UPBC key recommendations

Departmental reliance on one-time funding

UPBC has in the past recommended that departments plan for the future reduction in one-time funding as more full time, tenure track faculty and full time staff are hired. This year looks like it will finally be the “bubble” year where that one-time funding will be expended as CCSU continues to hire faculty and fill the holes created by fringe benefit changes and ARP to SERS migrations. The committee, with the support of the CFO, has made an overall suggestion to all divisions to reconsider one-time requests for inclusion in capital should they qualify for that type of funding.

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

Working Out of Class

UPBC agrees that all requests pertaining to staff members working out of class should be reviewed and properly addressed. In recent years, with budget reductions and continued increases in workload, staff members have been asked to do more and more work beyond where they are often classed. The allocations requested are reasonable.

Revenue enhancement

Creative revenue enhancement ideas seem to have lessened this year as the focus turns toward general enrollment increases. Yes, an enrollment increase IS revenue enhancement. The committee however would still like to see more ideas and support for them come forward to build revenue at CCSU. The innovation grant program instituted by the Provost is a good example of one of these initiatives.
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. We do believe that the ability to satisfy these requests using one-time funding will be hindered this coming fiscal year and that alternative solutions will be needed to try and implement at least some of these proposed items. The continued hiring of full time, tenure track faculty is also heavily supported by UPBC.

**Administrative Affairs**

UPBC has, in recent years, received guidance that new position funding was to be allocated solely to teaching positions. With that understanding, the CAO may want to consider using reallocation to fund the Public Safety Administrative Coordinator should no base budget increase be approved. UPBC is generally not opposed to the position and we were pleased to see fringe estimates included in the proposal.

A few items on the capital request list stood out to the committee. Parking management system increases - $70,000. UPBC understands that parking management will be implemented in the Welte garage and that these proposals will constitute an expansion of that system. At this time UPBC would recommend a review of the system in Welte prior to any further commitment of funding to expand the system. The $70,000 request can be used elsewhere to fund higher priority items in the CAO’s request.

Football Stadium Sound System - $80,000. At this time, the sound system upgrade is not something supported by the UPBC.

Perimeter Fencing Soccer/Track - $100,000. UPBC believes that this item should have been included in the larger reserve funded field upgrade project that occurred in recent years. It seems that this is a carryover of that work. UPBC was concerned these additional requests would occur when the initial proposal to upgrade the fields was proposed. At this time, the fence is not something supported by the UPBC.

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

UPBC would caution against further reducing any deferred maintenance on the CCSU campus. The Transform CSCU 2020 plan offers some solutions to the deferred maintenance issues within the system and we hope that CCSU would be assigned a fair share of that funding to address these ongoing issues.

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

UPBC is supportive of the request to fund the additional time or personnel needed within Student Disability Services. Part time AAUP or part time SUOAF lines should be considered ahead of University Assistants for this work. Our counseling and disability services units need to be properly supported to respond to the growing needs of the student populations that they serve.

Nutmeg/Laurel Room Renovation- $200,000. UPBC believes that this is not the year to request this renovation project within Memorial Hall. Funds will be very limited and the spaces are not in dire need of refurbishment. Projects such as these should be considered for inclusion in the CAO’s budget and prioritized by that unit. Ultimately the CAO will minimally need to assign a project manager to oversee outside contractors, or at a higher level, provide qualified workers to do the project in-house. UPBC is concerned that facilities projects are proposed across divisional budgets.

North Entrance Awning - $10,000. Again this item should have been included in the CAO’s budget. It is referenced as a safety issue and would certainly rank high when prioritized. Within the Student Affair budget the item is 13th in prioritization. UPBC is supportive of the replacement should there be a true need with regard to safety of the people using that entrance.

Alumni/Bellin Semesters Sound System - $221,700. UPBC is not supportive of the project using limited one-time funding and would suggest a migration of this proposal to capital funding for consideration. Generally, the overall project ranked low in the eyes of the committee.

Alumni/Bellin Mixing System - $23,500. Our response is identical to the one listed for the above item.

