

# UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

## CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

---

March 9, 2019

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** President Toro

**From:** University Planning and Budget Committee  
Lisa Marie Bigelow, Chair 

**Copy to:** Mark Jackson, President, Faculty Senate

**Subj:** UPBC FY20 Budget Recommendations

Dear President Toro,

The University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) is charged, in part, with providing a forum for the discussion of planning and budgetary issues and advising the President on the strategic and budgetary priorities of the university. The UPBC's work on the FY20 budget recommendations began in October 2018, when we conducted, with the assistance of the CFO and Budget Office staff, training sessions for the fiscal managers of the three units selected to participate in Phase 2 of the Integrated Budget Model (IBM) initiative: School of Business, Information Technology, and Intercollegiate Athletics. A subcommittee of the UPBC met with teams representing each of these units to review, in depth, the philosophy of this budgetary approach, potential value to the university, and the template spreadsheets which they were asked to complete. Our work continued in the Spring semester when, on January 11, we began to receive IBM submittals and, on February 1, we received the traditional FY20 budget proposals from each division head. We conducted a paper review, participated in a full-day of budget presentations by your senior staff, and shared the proposals with the campus community to solicit their feedback.

The committee also reviewed prior years' work by the UPBC, as well as recommendations by the Integrated Planning Council (IPC) since its inception in August 2017. Overall, committee members were pleased by the degree to which FY20 requests were connected to the four elements of the Interim Strategic Plan and supported the "Areas for Strategic Investment for CCSU" as identified by the IPC in January 2018. The only area for strategic investment which the committee feels was inadequately supported by FY20 requests was "*additional resources needed for student support services such as the Learning Center, along with basic writing, basic math and other programs that are part of the institution's academic core.*" (See IPC Minutes of the Meeting of January 23, 2018.) Multiple FY20 budget requests could be connected to the other eight areas for strategic investment. This signaled fidelity to the Interim Strategic Plan and affirmed that the areas identified for strategic investment in 2018 continue to be high priorities.

The recommendations that follow are the result of careful, lengthy, and sometimes spirited deliberations, that spanned across three regular and six special meetings of the UPBC, in addition to countless hours spent individually by each member of the committee evaluating the information put before them.

## GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

### Budget Calendar

In reviewing the UPBC's recommendations for the FY19 budget, we noted that #3 from last year's report on cross-divisional integration has still not been fully addressed. That report said, in part "*The committee has observed that while we are in a period of unprecedented transparency as evidenced by the scope and depth of both historical and real-time budget data, there is still room for significant improvements in the areas of cross-divisional integration and prioritization of budget requests within divisions, the latter leading to budget request levels that were unrealistic.*" While we feel some progress was made to reduce the number of unrealistic requests, lack of cross-divisional integration is still apparent. We recommend further work be done to increase cross-divisional integration in the coming year, which we hope will be evident in the FY21 budget process.

Early in the FY20 budget process, the UPBC discussed the varied approaches used by ExComm members to gather feedback from their constituent units to inform and refine their budget submittals. This led to a revision of the FY20 Budget Calendar document to include providing a timeframe for "*Discussions at the department, school and division level of needs in relation to strategic goals with prioritization of needs within the division.*" According to the calendar, these discussions were to have taken place university-wide from November to mid-January. In an email announcement from your office on December 20, the FY20 Budget Calendar was shared with university community. Whether due to the timing of the notification or other reasons, there appears to have been no process—or no consistent process—through which faculty and staff were involved in budget discussions at the college/school level before the deans forwarded their requests to the provost. We recommend announcing the budget calendar earlier next year – well before the end of the semester in order to promote that this level of engagement occur. In addition, we recommend that the unit-level templates developed for the Integrated Budget Model be modified (simplified) so that they can be used by academic and administrative departments to request base budget enhancements as well as capital and one-time funding. This will assure that all departments have an opportunity to request budgetary consideration and division heads will receive consistent information to inform their budget requests. The requests can be submitted through a portal and archived on the UPBC website with other budget documents, providing both transparency and an historical record of budget requests.

