The University Planning & Budget Committee (UPBC) extensively reviewed the proposals submitted by the Executive Committee for base budget increases, capital equipment, and one-time funds. We were greatly aided in our work by the level of transparency you have provided, not only in the Historical Expenditure Information but also through the work of the Integrated Budget Model pilot program. It would be fair to say that this process has become more intensive in the past two years. Committee members reviewed an overwhelming amount of data in the preparation of this report. We are cognizant of issues that we simply lacked the time and expertise to pursue. We even deferred several of them. With all of this in mind, the UPBC proposed to the Faculty Senate changes to its composition and size. Under a proposal approved in the Senate this week, the number of voting members will grow from 11 to 15, and include representatives from all four undergraduate schools.

As we reviewed proposals, the UPBC focused upon the four goals of the Interim Strategic Plan: increased student enrollment, maintaining academic excellence, expanding community engagement, and developing additional sources of funding. With the task of reviewing the budget now complete, the UPBC can turn its attention to the development of a full strategic plan for the institution. We expect to deliver a proposal for an inclusive and transparent planning process to you by the end of the spring semester.

The UPBC would like to extend its sincere thanks to the Chief Financial Officer, Charlene Casamento, and the Budget Director, Lisa Bucher, for their tireless efforts in support of the integrated budget pilot and this annual review of budget proposals, capital equipment requests, and one-time funding suggestions. Without their generous guidance, the level of insight and detail in this report would not be possible.

**General Recommendations:**

The committee would like to offer several general recommendations for your consideration.

1. This UPBC recommends that the budget calendar be published earlier in the fall, and establish clear deadlines for submissions at the department level. Ideally, these would be due no later than December 1, with an expectation that immediate supervisors identify and publish their own priorities well in advance of the current division deadline of February 1. We also suggest that the meeting between the UPBC and members of the
Executive Committee be held at least three weeks prior to Spring Break so that the committee’s review can be completed beforehand.

2. We also suggest that additional guidelines be provided to the divisions as they prepare their proposals for review. In writing proposals, sponsoring departments should draw clear lines between the activities to be funded, and the goals of the Interim Strategic Plan. Numerous submissions in this round provided only tenuous connections to these goals, leaving the UPBC the task of filling in the blanks. To be sure, some items involved necessary upkeep and maintenance, a category that might be added next year to the dropdown menu alongside the strategic goals, but in some cases, proposed activities purported to meet two or more of the goals. The strategic goals must be more than a touchstone; they should inspire thoughtful, innovative proposals that will move the institution forward. A basic set of guidelines could explain the nature of strategic planning to the campus community in a manner that would encourage realistic proposals. It would also be helpful if, in advance of the budget deadlines, we identified thresholds or caps for the cost of proposals by division. Above these levels, division heads should be prepared to provide extraordinary levels of documentation.

3. 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. An example of the lack of cross-divisional integration is a perceived duplication of effort related to managing events held on campus. An example of the latter - prioritization within a budget request - is the level of capital expenditure requests made by a single division relative to the total amount of capital funds available to the university as a whole, both in this budget cycle and beyond. We strongly recommend further improvements to the budget process to encourage greater cross-divisional integration and realistic budgets.

4. The committee would also like to raise a matter of concern that has been included in previous years' recommendations: where, how, and at what cost the University manages events held on campus. Under existing structures, the area of Events Management (within Administrative Affairs), the Student Center (Student Affairs), and the Institute for Technology and Business Development (Institutional Advancement) all devote significant human and fiscal resources to supporting events on campus. At times, managing a single event involves contacting more than one of these areas, often creating confusion among and requiring additional effort on the part of the internal and external constituencies organizing an event. It is not uncommon for an event organizer to call one of these offices only to learn they need to contact another office. We recommend that a task force be formed to explore if the university could achieve cost savings by consolidating these areas into a single entity that would provide comprehensive support for all events held on campus. The committee further recommends that this task force be charged with reviewing the fee structure for use of campus facilities, analyzing the rationale and process for providing facility use fee waivers, and assessing how maintenance and capital improvement costs are accounted for, particularly in the facilities which are frequently rented out to off-campus entities at
little or no cost. We recognize that being a steward of central Connecticut often means opening our doors to the community. Anticipating that we will be doing this more frequently in the years to come, the Committee recommends work be done now to ensure that we approach this essential function in a manner that is both sustainable and user-friendly.

5. The committee also observes that the current budget process is open-ended. There is not yet a budgetary mechanism in place that “closes the loop” by analyzing what a division actually spent in a given fiscal year in relation to what was included in their approved budget request. We recommend that divisional annual reports be required to address budgetary performance during the reporting period and that these reports be shared, in whole or in part, with the UPBC so that the committee may see the impact of the resources allocated to each division.

