

University Planning and Budget Committee
Meeting of March 7, 2012
Blue and White Room, Student Center

In attendance: Chad Valk, Kris Larsen, Haoyu Wang, Thom Delventhal, Laura Tordenti, Larry Grasso, Margeret Leake, Otis Mamed, Kim Chagnon,, Yvonne Kirby, Charlene Casamento, John Tully, Sue Pease, Carl Lovitt, Celeste Roche

Meeting called to order at 2:01:

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

- 2.a (Chad): Introduction of Celeste Roche the new SGA representative in the UPBC.
2.c: Our meeting of the 21st will take place on the 28th, as the 21st falls in spring break.

3. (Otis): Facilities Planning has not met since the last UPBC meeting.

(Chad) Richard isn't ready to do a Master planning presentation. Expect him on the 28th of this month.

4. (Charlene): Meetings between the new CFO and the President have begun. These meetings have included HR, IT and Student affairs. The President has said "Thank-you" for our recommendations. We are awaiting further word.

(Chad): Has there been any application of recision to the divisions?

(Charlene): The president is waiting to hear from William Bose. A good thing is that if our proposal is approved, it appears our portion of the recision will be absorbed by vacancies.

- 5.a. (Chad): The senate has asked for another UPBC representative--in addition to Guy--to speak about athletics spending. I'm happy to do that, but can we review the discussion a little so I feel I can represent us well?

Brief recap and discussion including:

Guy: I plan on simply giving them the report. The info is all in the UPBC minutes. I have nothing new to say.

- 5.b. Fiscal (Charlene): I may need some admin support. I have no clerical support. I'd like to have a UA. That's the change in my budget. I don't know that I'll act, but I want the option.

Institutional advancement:

Chris not present, but Larry expresses some concerns:

There's a feeling in Chris' comments that investments pay for themselves. For example, hiring someone for \$50,000 is a good expenditure because they'll raise \$100,00. But there's no caution toward exhausting the donor base with administrative costs. Donors like to see this at about 15%, so for a new hire to be valuable there's got to be a 1 to 10 ratio of cost to money raised.

Chad: Chris said his target would be \$150,000.

Larry: I don't think that's good enough. For ex. say I give money to the heart foundation, and they flood me with paper. I ask, "What am I paying for?" They're less likely to get another donation from me. We have to be careful. Also, "Razor's Edge" was supported by Braden. Now there's another \$20,000 to support that. I don't like that. People oversell a product and underestimate implementation. They're always looking for the next buy.

Chad: Yes, there's a software concern on this campus. Should we be willing to fund an enhancement over another NEED a department has. Internal" is not free. Larry has also suggested that The Courier and other campus Publications have an "opt out" to receive it electronically only and we can save money there.

I don't hear a lot of people running to the defense of "Razor's Edge" or Chris' new position. What about positions above? For, ex, in-rank salary increases?

John: Hard to know.

Chad: you have to trust their leadership and decision-making.

Some discussion of how HR vets these kinds of things ensues.

Otis: His \$ figure for Assistant Director is high.

Chad: He may have salary savings. Maybe we should recommend that he hire lower and use the savings for Razor's Edge. Carl, any changes for Academic affairs?

Carl: I'm going to request another UA.

Kris: how 'bout more VISTA volunteers?

Carl: Hannah Hurwitz has been amazing. I'd really like that \$20,000 to keep her.

Larry: Equipment needs should go to IA, so they can be specifically addressed by donors.

Guy: It'd be good for UPBC to formulate a specific plan for that. The devil's in the details. We need a process. From faculty perspective we don't know what we can and can't take. And the administration doesn't want something they can't maintain.

Chad: There are some mechanisms in place. But there is a question about whether donations are superseding bidding requests.

Meg: There is a process in place. It just needs to be clarified.

Chad: Otis, your comments mentioned that Academic affairs' figures were not in the standard format. Can you clarify?

Otis: I like consistency. All that information should be reported as we ask for it.

Carl: Sorry.

Larry: One thing that would be helpful is to clarify if a request is to enhance or maintain.

Otis: Can't we plan for equipment replacement instead of always relying on on-time funds?

Sue: You can't always know. Some things don't last. Others last longer than expected. I have a lot of equipment in my school.

Larry: But that's still important, particularly for buildings. If we build a building, what's the cost of keeping it?

Chad: So in addition to maintenance/enhancement we might want to see a plan for replacement.

Guy: Inventory. If we track what we're getting rid of, we can know what we need. The problem is, some people are hoarders.

Chad: OK. This issue of Carl using discretionary funds for 37 items he doesn't want to take out of the budget. Carl, does that tie your hands—leave you depleted?

Carl: not exactly. It's a strategic decision. We need these student-learning enhancements. This is directly linked to improvements in retention and graduation rates.

Chad: It's important for us all to be aware that salary savings are crumbling. I think Carl has to be left with that. Any disagreements?

Kris: How are retention in Nursing and Sociology?

Carl: We lost 3 students. Break out numbers are not yet available.

Chad: Administrative Affairs. The claim they're going to move \$250,000 from somewhere. If that money exists we should know.

John: It's been the same for 3 years. "It's past its life-expectancy." We've asked for something on the actual condition and never received it.

Chad: We've asked repeatedly. Is it a safety issue? I'll write: "The rationale has not met the concerns of the committee."

Retro commissioning \$:

Charlene: Are there any #'s for a return from energy savings resulting from these investments?

Chad: No, but we could request them. Anybody recall if there were safety issues? Their lower items, i.e. accreditation, should be higher on the list. How will we survive if one-time funding disappears?

Meg: We've been relying on one-time for 3 years. These things need to be included in the base budget.

John: FYE learning center is not in the base budget.

Meg: Exactly.

Guy: We can't go on this way. If we lose one-time it will simply become a matter of, "Choose what you want to eliminate."

Chad: Should they be using fee structure to address the turf issue? I think we should object to the \$18,000 for cameras in Founder's.

Charlene: It'd be helpful to know which of these items is about requirements to meet code and which are just improvements.

5.c. Moved to March 28th meeting.

5.d. pulled

Adjourned at 3:50