Despite what we assume were their best efforts, not all Executive Committee members were able to meet the February 1 deadline for submission to the UPBC Chair this year. The UPBC granted extensions to the two new members of the senior staff – the Vice President for Student Affairs and Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management – due to their start dates in relation to the deadline. We received those submissions on time. We did not anticipate, however, several delays, incomplete submissions, and subsequent revisions by other division heads, most notably Academic Affairs and Information Technology. This led to a delay in posting the proposals for campus-wide commentary and caused UPBC members to have to review multiple versions of some requests. We recommend moving the February 1 due date to the last Friday before the Spring semester starts.

The UPBC will be working on a revision to the budget calendar to improve the budgeting process and will make a recommendation to the IPC no later than May 2019.

### Budget Tools and Submissions

Throughout the budget review process, the committee was frustrated by matters relating to the budget timeline and the Excel templates used in the budget process. Frustrations were compounded by numerous instances of insufficient information (complete lack of supporting information in many cases), and multiple follow-up questions that needed to be asked and answered simultaneous to the committee trying

to complete their work. In short, much of the work that was done to clarify requests should have been done prior to the requests coming to the UPBC. To aid our work, we created a single consolidated spreadsheet and each division's request was imported into the master Excel file so that requests could be considered individually, but also as a whole, with calculated running totals of approved line items. We recommend this consolidated spreadsheet be used in future years to transmit all traditional budget requests (baseline, capital, and one-time) to the UPBC in a single file. In addition, we recommend several process improvements for next year:

- (1) that all line items include a complete description of the item or services requested;
- (2) that requests comprised of several cost components be separated into individual line items and the line items be identified as a package;
- (3) that the accompanying narratives succinctly describe how individual line items combine to support a particular program, project, or initiative.

The UPBC will be working on a revision of the budget templates to improve the budgeting process and will recommend make a recommendation to the IPC no later than May 2019.

#### *Budget Estimates*

During the course of the budget presentations on February 22, it became apparent that many submissions included questionable estimates for labor, services, and goods. Some full-time salaries were quoted at levels below collective bargaining agreement requirements. Insufficient explanation of how cost estimates for goods and services were derived was pervasive throughout the submissions, and in some cases, the estimates used by division heads for some rather large ticket items were inflated and later reduced as a result of information provided by the CFO and her team. There were at least two duplications, one involving a \$40K line item being in more than one division's submission and another \$680K duplication in equipment. This speaks to both communication among ExComm members and the importance of a thorough technical review occurring prior to the requests being sent to the UPBC.

Large base-budget increases (\$65K or more) provided little justification other than it was "due." We recommend development of a narrative to accompany the budget templates that provides clearer direction on what level of research and detail should go into future budget submissions. For example, after submissions were received this year, the CFO sent out a clarification to ExComm members suggesting they use salary midpoints, rather than minimums, when requesting new positions (a planning assumption that the UPBC supports.).

#### *Integrated Budget Model*

As noted above, Phase 2 of the Integrated Budget Model occurred this budget cycle with participation by the School of Business, Information Technology, and Intercollegiate Athletics. Participating divisions were notified of the IBM calendar in late October and initial planning meetings with a subcommittee of the UPBC and CFO staff took place with each unit in early November. Attendance by fiscal managers from the units participating in the IBM varied and as did the quality of the submissions received, which appeared directly related to how fully division personnel participated in the IBM planning sessions. The School of Business submission, for example, had to be returned for correction and clarification multiple times by both the UPBC and the CFO's office. This could and should have been avoided. If the IBM continues to Phase 3 it is critically important that all designated personnel participate fully in the process.

The committee sought the feedback of participating department and division heads. Across the board, the budget managers reported that participating in the IBM pilot was beneficial to them and increased their understanding of how their existing base budget is used. The UPBC weighted the pros and cons of the

IBM pilot and concluded that although the IBM may be of great value to unit and division heads, it did not contribute significantly enough to the work of the UPBC to justify the time commitment it required.

