

**Joint Planning and Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 14, 2019
8:30 – 10:30 a.m., 220 Seymour**

ATTENDEES:

Voting Members

Sondra Aman
Mike Andriatch
Davida Bloom
Steven Breslawski
Frances Dearing
Scott Haines
Tom Hernandez
Katy Heyning
Debbie Jacob
Sara Kelly
Kadathur Lakshmanan
Brooke Leddon
Teresa Major
Jose Maliekal
Dave Mihalyov
Cherise Oakley
Kathy Peterson
Summer Reiner
Katy Wilson

Non-Voting Members

Denise Copelton: Co-Chair
Crystal Hallenbeck
Karen Riotto
Jim Wall: Co-Chair
Melissa Wight
Jim Zollweg

Guests

Dawn Footer –
*attending on behalf of
Jay West*

REGRETS:

Voting Members

Susan Stites-Doe
Jay West

Non-Voting Members

President Macpherson

The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Copelton asked the committee to review the minutes from the December 6, 2018 meeting. With no corrections, Dr. Peterson motioned the minutes to be approved, Dr. Lakshmanan seconded the motion, and all present voting members were in favor. Therefore, the minutes were approved.

Announcements

- Dr. Copelton welcomed Sondra Aman as the new OSU Representative. She will be fulfilling the rest of Mr. Menear's term as Mr. Menear removed himself from the committee due to a change in jobs.
- Dr. Copelton discussed the upcoming vacancies and the nomination form that has been developed to fill the vacancies on the committee. An article will be in posted in the Daily Eagle regarding the upcoming vacancies with information on how to nominate. The nomination form will be opened up to the campus for two weeks for individuals to nominate others or to self-nominate. The nominations will be reviewed by Dr. Copelton, Mr. Wall, Cabinet and Senate.
- Dr. Copelton encouraged committee members to attend the following upcoming presentations:
 - Budget Town Hall – Tuesday, February 19, 2019, 2:00-3:15 p.m. in the McCue Auditorium
 - Fee Based Budget Presentations – Thursday, February 21, 2019, 8:30-10:30 a.m. in Union 220.

Fee Based Budget Subcommittee Report

Note: The report, recommendation and supporting documentation are available on Blackboard.

Ms. Riotto provided a report on the work accomplished in the fall by the Campus Based Fee Review Subcommittee. In addition, Ms. Riotto put forth a recommendation from the subcommittee regarding the Commencement Fee. SUNY has updated the Fees, Rentals, and Other Charges Policy that now states the Commencement Fee needs to be voluntary and our current fee is not. The following are questions, answers and discussion points that occurred during the review of the recommendation:

- The suggestion was made that since participation in commencement is voluntary; the fee should be as well and charged when the student indicates that they wish to participate. Ms. Riotto stated that is an option that is outlined in the recommendation document as the opt-in or opt-out fee. The concern is about the mechanics it would take to implement the fee in this manner. Ms. Major also stated that a concern would be students showing up that did not pay and having family members with them. Depending on how this is handled, it could end with bad public relations. Ms. Riotto stated there could be a concern with crowd control as well.
- The suggestion was made to increase the fee for the cap and gown and put the additional revenue towards the ceremony. This would ensure that only the students that are participating in the ceremony would be charged the fee. The concerns for this suggestion are the following:
 - If the fee went on the student bill after the spring bill is paid, this could pose a problem with obtaining the fee and/or with financial aid.
 - If the fee remains with BASC, there would have to be a mechanism put in place to obtain this revenue from BASC.
 - Students already share cap and gowns because many cannot afford the cost of the cap and gown. Therefore, this would not help with gaining funds towards the ceremony.

