

University Planning and Budget Committee
Meeting of February 1, 2012
Blue and White Room, Student Center

In attendance: Chad Valk, Kris Larsen, Haoyu Wang, Thom Delventhal, Lisa Bigelow, Laura Tordenti, Larry Grasso, Margeret Leake, Otis Mamed, Kim Chagnon, Yvonne Kirby, Shuju Wu, Paul Schlickman, Richard Bachoo

Meeting called to order at 2:03:

1. Minutes reviewed
Motion to approve (Yvonne), 2nd (Hao)
Corrections Made
Minutes approved

2. (Chad) From the BOR: A freeze is on, but not a "hard" freeze. Everything is being scrutinized, but planned hires are still moving forward.

Any objections to moving up item 5b (athletics roundtable) so Paul and Richard can leave? (None). First item is struck as Guy isn't here.

Report of the proceedings re: this issue in senate (Thom): I was asked to tell what had transpired here. I reported that Guy had presented the Knight Commission Report and there had been a great deal of discussion. There was agreement that greater transparency would be beneficial, but that Guy's other proposals were not taken up. Guy arrived and there was a lot of discussion about his other proposals. The original motion passed here was also passed, though there was some confusion in the senate as to what was wrong since the information had been made available since the resolution passed here. Finally they agreed they'd like to hear more from Guy about the Knight Commission

A suggestion was made that it be a topic for a Senate/President Open Forum.

Kris: This is a lose-lose-lose situation. We will be demonized, no matter what.

Richard: We have nothing to hide.

Chad: Pres. Miller sent the Auditor's Report. I'll share it.

Laura: There's no ground swell (In senate) but there is a distinct sentiment that we are hiding something.

Larry: It's about transparency. The info has to be easier to find. MNow, you have to hunt for it.

Chad: Let's put links on our website.

Larry: Also, we have to find a way to assess the return of an investment. There's only one item in the Strat. Plan that mentions Athletics. How does athletics impact community engagement, diversity, etc?

Chad: Yes. Perhaps we need to accept some responsibility. We helped make the Strat. Plan.

Rich: But athletics and the Strat. Plan...the relationship is strong. Athletics is the only goal that insists on 100% compliance. We have taken leadership.

Larry: This, if anything is how this committee should be involved with athletics. How can we measure success?

Chad: Do we need a forum?

Larry: I think we can do it here.

Paul: I should present before any of this goes to the senate.

Chad: So we're tabling the open forum. Let's return to the budget.

Laura: I think that "gadflies" are important. They keep us honest. This is why total transparency is so important. There should be no issue that we can't talk about.

Chad: Should we post budget reports? We did at one time.

Meg: That's not our province. We listen, advise, but what happens with data is the President's prerogative.

Shuju: Yes, It's not our responsibility to post these things.

Larry: Part of the mistrust--or frustration, is about getting info so late. If it could be published more timely people could relax.

Chad: The President will say he's doing all he can.

Hao: We've been talking so long. The Provost has said it takes time. But the faculty has no knowledge. We know what the faculty wants to.

Chad: So we should publish the budget report. But there are so many uncertainties. The President himself just learned of the freeze.

Kim: I had no idea what our numbers were going to be until the day they were published.

Meg: We're talking about local, but let's not forget the national issue. Everyone's talking about the rise of the cost of higher education. There are more and more questions about what we get for what we pay.

Yvonne: People don't know that tuition increases are being driven by dropping state appropriations.

Laura: Then people start : "cherry-picking" info and asking, "What good are sabbaticals? Why all these administrators?" etc.

Chad: Let's get back on track: We have a new CFO:

Kim: Ms. Casamento comes to us from DOT (excerpt from President's announcement: Ms. Casamento possesses 20 years of progressively responsible fiscal and administrative experience, most recently serving as Bureau Chief of Finance & Administration at the Connecticut Department of Transportation. She has also held various positions with the Connecticut Department of Children and Families. Ms. Casamento earned her MBA at the University of Hartford. She will begin at CCSU on Friday, February 24, 2012.). She has lots of experience with state offices. She's reducing the number of people she oversees by coming here. I'm corresponding with her already, sending her info. She's very excited to hit the ground running.