UPBC was told in the past that we banked recreation fees that were used for the field and recreation upgrade projects. Going forward since that time, where have the recreation fees been going? The request for $5,398 for a power rack in recreation seems like a perfect use for the funds accumulated under that fee structure. The committee recommends a review of the recreation fee allocations to allow for projects such as this one to be funded from that pool of money.

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

Information Technology

The committee supports the request by the CIO for funding of the additional position to address the growing data security needs of the campus. Clarification of the reallocation funding accounts and inclusion of fringe estimates should be in the final approved version of the proposal.

Classroom Enhancement Pool - $150,000. It is the understanding of the committee that the Provost, CIO and CAO have combined to address this need. The UPBC is pleased to see the CAO’s support of the project however recognition of such projects should still occur somewhere within the CAO’s proposal in order to provide a level of understanding that there is a
commitment of facilities management’s time and personnel to manage these projects when they get off the ground. Facilities staff is already handling multiple large building renovations and construction projects and these classroom upgrades will require their involvement. The upgrades requested to rooms in years past have often been denied while other facilities projects including increased media technology spending is favored. The UPBC is supportive of a return to focusing on classroom improvements (segmented lighting, darkening blinds, chalk board replacement, etc.) ahead of spending on hallway technology increases by the CAO.

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

UPBC agrees with the IT reduction strategies as they appear to not cause considerable operation impairment to the division.

**Institutional Advancement**

The Institutional Advancement request received much discussion this year. After approving of a move to a new web site and content management provider 5 years earlier, the time has come for a new renewal of services. Additionally the VP of IA has requested a larger increase in marketing dollars for the University in support of enrollment increases.

Web (CMS) - $199,750. The UPBC recognizes that we cannot be without a web site. The funding allocation number is less of a concern to the committee as where it will be paid from and the manner in which that funding is applied and carried forward. In the current proposal before the committee, the item is requested as a base budget increase. UPBC does not support an annual increase of this amount. Should the contract be paid over 5 years, UPBC is supportive of a $31,000 base budget increase with an allocation from one-time funding in year one of the agreement in the amount of $44,750. Should contractual rules and discounting allow for a single upfront purchase of the 5 year CMS, then the item needs to be moved to one-time or capital funding.

Recruitment and Admissions - $200,000. UPBC is concerned about the large number presented here. We understand the idea is to spend marketing money while the enrollment is down in order to mitigate our enrollment declines. The plan shared with UPBC at a later date details the specific areas in which this funding would be applied. The President will need to take a hard look at the availability of funding to allocate for this purpose versus using it to assist with current programming on the campus. UPBC would encourage that the VP of IA seek additional support from the system office for funding for this purpose. Enrollment increase is a system wide issue that the BOR has secured funding to address. An example might be that the BOR offer to produce radio and TV ads that each University can “tag” as their own and then pay for the ad air time, saving considerable dollars using efficiencies of scale. Additionally in-house production utilizing CCSU operations and students must be considered to effectively maintain the costs. UPBC will not recommend the exact level of funding support needed here, but will request that any allocation be reported back to the committee in FY 15 with updates on the data to support the success or failure of this approach to increasing our enrollment.

Reallocations to fund positions are supported by UPBC. The committee has asked the administration to continually track these new or renewed lines as they do minimally incur some overall increased costs to the University in terms of healthcare support versus the single position that they once came from.
President's Office

Victim’s Advocate - $55,000. As with the similar item in the CAO’s budget, the committee is supportive of the position should base budget funding be available. Should that not be the case, reallocation of funding should be considered. The committee again would like to see a breakdown somewhere of fringe costs and recognition of this cost overall to the University when new positions are added.

Fiscal Affairs

No specific budget recommendations.

The committee would again request a forecast of the impact the minimal wage increase in 2015 will have on University operations. Many part time staff (students) will qualify for this increase and divisions should be prepared for that change.

Human Resources

No specific budget recommendations.

HR continues to manage their operations well in the face of reductions in staff due to departures.