- Some students complain that they do not utilize the services that they pay for such as the recreation center, but we tell students that these fees are for the good of all students so this fee can be looked at in the same way.
- The question was asked how much revenue was lost when the Alumni Fee (The Gift to the Fund for Brockport) became voluntary. The concern also is if the fee is raised by \$5, would that cause the funding received to decrease. Mr. Andriatch stated he would have to research that information, as he did not know the amount. Mr. Andriatch also stated that the amount that has been received in the recent past has not decreased, in fact it has increased. In addition, he stated that there is a possibility of a decrease in revenue with increasing the fee, but the fee has not been increased in several years so it is hard to predict what will happen.
- Another suggestion was to no longer provide free tickets and charge for tickets. Ms. Riotto stated this is an option, but we would have to be very planful.
- A concern was brought up regarding how the funding would be provided for the 25% of the clerk duties in Registration and Records. The discussion was that this work would continue and it is for the function of commencement. Another thought was that this work is an essential function of the College and the College should be funding the money for this work to be completed.
- The statement was made that an opt-out option is not a bad solution, as most people do not chose to opt-out of fees and there are a high number of students that participate in the ceremony.
- The statement was made that the recommendation that the subcommittee has come up with is a good recommendation. The other options would be difficult in terms of operations and potential bad public relations. In addition, this option engages the Alumni.
- The question was raised if the committee endorsed this recommendation and the increase would contribute \$38,000 of the approximately \$75,000 needed for the ceremony, what would the process would be for reviewing where the rest of the funding would come from and would that review come to this committee. Ms. Riotto stated that if the recommendation was endorsed, the recommendation would move on to Cabinet for approval and then Cabinet would review where the other funding would come from.

Committee members decided to vote on the endorsement of the recommendation. The results of the present voting members were as follows:

Endorse – 16

Not Endorse – 1

Abstain - 3

Call Letter for Strategic Plan Update & New Resources Request Presentation

Note: The Call Letter and PowerPoint templates are available on Blackboard.

The following discussion points occurred regarding the Call Letter:

- The concern was brought up that in the past, we have requested the Divisions to share their cost-savings and that seems to be missing with this new process.
- The concern was brought up about the timing of this request. Goal Group leaders will not have all of the information needed for the request until they receive the end of the year reporting. This request will have Goal Group Leaders requesting information from the campus that they will in return be requesting again in one to two months. Another challenge

is with the new resources request, as we may not know which Investment Fund proposals will receive funding, so this makes requesting new resources difficult.

- The question was raised regarding where the funding would be coming from for the new resource requests. Mr. Wall stated it would be from the reserves unless there are cost-saving initiatives in place that would cover the cost of the requests.
- A concern was brought up that someone would be reviewing all of the requests so that an area could not request funding from different goals for the same item. Dr. Copelton stated this committee would review the requests and our recommendations would be sent to Cabinet. Cabinet would have the final say on which items would be funded.
- Clarification was requested on what items needed to be included in the presentation. Dr. Copelton stated that in order to better understand the new resource requests, the Goal Group Leaders should be providing a report on the progress to date and the resources needed to meet a particular measure.
- The concern was brought up that the three-week timeline to provide the information was not a sufficient amount of time to gather the requested information. If the request was changed, similar to what was done last year, to provide how the new resource request will help meet the goal, then the timeline would be attainable. If the request is for all updates, then the whole campus will be scrambling.
- Clarification was requested on how the information in the presentation would be used. Dr. Copelton stated that any new resource request needs to be submitted through this committee. This committee then makes recommendations to Cabinet on which requests the committee endorses and does not endorse. Cabinet will make the final decision and these decisions effect the budgets for next year.
- A concern was brought up that we have gone from requesting one report from individuals to four reports from individuals and we may need to change the request to prevent redundancy. Dr. Copelton stated that this request does change how information is collected and presented, but we have been charged by Cabinet to complete this review of information through Goal Groups rather than Divisions. Mr. Wall and Dr. Copelton both stated that this is the first year of the request and we need to find a process that helps the committee complete the task that we have by asked to do.
- It was stated that there is a template currently in development for the Division of Academic Affairs. This template will provide information regarding progress that has been made in each area of the Operational Plan. The distribution of the template is the end of the month with responses due by the end of March. This way the information gets requested one way so people are not getting numerous requests for the same information. Dr. Copelton stated that the process that is being described is the process that was completed last year when it was done by division, but this year Cabinet has charged the committee to obtain the information from the Goal Group Leaders regarding the progress and resource requests in each goal.
- A request was made to review and discuss a way to align this process with the Investment Fund process. This way there would be a better understanding of what is being asked for and supported through the Strategic Priorities fund. Dr. Copelton stated that one possibility moving forward would be to take the money that is allocated for the Investment Funds and put it towards this process instead of having two separate calls. The challenge in this request is that there is not a specific dollar amount set aside for this call. Mr. Wall said we would have to look at the timing of requests because Investment Funds are only for one year, whereas resources can be requested to be permanent.

