

University Planning and Budget Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of September 19, 2017

Members Present: R. Benfield, L. Bigelow, C. Casamento, S. Gross, J. Hodgson, M. Jackson, Y. Kirby, K. Martin, J. Nicoll-Senft, C. Soler, B. Sommers, P. Troiano, R. Wolff

Members Absent: C. Galligan, S. Pease, C. Valk

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm by R. Wolff.
2. The minutes of the meeting of May 9, 2017 were approved as written; the minutes of the meeting of September 5, 2017 were approved as amended (Martin/Jackson)
3. Announcements/Updates
 - a. R. Wolff gave the following updates related to the last meeting:
 - i. The two vacancies on the zero-based budgeting workgroup convened by the Integrated Planning Council will be filled by Peter LeMaire (Physics) and Brendan Kruh (SGA President).
 - ii. Carlos Soler has joined the UPBC ad hoc subcommittee tasked with reviewing the proposal for a New Britain dual enrollment/college readiness program that the IPC forwarded to UPBC.
 - b. R. Wolff presented the 2016-2017 annual report to the Senate on September 11.
 - c. J. Farhat has replaced Provost Pease on the Zero Based Budgeting Work Group.
4. Brief Reports
 - a. Chief Financial Officer: C. Casamento reported that there is still no State budget; she refrained from speculating on when a budget might be in place.
 - b. OIRA Director: Y. Kirby reported that yesterday (September 18) was the census date. CCSU's FTE is up by 1.9% and that when system-wide data would be available was unknown given that Charter Oak State College's census date is not until late October.
 - c. Facilities Planning Representative: R. Wolff provided the following updates from C. Valk, the UPBC's liaison to the FPC:
 - i. The Willard/DiLoreto project is expected to be substantially completed by November 2018, the occupancy date is currently January 2019 and the first classes in the new facility are expected to happen in Summer 2019.
 - ii. The bid for the new recreation center has been extended.
 - iii. The addition to Barnard Hall is supposed to begin one year from now, but that start date is only tentative and may be pushed back.
 - iv. Construction on the new Engineering building is expected to begin in Fall 2018. The expected completion date is Fall 2020.

- v. Work on the 600 space Manafort Garage (new construction) is estimated to begin in September 2019.

5. New Business

- a. The committee discussed the *ad hoc* subcommittee's written report on the proposal for a dual enrollment/college readiness program in collaboration with New Britain High School. Questions were raised about the genesis of the proposal, what need the initiative would meet, and how the initiative would complement or otherwise articulate with existing similar programs on campus. Concerns were raised about the cost of the project, particularly in light of the relatively small number of students the program would serve. Members of the committee questioned whether this program was needed, whether it was an attempt to replace the ConnCAP program, and whether it looked to any national models for benchmarking. It was noted that there are already several isolated programs operating on campus and adding another may not be the best use of resources. Questions were also raised about the metrics that would be used to assess the initiative. Finally, it was observed that there was no visible connection between the proposal and current recruitment efforts, nor did the proposal include adequate support services for the target population, which has already been determined to be at-risk.

L. Bigelow commented on the structure of the proposal, the elements that were missing, and observed that one takeaway from the process of reviewing of this particular proposal was to help the UPBC determine what guidelines should be used to help authors of future proposals craft a well-conceived and compelling proposal.

The committee did not feel that there was any reason to request that the ad hoc committee rewrite its report. C. Soler observed that the University community needs to be creative and utilize best practices; in his assessment, this proposal fell short of those goals. He further observed that the budget was high for a program that would impact only 25 students.

R. Benfield made the following motion:

The UPBC accepts the ad hoc committee's report as written and recommends to President Toro that she table the proposal pending additional information, including:

- (1) *Demonstration of the need for a program such as this;*
- (2) *A narrative that addresses how this program would integrate with existing CCSU recruitment efforts;*
- (3) *Information on how this program benchmarks with other similar programs;*
- (4) *A revised budget that demonstrates a more appropriate cost-benefit;*

(5) Integration with appropriate metrics.

The motion was seconded by M. Jackson and the committee voted in favor of accepting the Motion.

b. Strategic Planning Pathway Flowchart

R. Wolff provided a background on the creation of the draft Strategic Planning Pathway Flowchart, an outcome of the recently convened Integrated Planning Committee. K. Martin questioned the UPBC portal, and R. Wolff described when the portal would be used to submit a proposal and when proposals would be sent directly to the Senate. He explained that the portal would provide a mechanism to receive, record, and track all proposals that are submitted, providing transparency and a means for anyone on campus to submit a proposal for further consideration. K. Martin questioned whether all proposals would need to go through this process or whether individuals, such as President Toro, could propose an initiative outside this process. R. Wolff explained that the President has already, in essence, used the process to submit the proposal that we just received.

L. Bigelow indicated that the main reason that the IPC came into existence is to integrate the planning and budgeting functions to meet the NEASC standard and to avoid situations, as have happened in the past, where projects get implemented without any review and other projects get programmatic review but receive no budgetary review. C. Casamento observed that some guidelines would have to be established to address the general parameters for when something has to be submitted through the UPBC portal; she stated it was important that the University community not get “log-jammed” waiting for proposals to go through the process and give examples clarifying which initiatives could still get accomplished using existing resources within departments/divisions.

Y. Kirby stated that close attention needs to be paid to the metrics that will be used for each proposal so that true assessment could take place. She stated that one thing that could become a concern is that authors would believe they did an exhaustive search of existing programs but really, they did not. She suggested that the UPC process somehow create a database of what already exists. R. Wolff agreed that this could be accomplished.

M. Jackson asked about the timeframe necessary for a proposal to make it all the way through the proposed flowchart. R. Benfield discussed the flow of communication between the UPBC and Senate and noted that some proposals – those that need review by all bodies mentioned on the flow chart -- may take upwards of one year to go through all of the processes. He further noted, however, that the President wants the process to be nimble and that the Senate President agrees in principal, but added the caveat that there may be a proposal that takes a while to go through the process.

C. Casamento addressed the part of the flowchart that had proposals coming to the CFO for review via an IPC sponsor when proposals are greater than \$500,000. She noted that as an ex officio member of the UPBC, she may be able to directly participate in the UPBC review discussion and not have to wait for the proposal to be referred to her via an IPC sponsor. Further discussion was held about the minimum dollar value threshold needed before a review by the CFO would be triggered and when individuals held accountable to achieve certain objectives could develop and execute initiatives without going through this process.

Y. Kirby questioned whether this new process would only be for initiatives that involved funding; she inquired whether policy changes would also need to go through this process since policy development is part of strategic planning.

The committee discussed how and when proposals would leave the process (e.g., returned to sender) because they were incomplete, not approved, etc. R. Wolff noted the need to develop a process for disposing of proposals that are not being advanced.

The discussion concluded with the sentiment that we would need to put “a stake in the ground” at a certain point and require all proposals after that date to go through the process, with the understanding that changes will probably be made along the way as we go through the process – a pilot of sorts – the first few times.

Soler/Martin made the following Motion:

The UPBC recommends that the IPC pilot use of the flowchart.

The motion was approved.

6. The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Marie Bigelow
Secretary