6. Finally, given the fiscal challenges the University faces, the UPBC recommends the development of a transparent, comprehensive reduction plan with a careful eye on the use of vacancy and salary savings. In most divisions, these funds are sufficient to offset potential reductions of 3% or even 5%, as evidenced by most of the submissions here. In Academic Affairs, however, they are not. It is for this reason that we have been reluctant to approve the refill of vacant positions, with some exceptions. Until we have a contingency plan that accounts for the challenges faced by Academic Affairs, it is not clear how many of these positions we can fund. At the same time, in recent years the committee has grown increasingly concerned about the number of vacancies, especially in areas essential for the support of the academic mission and student success. The UPBC notes that the Integrated Planning Council has begun to investigate appropriate staffing levels in a number of areas (e.g., counseling). As resources are reallocated to address urgent needs, it is imperative that we maintain a realistic reduction plan even as we grow CCSU’s enrollment and garner additional sources of funding.

Specific Recommendations for the Divisions:

**Academic Affairs:**
The UPBC supports the reallocation of $1,000,000 in salary savings to the part-time lecturer budget, and strongly encourages a careful analysis of the factors driving increases in this area. The committee understands that $335,983 has been added recently to the division’s base budget in order to address the cost of living increases in the part-time salary budget over the past several years. Part-time costs, nevertheless, appear to be rising at a significant rate. Total expenditures on part-time lecturers were $1,970,572 in the 2016-2017 academic year (fall/spring only), but $2,376,627 in 2017-2018. Some of this results from enrollment increases in certain areas and contractual revisions to the collective bargaining agreement, but the UPBC finds the trend worrisome. The committee supports this reallocation in the expectation that the part-time lecturer budget can be placed on a realistic footing, and its management be reviewed in subsequent years.

The committee supports other budget requests (priorities #2-5, and 7-10) with the exception of ProctorU (#6) and the proposed Planner/Analyst position (#11). It is our understanding that the
actual cost of ProctorU is substantially higher than $20,000. If that is the case, we should explore alternatives. The committee deferred a final decision on the Planner/Analyst position at the last minute. We will follow up with Academic Affairs to solicit more information.

The committee has already expressed its support for the Doctorally-trained Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist position (#5).

**Capital Equipment:**

The UPBC appreciates the effort the division made to identify its top recommendations among so many that were submitted. The committee supports items #1-12, 14-25, and 27-31. Included in these recommendations are funds to replace the Founders Hall piano (item #23), but the committee would certainly prefer the less expensive rebuild option if that is possible.

The committee does not support the request for a Power X-Ray Diffractometer (item #13) at this time, noting that it was initially a medium priority for SFY 2021. Could the departments that requested this item pursue a National Science Foundation grant to cover the estimated cost ($350,000)? The committee does not support the Robotics request (item #26, totaling $300,000) at this time.


**Equipment less than $1000:**

The committee supports all items identified here as high priorities for SFY 2019. Total recommended: $19,244.

Funds permitting, the committee would also support those items identified as medium priorities for SFY 2019 and high priorities for SFY 2021. Please note that no cost estimate was provided for the moveable wall (item #4). Additional amount recommended: $29,980

**One-Time Requests:**

The committee supports priorities #1-4, including the EOP University Assistant, University Assistant to support advising, degree completion initiative graduate assistant, and Admissions conference request. The committee does not support the Medicine & Dentistry database at this time. Total recommended: $80,652.

**Academic Department Integrated Budget Pilots:**

As a rule, the committee did not endorse requests for additional staffing contained in the pilot documents because the Provost, and in some cases the Deans, replied that it was difficult to consider these requests in isolation. The Interim Dean of the School of Education and Professional Studies, Kimberly Kostelis, suggested that final consideration of OE budget needs for support of an off-campus cohort of students in Educational Leadership should wait until staffing issues have been resolved; the committee concurs. The UPBC also reviewed the
Finance department’s request for additional advertising funds, but believes the sum requested ($1000) lies within the discretion of the Dean of the School of Business, Ken Colwell.

A number of capital requests from the pilot departments were incorporated into the division’s overall request. They are not considered separately here.

**Administrative Affairs:**
The committee understands that the System Office will be providing funds that address the requests (priorities 1-10) covering upkeep of the renovated Willard/DiLoreto Hall and new Huang Recreation Center. The annual cost is estimated at $1,386,000, with the System Office providing 50% (or $693,000) each year. As these buildings will be operational for half of SFY 2019, the UPBC recommends a base budget increase of $346,000, with an understanding that the division will request additional support for SFY 2020.

The committee does not support the proposed increase to the Events Management budget at this time, but recommends that a task force examine its operations in conjunction with those of the Student Center and the ITBD to explore possible synergies.

The committee sent a recent request for additional information to the division, to which it has not yet received a response. The committee therefore defers final decisions with respect to the division’s other budget requests, including some related to the integrated budget pilot in Information Technology. Similarly, we have deferred consideration of some capital requests.

**Capital Equipment:**
The committee supports the requests for the Verint storage device and recorders, as well as the digital RF and dispatch console (items #1-2). Consideration of other items deferred. Total recommended: $662,000.

**One-Time Requests:**
The committee supports the request for CCTV Installation in Kaiser Lot. Total recommended: $49,000.

**IT Integrated Budget Pilot:**
Based on documentation from Charlene Casamento, the committee accepts that a base budget increase of between $450,760 and $499,000 will be needed to absorb costs transferred from the System Office.

