

**Joint Planning and Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 23, 2019
8:30 – 10:30 a.m., 220 Seymour**

ATTENDEES:

Voting Members

Sondra Aman
Mike Andriatch
Steven Breslawski
Frances Dearing
Scott Haines
Katy Heyning
Debbie Jacob
Sara Kelly
Kadathur Lakshmanan
Teresa Major
Dave Mihalyov
Katy Wilson

Non-Voting Members

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

Guests

Lerong He – *attending
on behalf of Susan
Stites-Doe*

REGRETS:

Voting Members

David Bloom
Tom Hernandez
Brooke Leddon
Jose Maliekal
Cherise Oakley
Kathy Peterson
Summer Reiner
Susan Stites-Doe
Jay West

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Copelton asked the committee to review the minutes from the May 9, 2019 meeting. With no corrections, Mr. Haines motioned the minutes to be approved, Ms. Major seconded the motion, and all present voting members were in favor, except there was one abstention. Therefore, the minutes were approved.

Announcements

Dr. Copelton made the following announcements:

- The meeting minutes from our last meeting are not yet available. Those minutes as well as the minutes from this meeting will be distributed for our first meeting in the fall.
- Our first meeting in the fall is scheduled for August 29, 2019. All returning committee members should have received a meeting invite.
- Congratulations was provided to Dr. Lerong He for being appointed the Interim Associate Dean for the School of Business and Management. With this new role, a mutual agreement was reached between President Macpherson, Dr. Copelton, Mr. Wall and Dr. He that Dr. He will defer her appointment as the committee Co-Chair Elect for one year. This is due to the fact that the Charge states that the Co-Chair Elect is to be a faculty member and not an administrator. Dr. Copelton will extend her appointment as Co-Chair for an additional year so that the overlap year with the Co-Chair and Co-Chair Elect still exists to maintain a more effective transfer and to help prevent disruption of the work of the committee.
- Dr. Copelton extended her appreciation to all committee members for their work on the committee. She thanked all the outgoing members for their service, Dr. Lakshmanan, Dr. Breslawski, Dr. Bloom, Ms. Jacob, Ms. Major, Ms. Oakley, Ms. Leddon, Mr. West and Ms. Footer. She also thanked Ms. Smith and Ms. Wight for the support that they provide the committee.

Budget Model Presentation

Note: The presentation is available on Blackboard

The following questions, answers and discussion points occurred during the presentation:

- The request for clarification was raised regarding the calculation of revenue by program and how general education is factored into that. Mr. Wall stated that for the first round of review, the revenue by program is filtered by major. We have taken the tuition bill, enrollment numbers, faculty salaries and maintenance of buildings and calculated the revenue by major.
- The request for clarification was raised regarding how the enrollment numbers are factored for a major. Is it the number of students in enrolled in a class offered by the major or the number of students who have declared the major? Ms. Hallenbeck stated that Mr. Scheid pulled the numbers based on the number of declared students.
- The question was raised if students are being used with both their first and second major. Ms. Hallenbeck stated that it is just the first major for now. Mr. Wall stated that this is the team's first review and as they move along, they may find that there is further detail that needs to be reviewed.
- Clarification was requested regarding how the maintenance of a building is factored into the cost of a program. Mr. Wall stated that the team is reviewing how much it costs to run a building on an annual basis and determine the best way to allocate that cost across the programs within each building. This is still under discussion because the team is trying to determine a fair way to allocate the cost because some programs are in older buildings, where the cost of the building is higher.