- Dr. Copelton stated she understands that the timeline of this process is not ideal, but the committee does not meet over the summer and we have a fixed timeline of what we need to accomplish.
- The statement was made that another difference between the Investment Fund requests and the resource requests from the Goal Group Leaders is that the Goal Group Leaders could be requesting staffing as this is not an option with the Investment Funds.
- A suggestion was made to change the call to request goal highlights from the year, resource requests, and the supporting information regarding the requests. Mr. Wall stated that it is important that Division Leaders are aware of the requests so that they can be taken into consideration when developing their budgets.
- A suggestion was made to make the request a two-year cycle to allow time to gather the needs that have appeared over the year and report on it the following year.
- A suggestion was made that the presentation comes from the Vice Presidents and they specify the resources needed for each goal. The presentations are reviewed by the Goal Groups and they can decide which requests they support. This would consolidate the report having the same presentation for the Goal Groups and for this committee. This would also help individuals to see if areas have requests for each goal. Dr. Copelton stated that would entail adding more meeting dates because we would have to allow for presentations from the Vice Presidents and then from the Goal Group Leaders. Mr. Wall stated that it is important to consolidate the requests and break them down by Division. This way they can be reviewed before they go to Cabinet.
- A suggestion was made that we need to create a mechanism with the endpoint in mind and then determine the best way to get there. If the Divisions are the ones spending the money, then they need to be involved in the process, otherwise we could recommend funding that cannot be utilized right away or may not fit within the priorities that the Division has established.
- Many members suggested moving these reports to the fall, so that there is a better understanding of what the needs are and more accurate reports for the progress in each goal. The concern with this was that the budget deadline is July 1. Ms. Riotto and Ms. Hallenbeck stated that reserve funding could be moved manually after the deadline if needed.
- Another concern in the timing of this is that the State budget is not finalized yet, so these decisions of resource requests should be made when we have a better idea of the funding that we will have available.
- The suggestion was made that all resource requests need to come through this committee, so the timing of the requests should not matter as we always have the ability to discuss the requests at a committee meeting.
- The suggestion of moving the presentations to the fall would also align in terms of assessment and for the many individuals that need to contribute information for the presentations.

The motion was put forward to postpone the presentations until the fall, Dr. Breslawski moved the motion, Dr. Kelly seconded the motion, and all present voting members were in favor.

Investment Fund Recommendations

Note: The report is available on Blackboard.

Dr. Copelton presented the recommendations for the funding of the Investment Fund proposals from

the subcommittee. The following are questions, answers and discussion points that occurred during the review of the recommendations:

