**Integrated Planning Council**

**February 9, 2021**

**Meeting Notes**

**Present:** Z. Toro, C. Casamento, G. Claffey, S. Cintorino, S. Hazan, C. Magnan, A. Suski-Lenczewski, Y. Kirby, K. Peckham, F. Latour, J. Melnyk, D. Dauwalder, J. Tully, J. Jarrett, S. Collins, S. Watton, K. Kollar

**FY 21 Budget Update**C. Casamento provided the following budget update:

* The mid-year forecast was submitted as a balanced budget; however, this balanced budget was achieved through $16.6 million in one-time relief, and $13.8 million in reductions.
* It is unlikely we will receive the same relief funding for FY22.
* There are currently 740 students in housing, which is slightly higher than our estimation of about 700 students.
* We have assumed approximately $2.1 million in COVID expenses for the Spring. If residence halls are forced to close at any point, we could incur additional expenses.
* We will draw $1,750,000 from reserves in order to pay our residence hall debt service, as well as debts related to the new parking garage.

C. Casamento noted that the above-mentioned figures represent one-time strategies to balance the budget, and we should assume that it may take until 2024 to get back to where we were financially. As such, it is safe to assume that next year’s spending plan will also include the same $13.8 million reduction from the original budget.

S. Cintorino added that he received guidance from the DPH to utilize the same COVID testing plan that was used for the Fall, as well as to assume that there will be no reimbursement from the state for these testing costs.

**Issue Involving New Academic Programs**

Z. Toro reported an issue involving a new academic program submission. In the past, white papers were submitted to the IPC for consideration before they were submitted to the System’s Academic Council. A full proposal would then be created upon approval. The Academic Council no longer requires white paper submissions.

Z. Toro reported that a white paper for an aerospace engineering program was submitted to the Academic Council without the IPC’s knowledge, and a full proposal was created despite the fact that Z. Toro did not support the program. The proposal was then sent to Curriculum Committee, and Z. Toro again expressed her disapproval of the program.

Z. Toro then asked the Council for feedback regarding how to approach the process of developing new programs, in order to avoid these types of issues. She noted that the IPC is responsible for the allocation of resources, and therefore, must be involved in this process. Members then provided the following feedback:

* J. Melnyk reported that the UPBC was never informed of this program proposal.
* D. Dauwalder noted that in the past, the white papers were beginning to resemble full proposals. We should decide whether white papers should continue to be reviewed by the IPC. Z. Toro replied that a white paper with a general description of the resources required to run the program is important to consider before a full proposal is created.
* S. Collins noted that when considering our current environment, we may need to look at programs what are no longer viable in order to fund new programs that may be more appealing to students.
* C. Casamento noted that she has not been involved in any modeling for an aerospace program. She then suggested taking a good look at our current approval process and determine what needs to be revised.
* Multiple members agreed that understanding the resources required before a full proposal is created is important.
* Y. Kirby stated that if a program is submitted for approval with zero cost, it may be helpful to understand how current faculty will be utilized to cover the courses for the new program.
* Z. Toro suggested including guidance from the Dean as part of the proposal development process. F. Latour agreed, and added that the Dean can serve as an intermediary between the faculty and the Provost and President.
* J. Jarrett noted that the Mechanical Engineering program already had an option for an aerospace focus. He added that he believed a market analysis was done by Hanover, and there was a positive recommendation regarding developing this program.
* D. Dauwalder noted that our process was revised so that only full proposals were going to the IPC and UPBC. However, it seems that the IPC would like to receive a concept paper before the full proposal is submitted. Z. Toro agreed.

After the discussion D. Dauwalder and Z. Toro agreed to examine the current program approval process and come back to the IPC with some suggestions for improvement at a future meeting.

**Program Cost Model Developed by Academic Affairs (Cont.)**At the last meeting, Z. Toro asked J. Melnyk to bring the program cost model developed by Academic Affairs before the UPBC for discussion. J. Melnyk then reported on the UPBC’s discussion. Over the course of two separate meetings, the UPBC ultimately determined that this model seems to be directed at satisfying a requirement for the BOR; however, it was challenging to understand how CCSU would use this model moving forward. The UPBC offered the following suggestions:

* Look at how data relates to faculty lines based on the costs presented
* Identify and define any qualitative data obtained from department chairs
* The model does not seem to look at retention or revenue
* Look first at what questions we want to answer, and what we want to do with the data, before finalizing a cost model

The UPBC meet again to discuss the model before offering any official recommendations.

Z. Toro then stated that based on this model, we can identify programs that are very costly to offer. However, most of these programs (i.e.: Nursing and DNAP) have a direct impact on the economic development of the state and the world, and they are distinguishing programs for CCSU. Z. Toro then asked for feedback regarding how to use this proposed model when it comes to moving forward with decision-making for programs like this. C. Casamento stated that this model can be used as a tool to plan, ask questions and determine where more research needs to take place. In addition, the model can be used to determine options for changing the delivery of certain programs. Several members agreed that this model is a starting point; however, we need to determine the full process for evaluation of our programs. J. Melnyk suggested looking at ways to automate this model. G. Claffey will work with C. Casamento and D. Dauwalder to develop an automation tool for this model.

Z. Toro stated that we will not use this model as a tool just to cut programs. Moving forward, we will continue to explore various ways to use this model.

A brief discussion occurred regarding the retention of our Nursing program students. Z. Toro asked K. Peckham and D. Dauwalder to have a discussion with the Dean regarding what can be done with the program as it stands now, as well as next steps for the possible expansion of the program.

**Response to the Changing Landscape of Higher Education (Cont.)**

Z. Toro asked members for feedback regarding the main issues that should be addressed regarding the changing landscape of higher education. F. Latour replied that faculty are concerned with what will be done regarding online education once students return to campus. Z. Toro added that we need to think about ways to ensure that we are providing quality online courses.

Z. Toro concluded the meeting, noting that we will discuss the following items at the next scheduled meeting:

1. Response to the changing landscape of higher education (cont.)
2. Process for considering concept papers for new academic programs