- President Macpherson added that the aspect of cost is not an item that we have looked at in the past when determining long term planning. It is not the only driving force of a budget, but it is something to be aware of when making strategic decisions.
- The question was raised regarding the amount of tuition that is not being paid when a student enrolls in more than 12 credits because a course load above 12 credits is assessed the same rate as a student who is enrolled in 12 credits. Mr. Wall stated that the answer would have to be researched. Dr. Breslawski stated the concern is that there is an increasing number of students taking six courses and was wondering if there is a way to adjust the full-time rate. Ms. Riotto stated that the rate is set by SUNY. Dr. Breslawski asked if the overload limit could be adjusted. It is a disservice to allow a student to take six courses and work full-time when they have a 2.0 GPA. Ms. Riotto stated that she believes the overload limit is a local decision.
- The concern was raised about the lack of interest in Brockport from potential students and what is going to be done to help prevent us from this projected significant decrease in enrollment. President Macpherson stated that the enrollment projections are based on trends we are seeing in the data on demographics. If nothing else changes, this is likely what enrollment will look like. We also have to calculate these numbers because SUNY requires us to estimate our numbers. We have to make sure that we estimate as well as we can because that effects our funding. What we have been doing and continue to do is to focus on graduate education because that is the thing that is likely to make a difference. The demographics of 18 years olds in Western NY is not likely to spike. The other piece that we have grown in and need to do more is online education. The Chancellor is supportive of this program and wants schools to expand in this. These two areas may make changes in enrollment, but because they do not exist yet, we cannot include this in our estimate. There is a great deal of marketing going on in the state. Part of the strategic plan is to be a college engaged with its community and with that is to raise the profile of the institution. This piece takes time to do.
- Mr. Haines stated that a recent survey was randomly sent out to a third of the student population and the results for 2018-19 on the importance of the recreation facilities that factors into the decision to attend Brockport was 83.21% and 79.7% decided to continue at Brockport because of the recreation facilities. The quality of the facilities does impact why students decide to come here and why students decide to stay.
- Dr. Wilson added that she recently read an article regarding Generation Z and their expectations on facilities, amenities and technology. We are really going to have to determine how we are going to provide what this generation expects in a time where there are fewer resources.
- Dr. Heyning stated that we are further long with the classroom technology inventory than previously discussed. Once the inventory is completed, we will blend it with the facilities information and by the end of summer we should have a general understanding on the cost it would involve moving a percentage of our instructional classrooms to the next level of technology. In addition, she has been working with Dr. Wilson and Dr. Kelly as this initiative will be added to Goal 1 and will be presented as a budget priority for next year.
- The question was raised regarding the different budget models listed but not discussed in the presentation and what models are feasible for Brockport. Mr. Wall stated that BASC uses the “Activity-Based” model as they can base it on the number of students who purchase meal plans and they know what their variable cost is so that they can work with this model accordingly. They could order less food if there was a decrease in

purchased meal plans. Residential Life is another area that could use the “Activity-Based” model, as this is another area driven by the numbers. We have a high fixed cost so this model does not work for us. The “Centralized” model is taking all of your spending and putting it in one central area. For example, putting all of what Facilities spends in one area, all of what IT spends in one area, etc. It is taking the cost structure and allowing it to be centrally managed. Facilities is pretty centrally based and IT could be as well. The “Performance-Based” model is primarily used in sales organizations because you can determine if you sale a product, you can determine how much cost you can absorb and based on that if you drive volume up, you get more budget. This model does not fit in higher education. I have not found a school that is utilizing this model. You can use different budget models in different areas depending on how those areas operate. This is the big misconception, as some believe that you have to use the same model across the board, but a hybrid approach could be quite successful. The team feels if we understand the total gross spent to run the entire campus to understand how best to manage. The State wants the budget to be submitted in a certain way, there are only so many funds and we populate the accounts with those funds, there are requirements that we have to submit to the State in a certain way, which provides limits.

- The question was raised regarding the team that was put together to work on determining the budget, what the timeline is for the team to provide recommendations, what progress is expected for the team in the fall and when the new model would be implemented. Mr. Wall stated that the goal would be to continue to work on this over the summer, have some reviews with Cabinet regarding the recommendations and bring that information to an early fall meeting of committee with the goal to implement the changes for budget year 2020-21.
- The recommendation was made that there should be open forums to the campus on the recommendations that are made to the budget model. This way the campus community will have an opportunity to provide feedback so that they feel they have input into the decision. It is important to have campus dialogue. Mr. Wall agreed and stated the main goal of this is to understand as a campus what our total spending is, what funding is need strategically, what is needed operationally to run the campus, so we know exactly what is needed to be spent to have a top-notch facility giving us the ability attract students. We just do not have that visibility today. Therefore, we are working on making some changes on determining what our costs need to be so that we can have better visibility.
- The concern was raised regarding the current rate for adjunct professors and our inability to compete with other institutions in this area. Dr. Heyning stated that we are reviewing the adjunct pay, we have benchmarks on what the pay is, what the pay will be with the UUP increases this summer, and we are looking at what the surrounding school are paying. The Deans Council will be reviewing all of this information and will be providing recommendations. We are aware that for many years, we have been at the bottom of the range of pay and we do not need to be. We need to figure out the appropriate place we should be in that range.

Call Letter and Goal Group Presentation Templates

Note: The Call Letter and presentation templates are available on Blackboard

The committee reviewed the Call Letter and presentation template. Dr. Copelton stated that the terminology of “new resource requests” would be changed to “budget prioritization requests” in

the letter and in the PowerPoint templates. Materials are due at the end of September and presentations will occur at the first two committee meetings in October. Therefore, the Call Letter will be sent out in June so that Goal Group Leaders have the summer to work on the presentations and all materials requested. Dr. Breslawski put forward the motion to vote on the approval of the Call Letter and PowerPoint templates with the language changes, Ms. Dearing seconded the motion and results of the present voting members are as follows:

Approve – 13

Not Approve – 0

Abstain – 0

Other Items from the Committee

President Macpherson thanked Dr. Copelton for serving as the Faculty Co-Chair and for all of her hard work this year. Committee members also expressed their gratitude to Dr. Copelton.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 a.m.

Next Meeting: August 29, 2019, 8:30-10:30 AM

DC/JW/mw