- The concern was brought up that the traditional requests that were brought to the Small Projects and Alternations Committee for the small projects did not appear to come through this year in the Investment Fund process even though the funding was combined into the Investment Fund proposal process. This could increase the requests that go through Facilities and in turn will be requested to come out of the Division of Administration and Finance's budget. Mr. Wall stated that there has been increase in the minor critical maintenance requests. Dr. Copelton stated that it was listed in the Investment Fund Call Letter that the Small Projects and Alternations Fund was now included with the Investment Fund process. In retrospect, it would have been useful to post a separate announcement in the Daily Eagle indicating that Small Project and Alternation Funds are now going through the Investment Fund process because unless you were reading the Call Letter for the Investment Funds, an individual would not be aware of the change.
- A statement was made in regards to the subcommittee's concern over the number of safety and security proposals and the high level of funding requested for these proposals. The statement was that the divisions do not have the funding to support these requests, so when a proposal goes through the Investment Fund process, it is brought to the attention of the appropriate individuals that need to review the concerns. Dr. Copelton stated that the lack of funding is a concern that is why the subcommittee is requesting Cabinet explore the possibility of establishing a separate fund for these requests that the Enterprise Risk Management Committee may oversee.
- The concern was brought up regarding the recommendation that individuals use an internal loan to replace furniture. For example, no one department owns the Union and the whole campus utilizes it, therefore it would not be fair to request that one department pay back the loan. It was agreed that the proposed replacement schedule would be helpful. It was also stated that there are other colleges that have established replacement schedules and this is an idea that we should look at developing as part of the budget because the Campus Events Manager has a small operating budget and there is not enough funding currently available for furniture replacement. Dr. Copelton stated that it was appropriate for the furniture requests to come through the Core Needs, Facilities & Alterations Fund, but these are going to be recurring requests and we need to be more planful so that we can manage these requests. The schedule may not determine which department should fund the replacement, but it will at least help us to identify how often these needs will occur.
- An explanation was provided regarding proposal #75, where the University Police are requesting funding to update their portable radios. It was stated that the county has decided to go to digital so this effects all of the police, fire, ambulance agencies, etc., that have analog. We do not qualify for any of the grants that are available to be utilized for this upgrade. SUNY is aware of this switch and the only other county to switch over to digital is Albany. The county helped the University of Albany with funding for the update. Our request for funding support was denied at a County Planning meeting and by the County Executive. Now that the county has finished the fourth tower, they will be switching off the analog, therefore leaving us without the ability to communicate with ambulance, fire and police agencies.
- An explanation was provided regarding the equipment requests. It was stated that when the science buildings were renovated, the cost for equipment was included in the cost of the

renovation. In addition, many faculty members have written grants to purchase expensive equipment. When these items need to be replaced, there is very little funding available. To develop additional funding for equipment replacement is a very good idea. The concern is with the departments using the loan to purchase equipment, as the departments do not generate much revenue. Many of the lab fees are used to cover the cost of the supplies needed for the specific course that the fee is linked to. Dr. Copelton stated that an option for revenue that was discussed was for departments to possibly use their Summer Gainsharing to pay off the loan. A concern was brought up regarding Dr. Copelton's response as the most a department can receive in gainsharing is \$4,000 and with how expensive the equipment is, it could take ten years for departments to pay off a loan for equipment. Dr. Copelton stated that the subcommittee did recognize that there are limitations for the departments that is why some of the proposals were recommended for partial funding to cover the more expensive equipment. For the equipment that was not as expensive, the subcommittee felt the departments could put a request through the Academic Equipment Replacement Fund. This is to help encourage departments to utilize the Academic Equipment Replacement Fund first.

- The question was asked how much revenue departments have received since the gainsharing has been implemented. Ms. Hallenbeck stated that it varies by department as the department gets a percentage as well as the Dean's office.
- Clarification was requested that if the committee approved these recommendations, the committee would be approving funding that is approximately \$150,000 over the designated amount. Dr. Copelton stated that because there was not a designated amount for each funding source, it was difficult to integrate the proposals into one rank order. The subcommittee decided to submit the recommendations as is with the understanding that the amount exceeds the allocation and leave the final funding decision to Cabinet.

Dr. Copelton requested an affirmation from the committee on the funding recommendations and committee members agreed to vote. It was decided that since this was an affirmation, there would only be a vote counted for those voting members that affirmed the recommendations. The voting results of the present voting members were as follows:

Affirm - 18

Other Items from the Committee

Committee members expressed appreciation to the Campus Based Fee Subcommittee, the Investment Fund Subcommittee, as well as Pat Maxwell for all of the work they accomplished within the subcommittees.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Next Meeting: February 28, 2019, 8:30-10:30 AM

DC/JW/mw