**Capital Equipment:** The committee recommends the expenditure of $1,000,000 in support of the computer requests for students, staff, and faculty identified in the capital equipment request appended to the INFO02/INFO03 materials. Having reviewed the requests for computers carefully, and considered the projected annual expenses in this area, the UPBC is concerned that these expenses will prove unsustainable, especially if bond funds are in short supply. Would it be possible to utilize virtual terminals in some
areas? These would presumably cost less, although networking expenses would rise somewhat.

We recommend approval of the request appended to the INFO05/BSRV04 material that would replace the Barrows Hall wifi at a cost of $110,000.

Total recommended: $1,110,000.

**Fiscal Affairs:**
The committee strongly supports the proposed reclassification of the Office Assistant position.

Capital Equipment:
N/A

One-Time Requests:
N/A

**Human Resources:**
The division did not request a budget increase.

Capital Equipment:
N/A

One-Time Requests:
N/A

**Institutional Advancement:**
It is our understanding that a base budget adjustment of $500,000 already has been made to support the increased costs of advertising the university, so the committee did not consider this request. The division should consider carefully the refill of its vacant positions; if an additional trainer and strength/conditioning coach in Athletics are essential, can some of the vacant positions be used to fund them? The committee does not support the other budget requests at this time.

Capital Equipment:
The committee supports line items 1-3 in the Institutional Advancement capital equipment request for the Media Center, with an understanding that item 2 will be funded at $10,000. Total recommended: $299,840.

The committee does not support the Athletics capital equipment requests.
One-Time Requests:
The committee is broadly supportive of the Athletics requests (priorities #1-2) related to off-site facility use and bus transportation, as this issue did not play a role in the Athletics task force report. This recommendation, however, is subject to a careful review of the basis for the cost estimate of $431,218.

The committee supports requests (priorities #1-3) related to the Media Center and Institutional Advancement. It does not support requests related to the ITBD. Total recommended: $42,000, plus appropriate amount in support of Athletics’ off-site use and transportation.

President’s Office:
The committee reaffirms its support for a new Chief Enrollment Management Officer. It also supports the additional budget requests in support of this new office.

Capital Equipment:
The committee supports the request for a color copier. Total recommended: $10,000.

One-Time Requests:
The committee supports requests for Diversity & Equity professional development, and climate survey research. Total recommended: $103,500.

Student Affairs:
The committee strongly supports the budget request for funds to hire both an Assistant/Associate Counselor and a Director of Counseling. Given limited funding, the UPBC is reluctant to prioritize the Associate Vice President/Dean of Students over additional positions that require less funding. This said, the committee supports additional expenditures in this area, if at all possible.

Capital Equipment:
The committee supports requests (priorities #1, 3-12) in support of Student Activities & Leadership Development, and the Student Center. The request to replace carpet within the Student Center (priority #2) may be project-related. The committee is reluctant to support capital equipment requests for subsequent years in this area. Total recommended: $52,282.

Evaluation of the Integrated Budgeting Pilot:
In general, the UPBC found the enhanced level of detail provided by the pilot departments -- Athletics, Biology, Design, Educational Leadership, Finance (academic), and Information Technology -- helpful. The committee wishes to express its thanks to the faculty and staff from these departments for their considerable efforts. The UPBC recommends that the pilot be extended into next year. Specifically, we suggest that the Integrated Planning Council extend
the pilot in both Athletics and Information Technology. We further suggest a pilot in Academic Affairs focusing on the School of Business.

Our reasoning is as follows. The integrated budgeting pilot has been extremely labor intensive, both for Fiscal Affairs and the affected departments. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment also provided benchmark data for the four academic programs. The UPBC finds that the process has many merits but that we do not yet have the resources and experience to effectively roll out the process to a wider portion of the campus. There are compelling reasons for continuing the pilot in both Athletics and Information Technology. The real benefits of the model will only be apparent over time, as the UPBC and IPC monitor these areas to see if proposed plans come to fruition. Athletics should also be monitored closely to see the effect of the recommendations made by the Task Force for the Sustainability of the CCSU Athletics Program. Similarly, Information Technology should be reviewed on an annual basis in order to monitor the high cost of campus technology. To some extent, this year’s review of these programs was hampered by the absence of benchmark data from EDUCAUSE and the NCAA. It should go without saying that these data must be made available in a timely fashion for any subsequent review.

Three of the four academic departments struggled with the integrated budget pilot because our institutional culture has traditionally vested budget responsibilities in the Deans’ offices. It will take time for that culture to change. It was also the case that the Deans could not judge the requests from one department in their schools without taking into account needs elsewhere. The UPBC therefore recommends that a pilot focus on a single school so that we can pilot the process in a manner that allows a Dean to make recommendations across an entire school. Since the Finance department chair, Joseph Farhat, proved adept at completing the pilot documents, and can readily train his colleagues, the School of Business seems the logical candidate. The size of the School of Business also seems manageable.

To facilitate the pilots next year, we also recommend that participating individuals be provided with Excel training and other additional support.