

## University Planning and Budget Committee Meeting of October 5, 2011 Room 148, Student Center

In attendance: Chad Valk, Haoyu Wang, Guy Crundwell, Thom Delventhal, John Tully, Larry Grasso, Laura Tordenti, Carl Lovitt, Kathleen Stankewicz, Yvonne Kirby, Richard Bachoo, Margeret Leake, Otis Mamed, Paul Schlickman, Kim Chagnon

Called to order at 2:04:

1. Minutes reviewed, corrections made

Motion to approve minutes with corrections (Meg), second (Guy).

Minutes approved.

2.a: Chad reports that at the last meeting of the Master Planning Committee there was an extensive power point presentation with hundreds of slides. There was a lot of possible scenario's presented involving development of east campus for athletics, some building tear-downs, Copernicus Garage, ITBD. There's still a lot more homework to do.

Carl adds that they are trying to get the report down to a digestible size before presenting it to the committee. The report has been reduced from 140 pages to 35.

Projections are down to specific square footage and the implications are that there are adjustments necessary on the 2020 plan, based on a final analysis of need.

Guy: Why so secretive?

Richard: No, no, it's not secretive. The consultants are long-distance. We just need to make sure everything is accurate. There was an error in their formula that was argued for weeks. Yvonne did a fabulous job of catching their errors. The plan is just not done yet.

2.b. The next meeting of the Facilities Planning Committee will be on Tuesday Morning.

2.c. Dr. Bachoo will talk more specifically about the Master Plan at the October 19 meeting of this committee.

3.a. (Carl) A new list of positons that can be filled now that we have a budget is continuing to be compiled.

Chad: When the list is complete can we get a copy?

Otis: For SUOF as well?

Guy: What's the priority on this list? Is it all based on the Dean's advice?

Carl: We're attempting to achieve parity based on needs. These 20 appointments are completely based on the Deans' advice. There are 3 more tenure-track searches underway. The President has made it clear that this is not how he'd prefer to go about it, but prudence and safety of

positions are still priorities. There is still a likelihood of cuts in the block grant by the new Board of Regents.

Guy: Do you think we'll have a harder time raising tuition and fees to meet those cuts?

Carl: No one knows. There is no one on the new board with higher-ed. fiscal experience.

3.b. (Please refer to Guy's report on CCSU's Athletic Program to fully understand these minutes)

Guy: Most important for us to understand is that what division we are in is not important. The discussion must be about the balance between academics and athletics. I've looked for comparisons between CCSU and other CT institutions.

(Page 3) "In '85, CCSU became division 1, with the resolution to wean off the support of student fees. Gradually this was phased out."

(page 5) "Although Erin Fitzgerald has looked the information about Eastern and Western which should be easy to look up, is unavailable. This committee has asked for the info several times, but no info has been found."

(Page 6) "Though there has been growth in the endowment the primary source of funding is still the university."

(Page 8) "There's a pile of money. Ideally that money should be distributed evenly. The spending on Athletics has risen while the spending on Academics has remained flat. This is not sustainable."

Paul (referring to data on page 9): We are allowed to give up to 63 scholarships but only 36 were awarded.

Guy: But it doesn't matter how many. It's about the total and we mirror the Knight Commission Report.

(At the conclusion of page 10) "Is it sustainable? That's all I'm trying to examine. (Referring to page 11) The good news is the revenue enhancement is increasing. But so is the reliance on institutional funds."

(Calling for transparency on page 12) "Are tuition and fees being used to balance athletics? (and moving on to 13) If fees and tuition are a bigger part of the pie as state appropriations shrink, then the answer to the question is 'Yes.'"

Carl: I'm uncomfortable with your suggestion that we are providing two separate things—academics, and a chance to play sports. That is a spurious dichotomy.

Guy: No, that's exactly my point. I want us to publically say, there is an important connection and this is how we distribute funds. There's no question that fees and tuition are subsidizing athletics. Let's be transparent.

Otis: This kind of breakdown used to happen, but it disappeared in '91/'92.

Guy: We need better metrics. We have to have some way of helping faculty and students understand these budget priorities.

(Page 16) "Here's what Otis was referring to."

Kim: There's a reason this breakdown no longer exists! We got rid of it! I wouldn't want to see us go back to that. Is this something students are concerned with? Where does this come from?

Guy: The Knight Commission. Students are taking out loans to subsidize athletics. They have a right to know this.

Richard: This is fungible (sorry I can't find this word in the dictionary, did I mishear?) money. I agree with you on principle, Guy. But be careful. You could wind up not being able to fund things like debt management.

Meg: It leads to us comparing the values of different programs, which I believe is also dangerous. What if we say, "History costs less than Chem. Let's get rid of Chem."?

Chad: Let's look at Guy's point of revenue enhancement. What is working there? How to increase and measure its contribution to academic scholarships. As Chris said, "The football program is not the biggest benefit of the football program."

The discussion was momentarily put on hold so Kim, who had to leave, could give us a quick budget update, which is that there really is not any new information. Chad asked if we could be kept informed about any new positions that had been added to any division and if a plan materialized. Kim assured him that it will be part of the report.

Guy: These budget issues, as they relate to athletics, should be included in the Strategic Plan. And something should be included in each student's bill. It doesn't have to say "You payed x for athletics," but it should state what fees are used for.

Chad: Classroom technology has ground to a halt, because the tech fee was rolled into the single category of "fees."

Meg: The point is the strategic Plan isn't working.

Chad: how often do we revise it?

Yvonne: 10 years.

Larry: (Back to "fees") Are we buying ala carte, or a bundle? It's too hard to separate out particular items. But we can ask, "What are the benefits that were expected @ the time we elected to go division 1?"

Chad: Keep division out of it. That's not the issue.

Yvonne: But isn't there already transparency?

Paul: Yes. There are several mechanisms to force transparency. The primary impetus of the Knight Commission was a concern about spending at FBS institutions. That's not who we are.

Guy: No, I'm looking at 12 million CCSU spent and 8 million was provided by the institution.

Chad: I think Athletics has grown each year of the last 3 while all others have seen cuts.

Paul: Athletics was cut.

Larry: It's all anecdotal. We need metrics.

Paul: The cost per student athlete, percentage of budget...There's a lot we can look at. We are in line with our peers.

Larry: But we have to be able to measure it. If we can, we may wind up with proof that the program is actually underfunded.

Motion to adjourn (Haoyu; Chad, second): 4:18