

University Planning and Budget Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of May 8, 2018

Members Present: N. Al-Masoud, R. Benfield, L. Bigelow, C. Casamento, D. Dauwalder, N. Elsinger, S. Gross, J. Hodgson, M. Jackson, Y. Kirby, J. Nicoll-Senft, C. Valk, R. Wolff, B. Sommers

Absent: C. Galligan, C. Soler, P. Troiano

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by R. Wolff.
2. Announcements
 - a. UPBC Budget Recommendations: C. Casamento reported that the IPC supported most of the base budget increase recommendations the UPBC put forward with a couple of caveats, pending additional information from some of the ExComm members. She also noted that the final budget is still not known. However four positions: a second DNAP professor, a planner analyst position in OIRA, and two counselor positions (associate counselor and director of counseling) are proceeding. These searches have been approved to move forward. C. Casamento also informed the Provost that Academic Affairs may proceed with Proctor-U or something comparable to ensure compliance with accreditation requirements. Dr. Troiano requested an accommodation software as a one-time request; because this will have an ongoing cost component and in light of the fact we have funding set aside for disability services, this will proceed as a base budget adjustment. Other approved positions include some in Administrative Affairs that are related to the opening of the newly renovated Willard-DiLoreto Hall.
 - b. Budget Update: as of midnight last night, the Democratic and Republican budget proposals for the CSUs were exactly the same at \$138M, which is what the Governor proposed and is what the University had been assuming as part of our spending plan. For the CSUs, that represents a \$3.9M reduction from the FY19 budget that was enacted in October 2017, and CCSU's share is in the neighborhood of \$2.4M with fringe. Also the same in both proposals is that the funding for IMRP has been cut.

3. Review of IPC Submissions

The committee revisited the M.S. in Civil Engineering Concept Paper that was deferred for action at the May 1, 2018 meeting.

- a. **M.S. Civil Engineering Concept Paper** – the committee recommended approval of this concept paper based on submission of additional information. (Al-Masoud/Nicoll-Senft)
4. Identification of Metrics for peer and aspirational benchmark groups.
- a. Y. Kirby presented a worksheet of data from College Navigator that provides a broad overview of national data that can be used to identify the peer and aspirational benchmark groups. One of the goals is to identify metrics where CCSU can say it set this goal because it is reasonable to assume that it can attain the goal, based on the performance of other like-institutions;. The peer group will allow us to look at institutions that are very similar to us and identify metrics/goals where we are excelling or where improvements need to be made; this group of institutions will help to put the goals into context. The aspirational group is the set of institutions that we aspire to be more like. These two groups will likely be chosen from the same pool of institutions and Dr. Toro has indicated that they should have an engineering school and community engagement.

Y. Kirby walked the committee through the various data elements that could be selected or omitted in choosing the peer and inspirational groups. She explained how each data element would populate a spreadsheet, cautioning the committee to be selective in choosing the metrics so that the spreadsheet did not become so large it was hard to use effectively. After discussion, in addition to Community Engagement and the presence of an Engineering program, the committee selected the following data elements to be used/considered in the initial steps of selecting the peer group:

- Enrollment profile
 - Total enrollment
 - % Minority
 - % Undergrad & % Grad ,
 - % Transfer
 - FTE enrollment
 - UG age, % ≤ 24 years
 - Grad age % ≥ 25 years
- % Pell-eligible
- Retention and graduation rates
- Student-to-Faculty ratio
- SAT profile
- Endowment
- Tuition and Fees

It was suggested that the committee convene within the next two weeks to discuss the metrics for the aspirational group.

5. Reports

- a. CFO – Given above
- b. Provost – None
- c. OIRA – None
- d. Institutional Advancement – None
- e. Student Affairs – None
- f. Facilities Planning - None

6. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Marie Bigelow, Secretary