### Strategic Planning

During the course of the presentations on February 22, we learned that several units – Academic Affairs, Information Technology, and Intercollegiate Athletics – are engaging in strategic planning efforts. We find this to be of concern, given that the University is concurrently engaging in a strategic planning process that will culminate in a new Strategic Plan for CCSU in December 2019. We find current efforts attempting to form long-term unit-specific strategic plans to be premature. We recommend that any units engaging in significant strategic planning at the division or sub-unit level slow their efforts until the new Strategic Plan is in place. Continuation of strategic planning in the absence of a university-wide plan risks misalignment and less than optimal allocation of resources; this may also potentially weaken the effectiveness of the emerging University strategic plan if all University units are not working together effectively in support of shared goals. Once a Strategic Plan is adopted, we encourage all units to engage operational planning, to establish measureable goals and objectives for their unit in support of the overall Strategic Plan; these goals and objectives should then drive future budget requests.

### Reorganizations

Several reorganizations were unveiled through the FY20 budget process including the disassembly of the Media Center, combining the Instructional Design and Technology Resource Center (IDTRC) with the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development, and separating the Career Center from Explore Central. The degree to which the proposed reorganizations are well-informed, the cost-effectiveness of the proposed solutions, plans for the implementation of the proposed reorganizations, and how the effectiveness of the resulting structures will be assessed cannot be determined from line items on a spreadsheet and scant detail was included in the accompanying narratives.

Reorganizations of the types proposed have significant budget and planning implication and require thoughtful implementation plans. There appears to be no single way in which reorganizations occur; there is also a lack of transparency about what data or events drive them. How planned and implemented reorganizations are communicated to the campus community is also of concern. The UPBC recommends that a proposal process be established for all reorganizations (except those of academic departments) that involves submission to the IPC portal. It further recommends that the proposal include, at minimum, a rationale for the reorganization, an assessment of the impact of the proposed reorganization on students and related and supporting organizational units, a fiscal analysis addressing potential revenue generation or cost savings, impact on accreditation, and an implementation plan that includes a timeline, any HR-related actions that need to occur, and a communication plan. Having reorganization plans go through the IPC process will ensure opportunity for feedback from the UPBC, FPC, and ITC, as well as ensure transparency by providing an opportunity for campus constituents to review the proposals on the IPC Portal website and communicate questions, suggestions and concerns to appropriate representative bodies.

## **FY20 BASE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS BY DIVISION**

### **Academic Affairs**

Revision Two of the Academic Affairs budget assigned very high or high priority to 27 line items/initiatives, while assigning low priority to an additional 33 base budget requests. Among the high priority items were eight full-time, tenure track positions (three in Business and five in Engineering, Science, and Technology.) The Committee does not dispute that more full-time teaching lines are needed, however in the absence of a compelling narrative outlining why these particular lines were given priority, we are not able to endorse funding these particular lines. We would like to see (in this and future years) a full analysis of where lines are needed the most, based on data including number of majors, number of credit hours taught by full- and part-time personnel and overload credits by department.

The committee reviewed the 33 items assigned low priority. Some of the full-time tenure track positions assigned low priority, based on a more data-driven review process, rank higher than those given higher priority. The committee concurred that the remaining items assigned low priority were correctly classified as low priority given the current budgetary environment.

Unless noted otherwise, the recommended items are independent of one another.

In no particular order, the committee strongly supports:

- Eight full-time tenure, track positions. But given that the funds may not be available to fund all these lines, what departments receive the lines should be based on more in-depth analysis, as noted above. As a result of the analysis, some of the funded new lines may come from the lines assigned low priority if the data suggests there is a more critical need in those areas.
- A SUOAF Admin III position assigned to the Theatre department to monitor and address health and safety issues in Maloney Hall. It is expected that this position will have a strong working relationship with both the Theatre Department and the Office of Environmental Health and Safety. (For budgetary purposes for this and all other full-time lines, we recommend that the midpoint of the range, rather than the minimum, be used.)
- A Science Technical Specialist (likely a SUOAF Admin III position) in Biomedical Sciences (\$111,150 including fringe requested; should be budgeted at the salary midpoint, plus fringe)
- Administrative support for the DNAP Program. Although the position is supported, the proposed duties outlined in the budget proposal suggest that a more cost-effective approach would be to hire a SUOAF member at the rank of Admin II or Admin III. (\$111,150 including fringe requested; should be budgeted at the midpoint of a SUOAF Admin III plus fringe.)

