

University Planning and Budget Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of November 6, 2018

Members Present: L. Clark, K. Martin, E. Pana, J. Farhat, S. Cohen, J. Hodgson, S. Gross, J. Gamache, C. Soler, L. Washko, L. Bigelow, D. Dauwalder, C. Casamento, R. Ghodsi, S. Mendez-Mendez, M. Fallon, D. Dauwalder

Absent: C. E. Valk, Y. Kirby, S. Petras, J. Effend

Invited: President Toro and Senate President Jackson

Chair Bigelow called the meeting to order at 1:47 pm.

IPC and UPBC: President Toro briefly discussed the role played by the Integrated Planning Council (IPC) on the planning, budgeting, and review process. Prior to the IPC creation, the President historically made decisions on budget proposals reviewed and recommended by the UPBC and Facilities Committee without involving others in the decision making. The creation of the IPC resulted in an opportunity to consult and share decision making with a multi-disciplinary team. The creation of IPC and its charge was done in AY1718 in consultation with the then-UPBC Chair. The President noted that the role played by UPBC in the planning, budgeting, and review process has not been diminished by the creation of IPC. The review of recommendations and proposals made by UPBC to IPC takes into account additional elements, such as limits imposed by regulations.

Strategic Planning: The President briefed the members of the committee on the recent history of the strategic planning process at CCSU:

- In 1995, the strategic planning process was led by the Provost. It was developed within 18 months and was governed by strict limitations.
- In 2003, another strategic planning process was initiated by the schools/units. The Provost was then the Co-Chair of UPBC.
- Only five years later, another process was started.

The feedback received by President Toro during her first tour of the campus was that constituents viewed the strategic plan as convoluted. The President noted that the feedback received during the campus tour was also confirmed by the 2008 NEASC Self-Study for Reaccreditation, as follows: “A majority of respondents to questions about strategic planning expressed dissatisfaction with the process. The following responses to a survey distributed at a

‘NEASC Town Meeting’ in January 2008 were fairly typical: ‘the strategic plan has a tendency to get bogged down;’ ‘the University Planning and Budget Committee process is not open, accessible, or transparent;’ ‘approaches need to be coordinated and communicated throughout the campus.’” (Self Study for Reaccreditation, October 2008, page 10)

Less than two months into her tenure at CCSU President Toro met with the chair of the UPBC to discuss the strategic plan and charged the UPBC with developing a plan, or framework, to guide the strategic planning process. The AY1718 year concluded, and this charge was not met. The President also asked the UPBC to consider whether it would be advisable to hire a consultant to facilitate the strategic planning process; the UPBC deliberated that during AY1718 and agreed it would be helpful to hire a consultant, however, this did not happen.

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) was recently formed with the goal of creating a framework for the strategic planning process. The SPSC goal is to present the framework to the UPBC at the December 18, 2018 meeting, for review, discussion and comment. The next step will then to share the framework with the campus community for input, feedback, and consideration. The SPSC will consider the feedback and send the final framework to the IPC for approval. Several UPBC subcommittees and/or permanent committees created by the Senate will be charged with the implementation and assessment of the plan.

President Toro emphasized that the strategic plan should have broad participation and should serve three purposes:

- 1) to enable the university to prioritize resources and achieve its goals (e.g., enrollment target);
- 2) to enable the university to advocate for additional State funding to enable the success of the new Capital Campaign.

The plan must be simple, with clear and measurable objectives and thresholds.

Several questions about the creation of the Strategic Planning Steering committee and faculty representation on such committee followed. S. Mendez-Mendez noted that while faculty governance is central to the process of creating committees, we now need to focus our efforts on ensuring the success to the strategic plan. President Toro added that UPBC will have a very busy schedule next semester. In addition to the review of IPC proposals, UPBC will spend significant time and effort on the budget and strategic plan. A question was raised about the process of submitting proposals to IPC.

Co-Chair Farhat asked President Toro to discuss UPBC’s input on the creation of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. President Toro replied that the Chair of UPBC mentioned discussions with the committee members and their feedback on bringing a facilitator for the

process. S. Cohen noted that consulting with the Chair of the committee is not the same as consulting with the committee. The President added that she was advised to keep the size of the Steering Committee to no more than five members. The President argued in favor of a wider representation of campus constituents and that the current size of the committee reflects that. Co-chair Farhat asked a second question about the delineation between IPC and UPBC. K. Martin added that IPC is not a faculty committee. President Toro argued that without IPC, the decision on proposals reviewed by UPBC was made by only one person, the President. Now, the IPC approval process commits the University to providing the resources needed by such proposals. Several recent IPC reviews of proposals were briefly mentioned. It was noted that IPC serves an additional role of documenting the process (institutional memory). A proposal was made to include an item to the next UPBC agenda about having the entire process used to review proposals explained to UPBC members. A question about the status of the Academic Plan followed. It was mentioned that a recent version of the Academic Plan was referred to the Senate. Co-Chair Farhat stated that the Academic Plan is with the schools/units for feedback. S. Cohen added that the Academic Plan should provide input in the approval of new programs. The President emphasized the importance of communication in identifying areas of improvement and asked UPBC to create a plan for IPC communication. She highlighted the important role UPBC will have on the assessment of the framework created by the Steering Committee.

Chair Bigelow thanked President Toro and Senate President Jackson for their visit.

The committee members briefly discussed the meeting of the IBM subcommittee with the School of Business. It was noted that all meetings regarding integrated budget models should focus on Academic Plan being aligned with new proposals and developments. Several comments were made about the distinction between representation and participation. As such, representatives of UPBC should not only report back to the committee, but also make sure their votes represent the will of UPBC.

A discussion about the Honors Program proposal sent to IPC ensued. Members of IPC provided clarification on the fact that it was not a request for funds but rather an information item on the IPC agenda. An answer that the proposal did not have a budget implication was countered with an argument that it had a recruiting component, and thus should've been reviewed by another committee before it was sent to IPC.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ella Pana, Secretary