Chad: Can you tell us something about the rescission letter (4b)?

Kim: The letter indicates that "declining revenue" has led to a persistent deficit of \$78,000,000. He is using rescission to trim that. CCSU's share of the trimming will amount to \$446,276 from our budget, which means another \$242,927 in fringe benefits.

Chad: Has the President "passed it down?"

Kim: Not yet. We've gone back to reduction scenario's to see where we *might* cut. There might be a rescission rescission. But probably not.

Chad: So expect a 4th quarter cut.

Kim: Maybe. Probably 2013 and perhaps again in '14.

4c: Budget presentation schedule for 2/15 (draft):

Location?

9: Coffee/juice

9:15: A. Alling

9:30: C. Galligan

9:50: J. Estrada:

10:20: L. Tordenti

11: R. Bachoo
11:40: K. Chagnon
11:55: Lunch (provided)
12:30: C. Lovitt
1:15: Wrap (Chad)

4d: Budget calendar review:

Chad: Please provide feedback by Feb. 29

5c: Freshman class concerns:

Chad: Kris, you had some concerns about how last semester impacted current freshman?

Kris: Yvonne, is there any data yet available?

Yvonne: Our current mid-year retention rate is 91.7 %. In '08 it was 91.5, in '09, 93.6 and in '10, 91.9. Enrollment is down by a little less than 2%.

Interview info. Is holding as, "Not enough to do on weekends." We tried to contact 165 students that did not return for the spring semester. We actually reached 82, and that was the prevailing answer. Jim Mulrooney also called a number of students from previous years that didn't return and got 30 to sign-up. But we're still down 1.6%

Chad: Did any of them make reference to the academic schedule?

Yvonne: No the reasons were mostly social.

Chad: But the weekend issue might be related to the academic schedule.

Laura: Student Affairs, Res Life, nobody's doing anything different.

Otis: Yes, there's no change in programs, they're just less well attended. So I have to look at what *has* changed.

Laura: We also have more vacancies in dorms. But we're not alone. Other campuses are experiencing the same thing.

Otis: There will be 5% fewer students available in the next few years. It's not academic. It's not social. It's not economic. The pool is simply shrinking

Yvonne: This semester is usually worse than fall, so we need to keep a watch on it. First-time freshman is the key if retention ever becomes a budget driver.

Lisa: We have to pilot new programs: accelerated and on-line learning.

Chad: There's been push-back though, to things like summer certificate programs. David Blitz made a great pitch, but there were no takers.

Meg: Aren't we talking apples and oranges? One set wants convenience, one wants more residential programs. Can we be flexible enough to serve both?

Shuju: I had 18 seniors that all asked for the Friday class to be moved to Wednesday.

Otis: We are down from 287 Friday classes to 82.

Larry: Are we suggesting we force more classes? What do students want? What will work pedagogically? 3 contact days is best, but 50 minutes is too short for an effective class. I prefer the 75 minute blocks. What about a M/Th, T/F schedule?

Kris: you'll never get the faculty on Friday.

Meg: But schedule isn't faculty prerogative.

Kris: The union will take it up.

Chad: Why don't we publish things like the decline in number of Friday classes and our opinion that it is a detriment to many components of success?

Larry: But we still haven't addressed the three different populations. On-campus, local and distant commuters. They all have different needs.

Meg: These are good times to have these discussions.

Laura: They are. Who are we serving? For ex, what customer services are available in the evenings? We have to have these discussions.

Otis: There are a whole bunch of factors. This is not a faculty issue. We have students who want to be out in four years and can't. Why? Others want a Club-Med atmosphere and wonder why tuition is rising. There are so many factors.

Chad: Let's all try to move this discussion out into campus. I'm going to move the report card item (6). Reports?

Yvonne: we're digging into NEASC. There's a lot to do.

Laura: We're talking about a lot of things: bullying, how to better serve, title 2 (we can no longer remove a student who is a threat to themselves, only to others)...how do we deal with them?

Yvonne: Program review is being presented to senate again. If it doesn't pass, I have no doubt we'll be on probation with NEASC.

Adjourned: 3:45