The committee supports:

- An increase in the Library's base budget to provide for inflation costs related to periodical subscriptions (\$75,235) and inflation for ongoing subscriptions for electronic databases (\$18,550.)
- Increasing the OE/DPS budgets (\$75,000) within the School of Business in order to gain equity with other academic units. However, we recommend that these funds be distributed proportionately to each department based on the number of undergraduate majors, and not held centrally to be allocated at the Dean's discretion.

- During the cross-divisional review initiated by the CFO, the IT department discovered that the Academic Affairs base budget request did not include costs associated with Degree Works rolling off of the CSCU five-year prepay program. We support a base budget increase to support this. (\$52,800) According to the CIO, the funds could sit in the registrar's office budget or in Info04 (Administrative Tech Services).
- Scholarship assistance for low income students participating in study abroad (\$25,000.) Because the request indicates these funds be awarded based on need, we recommend the funding be administered by the Financial Aid office, not the Center for International Education.

The committee does not support:

- edTPA fees (\$60,000) – We understand that there is no Systemwide expectation that these fees be covered by the institution beginning in FY20. We further understand these fees could be covered by awarding existing private (Foundation) scholarships more strategically, by giving preference to students in the semester during which they are student teaching.
- The Library's request to subscribe to Kanopy (\$10,000) based on concerns about the value that this particular service provides when compared to other less costly alternatives.
- The request to enhance tutoring in the School of Business (\$15,000) and increase graduate assistants in the School of Education and Professional Studies (\$25,000). However, the Committee strongly recommends that the university conduct an assessment of the resources devoted to tutoring to determine whether the structures and current allocation of resources meet student needs and are sufficient to have a significant, positive impact on retention.
- Resourcing a U.S. Study Away program (\$30,000) based in the Center for International Education (CIE).
- Socio-cultural programming (\$20,000) within the CIE. The Committee recommends this initiative be deferred until we have a comprehensive international student recruitment and retention plan in place.
- The use of summer research stipends to guarantee salary augmentation for Accounting faculty (\$108,000). The Committee feels this violates both the spirit and the letter of the AAUP contract, and based on data reviewed as part of our deliberations, believes salaries are non-competitive in other disciplines as well.
- Increasing the SEPS base budget to provide for warranties on lab equipment in the Blue Devil Performance Lab (\$21,000). The justification indicated that this lab generates revenue. That revenue should be used to cover the warranties.

The committee does not feel it has sufficient information to support the following requests and recommends that full proposals on each initiative be submitted for consideration through the IPC Portal. Requiring these proposed structural changes to undergo a holistic, rigorous review will ensure that the proposed structures are evaluated within the context of existing and related structures/services, implement best practices, resourced for success, and optimally implemented.

- Expanding the Community Engagement Office (\$119,195)
- Separating Career Services from Explore Central (\$317,017)
- Expanding Success Central (\$92,216)

- Combining the Instructional Design and Technology Resources Center (IDTRC) and Center for Teaching and Faculty Development (\$143,500) – This particular initiative seems untimely given the recently announced resignation of the current Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School. The pending reorganization in Information Technology also calls into question how the proposed new entity would distinguish itself from the proposed Academic Technology unit discussed in the IT budget proposal.

### **Administrative Affairs**

The health and safety of our students and all member of our extended campus community is of paramount concern. The UPBC supports Administrative Affairs’ efforts to ensure that the university is not only responsive, but proactive when it comes to health and safety.

In no particular order, the committee strongly supports

- Campus-wide safety training program (\$25,000)
- Annual inspection/repair of performing arts facilities (\$10,000)
- A University Assistant to support the handling of chemicals on campus (\$18,000)
- Student labor in the Office of Environmental Health and Safety (\$5,000)
- Camera maintenance (\$66,000)
- Lock maintenance (\$25,000)
- Annual Structural Inspection of Copernicus Garage (\$15,000)

The committee supports:

- EQUIP Asset Inventory System (\$25,000)
- An annual maintenance program on for campus signage (\$25,000)

We are also concerned about the apparent practices of (1) foregoing the purchase of warranties on expensive equipment and (2) making modifications to equipment which can potentially result in voiding warranties and/or give rise to potential health and safety risks. We therefore strongly endorse Administrative Affairs proposed plan to create a maintenance and inspection schedule that would ensure the periodic review of all equipment, to ensure it is working properly and mitigate potential liability

### **Enrollment Management**

The UPBC supported the creation of a Chief Enrollment Management Officer in FY18, as part of the FY19 budget process. Due to a failed search, the position was not filled until mid-way through FY19, and the new Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Karissa Peckham, joined CCSU in late January.

