

## UPBC Annual Report to the Faculty Senate for the Academic Year 2012-13

What follows is a summary from the University Planning and Budget Committee on their major activities during the 2012-2013 academic year.

- 1) As reported in the 2012-12 UPBC report to the Faculty Senate, it was decided that during the 2012-13 year the Committee would spend significant time reviewing the University Strategic Plan. This was accomplished, and the committee's recommended changes were submitted to the President. A copy of this document will soon be available on the committee's website: <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=6910>. A separate copy has been submitted to the Faculty Senate with this report. The review was done with the goal of improving metrics used to measure progress. When possible, metrics were aligned with national standards or definitions, and when necessary, University specific metrics were modified to align with available data resources. Five of the objectives were clarified, and a new series of objectives was added: 8: Enhance and maintain effective operations in information services and infrastructure in support of teaching and student learning.
- 2) The committee conducted its annual Budget Proposal Review on February 19, 2013. Recommendations were sent the President and are included here as an appendix. One of the most pressing issues raised was part-time faculty budgets and the relation between these and summer/ winter session. There was also concern that there has not been a study to determine the true costs of offering Summer and Winter session courses (including facilities costs) versus the revenue generated. The Committee will be further exploring this issue at its May 1, 2013 meeting.
- 3) The committee reviewed the reports of the STEM and Downtown New Britain Presidential Working Groups. Individual members' concerns and questions were forwarded to President Miller along with two recommendations from the committee as a whole:
  - a) The UPBC believes that the incoming Dean for the School for Engineering and Technology should be charged to collaborate with administrators and faculty from across the campus to develop, within one year, a vision for a CCSU School for STEM.
  - b) The report from the President's ad hoc committee on downtown New Britain contains a number of intriguing and exciting possibilities. The UPBC believes that a logical next step would be to prioritize the report's proposals, based on estimated cost and an analysis of anticipated benefits and logistical constraints. The UPBC is concerned that the report proposes a wide range of possible initiatives that do not fall under the purview of a single administrator or unit. Without a "champion," who will advocate for and oversee the expansion of CCSU's involvement in New Britain?

The challenges of the continuing climate of possible budgetary rescissions and concerns over enrollment management under such conditions (including challenges in the recruitment of students as demographics of the available pool of students will continue to change over the next decade and beyond) are likely to occupy much of the committee's time during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Appendix: UPBC letter

To: President Miller

From: UPBC

Date: February 25, 2013

Subject: Budget meetings

President Miller:

Thanks for meeting with us at the start of our day of budget meetings. Per your request, we have focused our attention on “big picture” items and the overall philosophy of planning and budgeting at CCSU. We hope our enclosed queries and suggestions will be of use to you as the budget process continues.

Collegially,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'K. Larsen', followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Kristine Larsen, Chair, for the Committee

#### Comments and Questions Raised by the Budget Presentations:

- 1) A general philosophical question was raised concerning the true cost of new buildings (including upkeep, power, staffing, etc.). Such costs are currently not clearly articulated to the campus community. The annual costs associated with any new building should be transparent and need to be kept in mind during the planning process. This is even more important given the current reality of decreasing enrollment numbers. There needs to be an open and honest discussion and dissemination of information demonstrating how these factors are all taken into account. There was also concern raised about the effect of the lag time between the conception of a building project and its completion on the planning process – can we realistically plan given these issues?
- 2) The Committee supports the line items in the Provost's proposed budget that increase funding for the Admissions Office, as well as any other direct attempts to recruit students and improve the marketing of the university overall.
- 3) It has been noted that past budget cuts have left some SUOAF positions vacant and unfunded. It appears that over the same period, there has been an increase in the number of University Assistants hired. Concern has been expressed that University Assistants are performing work belonging to the SUOAF Collective Bargaining Unit. It is suggested that before adding or refilling UA positions, an evaluation of the changing administrative needs of programs supporting strategic objectives be evaluated and consideration be given to filling these needs with FT SUOAF lines first.
- 4) It has been noted that some areas are capable of taking a disproportionately large (approximately 20%) cut in DPS/OE; does this imply that the base budgets of these areas should be revisited? In the future the UPBC would like to see detailed operating budgets for the different areas instead of just proposed changes to the proposed budget from one year to the next.
- 5) The Committee would like to commend President Miller's conservative approach to refilling positions over the past few years as a means to weather repeated budget rescissions and cuts.
- 6) The Committee is concerned about the number of One-time and Capital fund requests as well as the total dollar amounts requested. This is particularly true in the case of necessary line items that are perennially funded through these funding sources. These items should be moved to the appropriate base budget. The inadequacy of base budgets to properly fund essential services needs to be more clearly articulated across the campus as well as to the BOR, Legislature, and Governor.
- 7) The Committee has expressed concern about the \$900,000 line item in the IT budget for the Persona Lock Wireless requirements. In particular, although it was noted that this is a multi-year

project, the number of years was not given, nor whether the annual amount would be equally divided from the total. The Committee would have liked to have seen better coordination between the IT and Administrative Affairs budgets concerning this project.

- 8) The Committee expressed concern over the current practice of coupling the part-time budgets for Fall/Spring semesters with Summer and Winter sessions. There was also concern that there has not been a study to determine the true costs of offering Summer and Winter session courses (including facilities costs) versus the revenue generated. There was also concern regarding the fact that the part-time budgets do not differentiate between courses with mandatory small faculty-to-student ratios (such as student teacher supervision and practicums) and other sections, and between online and on-ground courses. There is also a need for a more realistic part-time budget to fulfill the needs for the Fall and Spring semesters.