOAF members of the committee believe that these are rather high amounts to be hiring these personnel at and should be looked at for salary savings below the hiring rates proposed. The annual giving position at \$50k (before fringes of 45%) is not supported by the committee. The feeling is that the proposed return on investment (ROI) is too small at the hoped for increase of the annual appeal by \$150,000.

In rank adjustments, tents and professional development are supported by UPBC. The video services line item, the committee hopes will be looked at for possible savings utilizing existing campus resources.

The reduction item of Prospect Research in Technology should be considered for upfront cost savings, maybe even reallocated to fund the proposed enhancement to Raisers Edge. At this time, UPBC cannot support the request to add an additional \$20,000 to an already very expensive and recently purchased software product such as Raisers Edge. Again, if this enhancement will require data migration from Banner and other IT resources post-purchase, it should be vetted through IT as suggested in the IT review in this document.

Fiscal Affairs

No specific budget recommendations.

The committee has recommended a study be done by Fiscal Affairs as to what the cost increases would be to each division should the legislature pass a minimum wage increase this coming fiscal year. We feel that this will, in some divisions, noticeably impact their budget planning.

Human Resources

HR has managed a 17% staff reduction effectively in the past few years. No new items are being requested, so no specific recommendations are being made regarding the HR budget request. Relative to NEOGOV and other software solutions, UPBC believes that we need to continually address how promised automated solutions realistically impact our operations before, if given the choice, we sign on to adopt them for broad use.