The Enrollment Management base budget increase included 25 requests. In her presentation before the UPBC, Ms. Peckham identified nine requests as high priority.

The committee strongly supports the following, which are independent of one another:

- Purchasing name buys from College Board, ACT, NRCCUA, and CBSS (\$100,000) in order to expand our recruitment reach locally, regionally, and nationally.
- Enhancing our Hobson subscription by adding access to Naviance (\$20,000), raising the visibility and awareness of CCSU to prospective students.
- A new Senior Enrollment Services Analyst (SUOAF Admin IV) to assist with the implementation of the new Customer Relationship Management (CRM) platform and improve current packaging formulas and scripts to support optimal utilization of Federal, State, institutional and private aid. (\$162,450 including fringe; recommend budgeting at salary midpoint, plus fringe)
- Adding a new Assistant Director of Undergraduate Admissions (\$111,150 including fringe; recommend budgeting at salary midpoint) to broaden in-state and out-of-state recruitment efforts and recruit special populations (e.g., Care Scholars)
- Increase in out-of-state travel (\$10,000) for undergraduate admissions to provide for in-person follow-up on applications resulting from name-buys in order to increase the yield.

The committee supports:

- Additional funding to improve Admitted Student's Day (\$50,000)
- Financial Literacy Office Marketing Materials (\$5,000)
- Travel budget for the Financial Literacy Office to conduct community outreach (\$1,000)
- Promotional and Informational Events related to Financial Literacy (\$2,500)
- Bus Services for a Campus Visitation Program (\$10,000)
- New Graduate Recruitment Folders (\$4,000)
- Student Mentor Program for Transfer Students (\$6,500)
- Scholarship breakfast/luncheon for high-achieving students (25,000)
- Professional Development (\$4,000) – However, this expense can be funded by SUOAF Professional Development and/or Minority Recruitment and Mentoring Funds
- Student Information Session presenters (\$15,000)
- Color MFP/Copier Rental (\$2,100)

The committee does not support:

- Hiring an Associate Director of International Admissions (\$145,350) and related international travel (\$15,000) in FY20. However, the UPBC strongly recommends that the University work toward building an environment that supports growth in international student enrollment.
- Secretary 1 hire (\$88,920). The UPBC recommends converting the existing part-time secretary position to full-time.
- Assistant Director of Graduate Admissions (\$111,150).
- Alumni Recruiters (\$20,000)
- Salesforce contract (\$25,000)
- Out of state receptions (\$20,000)

### **Fiscal Affairs**

The division of Fiscal Affairs did not submit a base budget request.

### **Human Resources**

The UPBC concurs with the approach to utilize contingency funds to address any potential FY20 impact that results from the restructuring of Human Resources, the Office of Diversity and Equity and the Office of the University Ombudsperson.

### **Information Technology**

The UPBC recognizes that, like Administrative Affairs, Information Technology provides support to all units within the organization. We appreciate the current efforts to ensure that IT be optimally organized to not only meet operating needs, but leveraged to spur efficiencies in other areas of the University. Further, we are cognizant of the ever-changing nature of technology, the need for planned maintenance, and the cost implications when software and equipment “roll off” of bond funding. The IT base budget request of \$1.4M represented 20% of all base-budget requests and included strategic and stop-gap initiatives, many of which have the UPBC’s full support, however in many instances, several things were bundled together making it difficult to discern the cost of individual components of a single line item.

The committee strongly supports:

- The requested baseline increase for software recommended by the Information Technology Committee (\$65,986)
- Increased costs associated with DocuSign for financial aid documents (\$5,617)
- Software and consulting to support the recommendations of the Task Force on Sexual Misconduct, Bullying and Campus Climate (\$60,000)

The committee supports:

- Hiring an Information Security Officer to address cybersecurity and related security issues (\$168,020, including fringe.)
- Hiring a Web/CRM/Imaging Specialist and the dedicated CRM Web Services Architect position that was also supported by Institutional Advancement (\$302,600)
- Cyber insurance, data loss prevention software, and cybersecurity audit (\$153,000)
- WebFocus Hyperion conversion/consulting/support (\$20,000) and Document Imaging costs related to OnBase (\$35,000) with the caveat that these items appear to be one-time, not recurring, expenses.
- Equipment related to the telephone system coming off of CSU bond funding (\$275,610)
- License costs for MS Office and VMware (\$53,308)
- A security audit and remediation that may be necessary (\$35,000)

The committee does not support:

- Support services to align to a new IT strategic plan (\$50,000). The committee feels this should be reconsidered in future years, once the University's new Strategic Plan has been developed.
- Increase costs in maintenance support (\$1,264). Lack of support is attributed to lack of detail accompanying this request.
- Academic Technology Support for specialty computer labs (\$136,800)
- Training and development for Project Management Office (\$5,600). The committee recommends seeking SUOAF Professional Development funding for these expenses.
- Raises for student workers (\$5,000.) However, it is important to note that the committee is in favor of addressing student worker compensation, across the university, in a more strategic way and it is hoped that this issue can be explored during the re-engineering of the offices of Human Resources, Diversity & Equity, and the University Ombudsperson.
- Extension of computer lab hours (\$90,000.) The committee recommends further study of whether the existing computer lab mirrors the computing needs of our students or whether there is a more cost-efficient way of meeting students' computing needs.

### **Institutional Advancement**

A majority of the base budget requests in Institutional Advancement pertain to investments in the university's web presence and structural changes being made to the Media Center. The UPBC unanimously agrees that we face several significant challenges with regard to our web presence, some a result of insufficient manpower related to design and content, and some related to behind-the-scenes hardware and hosting issues. The web-related position requests in the IA budget could not be considered independent of the web-related position and technological requests in the IT budget. This tandem review resulted in the recommendations below.

With regard to the structural changes related to the Media Center, the committee supports this, but at the same time, believes that this was a good idea expressed and implemented in a less than optimal way. The new structure announced on February 28 and implemented on March 1 can be used as a case study to construct a transparent inclusive process for making structural changes. This case study, as well as the other structural changes proposed in other budgets, gave rise to the reorganization recommendation at the outset of this memo.

The committee strongly supports:

- The requested Front End Web Designer (\$42,600 with fringe, net of reallocation) and the Web Content Manager (\$102,600). We recommend budgeting both of these positions at the midpoint of the salary range, plus fringe.)
- The requested Assistant Director of Institutional Advancement (\$42,600 with fringe, net of reallocation) on the condition that \$30,000 in annual funding be provided by the Foundation.

The committee supports:

- The proposed reallocation of funds to hire two University Assistants to assist with graphic design (\$25,000) and the Annual Appeal. (\$25,000)
- Support for the capital campaign. (\$25,000)

- Purchase of Quality Assurance Software (\$15,000) provided this has been reviewed and endorsed by the Information Technology Committee and is not duplicated in any other budget request.
- Support for the new University-wide Marketing and Communication Lab (\$50,000).

The committee does not support:

- Assistant Director of Marketing and Communications for social media. The committee recommends this position request be deferred until next year, giving the soon-to-be-hired Director of Marketing time to take office, assess need, etc.

The division withdrew the request for an Assistant Director of Continuing Education during the budget process.

### **Intercollegiate Athletics**

The UPBC reviewed the Intercollegiate Athletics budget submission within the context of the work and recommendations of the Task Force for the Sustainability of the CCSU Athletics Program.

The committee supports:

- Hiring a full-time strength and conditioning coach (\$40,294 net of reallocation.)

Based on the published fiscal impact of the Athletics Task Force’s work, the committee does not support the request for a \$255,648 base budget increase. The committee does, however, support the Task Force outcome to have the University “*match dollar for dollar any Athletics Program donations and sponsorship deposited into the Foundation in excess of the 5-year average of \$580,000 up to a maximum of \$150,000 beginning with State Fiscal Year 2020.*” If it is determined that the Athletics program meets this benchmark, the committee supports one-time funding of up to \$150,000.

### **Police Department**

As part of our review of the Police Department’s request, we reviewed the supplemental request for funding that was submitted through the IPC portal in August 2018 in which the Department requested \$563,816 in annual operating funds and \$81,944 in one-time funding. That proposal led to the approval of \$281,908 in annual operating funds and \$40,972 in one-time funding, which was to have brought the total number of sworn officers to 23. In the FY20 proposal, it was noted that one of the four officer positions approved through the IPC request was subsequently de-funded; the FY20 base budget request included two positions: the previously approved position that was de-funded and a new position. The committee is not aware of the circumstances which led to the approved position being de-funded. We support reinstatement of this funding bringing the total number of sworn officers to 23.

The committee strongly supports:

- Hiring one officer to bring the total number of sworn officers to 23.

The committee supports:

- The base budget request to outfit and equip new officers (\$62,000)

- The base budget request to the software index for recurring software maintenance/upgrades (\$30,000)
- The requested base budget increase for increased/expanded officer training (\$38,000)
- The purchase and ongoing use of Kronos TeleStaff to better track and hire for overtime (\$12,500). We note this is 50% of the cost and the remaining 50% will be covered by Information Technology.

The committee does not support:

- A second new officer position. Given the significant investment in the Police Department in FY19, and taking the pressing need for additional investment in health and safety in other areas of the University into consideration.
- A base budget increase to the firearms/ammunition index (\$10,000)

### **President's Office**

The committee supports the request to fill the Chief Information Officer based on the fiscal plan you outlined in our meeting with you on February 22, which demonstrated \$13K in net savings.

### **Student Affairs**

The committee is not able to endorse any of the four priorities put forth by the Vice President for Student Affairs:

- Associate Vice President/Dean of Students (\$230,850, including fringe). As the committee understands it, part of the justification that led to the creation of the Director of New Student Programs position was that a body of work would be taken away from the Associate Dean of Student Affairs, freeing up more of his time for serious student issues.
- Associate Director, Student Conduct (\$136,145, including fringe.) There is insufficient data to demonstrate the need for this position in addition to the two existing full-time position in the Office of Student Conduct.
- Assistant Director, Student Activities and Leadership Development (Multicultural) (\$111,150, including fringe.)
- Collegiate Link Software (\$12,500) The committee feels strongly that this cost should be covered by the Student Government Association.

## CAPITAL AND ONE-TIME REQUESTS

In contrast to our division-by-division review of base budget requests, the Committee combined all capital and one-time requests and selected from among the combined list those items we feel should be given priority. The accompanying spreadsheet indicates which line items are supported. However, we would also like to provide some commentary on a few particular decisions, by division.

### Academic Affairs

#### One-time Requests:

- The request for IRBNet software to manage IRB protocol submissions was supported based on the volume of positive feedback about the need and value of this software the UPBC received from faculty.
- The Library's request for a microform cabinet was not supported; the UPBC recommends the Library explore digitizing the resources stored in the requested cabinet.
- Graduate Assistantships of the type requested are not one-time requests and future similar requests should be submitted as base-budget requests
- Requesting funds to backfill the line of a faculty member on sabbatical was not supported because this practice is both unsustainable and part-time funds exist to cover the course loads of faculty on sabbatical.

#### Capital Equipment Requests:

- Priority was given to unmet needs and requests accompanied by a sufficient level of detail, with an eye to fair and equitable distribution across schools.
- SEST capital equipment requests lacked sufficient detail for the committee to identify which particular items to support; a flat \$30K in funding is supported.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

#### Equipment below \$1000:

- The committee supports all of the requested items.

### Administrative Affairs

#### One-time Requests:

- Priority was given to requests that had health and safety implications and/or related to instituting a planned maintenance program.
- The committee supports the request for funding to cover relocation costs as construction projects continue to require departments to be relocated. (\$75K)
- Four items related to parking and shuttle bus transportation were raised "for discussion" during the Administrative Affairs budget presentations. While not supported because they did not appear to be actual budget requests, the UPBC hopes these issues will be reviewed by the Task

Force on Parking and that the Task Force will make recommendations concerning these line items.

- The committee did not support renovations in Marcus White (lounge and Africana Center) because it did not have sufficient information on the purpose of the lounge, or whether alternate space for the Africana Center could be found on campus as a result of the many pending relocations.

#### Capital Equipment Requests:

- Priority was given to items with health and safety or security implications, and those items which could potentially be procured by 6/30/19 and paid for with FY19 funds.
- The committee does not support the construction of two bus shelters for the Student Center and Willard DiLoreto (\$80K); the cost was deemed to be excessive.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

#### Equipment below \$1000:

- The committee supports all of the requested items.

### **Police**

#### One-time Request:

- The committee supports seeing the assistance of the Daigle Law Group to review/rewrite policies and procedures for Police Department and we expect this will have a positive impact on operations, as well as reaccreditation.

#### Capital Equipment Request:

- During the budget review process, the capital request for taser replacements was moved to Equipment below \$1000 and this request was ultimately supported.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

#### Equipment below \$1000:

- The committee supports all of the requested items.

### **Enrollment Management**

#### One-time Request:

- The committee did not recommend new signage for the Open House and other events and suggests that the CCSU Foundation be asked to provide a grant related to this request.
- The committee supported the request for funding to support hosting a statewide and/or regional conference, but does not quite understand why this event cannot be self-sustaining.

## *Fiscal Affairs*

### One-Time-Requests:

- The committee supports the two UA positions requested in Events Management.

### Capital Equipment Requests:

- The UPBC supported all but one of the capital requests (pop-up tents) but questions whether many of the capital requests made by Events Management would be more appropriately consolidated into the capital requests made by Administrative Affairs. Having Events Management, a service, responsible for the physical condition of particular venues seems misguided. We recommend the university move in a direction where all non-academic physical property maintenance and enhancements are requested through the Administrative Affairs budget. This would (1) ensure broader cross-divisional communication/coordination; (2) consolidate health and safety-related issues within Administrative Affairs, which houses the Department of Environmental Health and Safety; and (3) allow for more effective planning of routine maintenance.
- The committee noted that some requested equipment will be transported between Welte and Torp. This will reduce the overall life of the equipment. We recommend an FY21 request be submitted to purchase additional equipment so that the equipment can reside permanently in each location.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

### Equipment below \$1000:

- The committee supports all of the requested items.

## *Information Technology*

### One-Time Requests:

- The committee did not support the two requests related to a PC-iPad conversion in the Reading Clinic/Lab because the rationale indicated this conversation has already taken place.

### Capital Equipment Requests:

- The committee struggled to support the \$1.8 million request for faculty and staff laptop and desktop computers. This is a recurring issue and the current replacement policy is unsustainable. We support a fixed \$1 million allocation, to be prioritized by the soon-to-be-hired CIO.
- The committee supports replacing WiFi in Sheridan Hall and replacing terminals with computers in various residences halls in order to increase student satisfaction and maintain/increase occupancy.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

### *Institutional Advancement/Athletics*

#### One-time Requests:

- The committee did not support the request for \$118,300 for recruiting based on the outcome of the Athletics Task Force noted above.
- The request for the video board in Detrick Gymnasium was supported due to its potential to generate revenue.

#### Capital Equipment Requests:

- The committee sees a connection between the wireless system for Arute Field requested by Administrative Affairs and the Sound System for Arute Field requested by Athletics. However, neither was supported based on higher priority being assigned to other requests.
- All other capital equipment requests assigned high priority were supported.
- Requests assigned Medium or Low priority by the Division were not considered.

#### Equipment below \$1000:

- The committee supports all of the requested items.

### *Student Affairs*

#### One-time Requests:

- The committee supports all of the one-time requests made by Student Affairs, but funding was not recommended for the desktop computers with specialized software requested for Student Disability Services because it is our understanding that the CFO manages an account that can cover this expenditure.

[end of document]