

University Budget Committee Meeting November 20, 2013

Present: Rajeev Bansal, Thomas Bontly, Angela Brightly, Elizabeth Jockusch, Min Lin, Nomin Mankhbat, Philip Mannheim, Clare Price, and Mohamed Hussein (Chair).

Invited Guests: Mun Choi, Richard Gray, Jeffrey Seemann and Lysa Teal.

1. The meeting came to order at 2:03 p.m.
2. J. Seemann discussed start-up costs charged to departments. With all the new hires that will be made under Next Generation Connecticut, a lot of money will need to be on the table. It is critical for the university to be able to attract the best faculty. STEM hires are an expensive arena to hire in and there will be a focus on some fraction of senior hires in those areas, including National Academy members. Faculty of this type have very large, \$5-10 million dollar range, start-up packages when costs including renovations, etc. are factored in. Next Generation Connecticut funding will help but this has to be a partnership between the faculty, departments, deans, the Provost's Office, and the Office of the Vice President for Research. The university will be stretched to find all the funding needed but everyone needs to be able to bring pieces to the partnership. R. Gray stated the State has been enormously generous to the university. J. Seemann stated that it is important to understand that start-up funding should never be seen as a forever deal. Rather, it is an initial investment in a new faculty member. The university wants to make a sufficient investment to get a return on that investment. P. Mannheim asked if a firewall should be created around the indirect costs. J. Seemann responded that it is his responsibility to redeploy indirect costs in ways that will get a significant return on investment. We first want to maximize the indirect cost return (ICR) to the front lines of research growth, e.g. new equipment, graduate student funding, etc. It is best not to lock down indirect costs in budget areas where it cannot be used, e.g. payroll for staff. The goal is to make indirect costs as usable as possible.

J. Seemann stated that the university wants to develop an even higher quality research operation. It currently has an ICR return model of 10-10-10 to faculty, departments, and schools/colleges. The first and best place to give IDC is to the faculty member who knew how to get it to begin with. Under the current fiscal structure the other 70% is substantially tied down in long term salary costs, and the OVPR only as a discretionary pool of approximately 10%. J. Seemann is working with R. Gray to determine how to get more of the IDC more directly into research investments. P. Mannheim stated that the formula is misleading because a large portion of the Dean and Department portions are eaten up in things such as start up costs that would previously have been funded directly by the research foundation. ~~that 10-10-10 is not really true because it really allows the Provost to not return 20% to the departments while retaining it in his own budget.~~ P. Mannheim stated his admiration for M. Choi, R. Gray, and L. Teal for expanding the research operation during a time of fiscal shortage. M. Hussein inquired with federal funding becoming smaller, is the university looking at foundations and philanthropic institutions to make up the differences. J. Seemann responded that the federal sources are getting tighter and are going to get more so every day. More institutions are competing for dollars that are not growing. The Research Office's responsibility is to help faculty make connections to sources of funding that they are not familiar with. R. Bansal asked how the funding sources for UConn compare to its aspirant institutions. J. Seemann responded that the university does not have as many big grants or big industry commitments or large philanthropic commitments as the institutions that it aspires to. UConn needs to create more collaboration between faculty from diverse disciplines. P. Mannheim stated that most federal research funding is not multidisciplinary. ~~stated his belief that most funding is not multidisciplinary.~~ J. Seemann replied that pursuing multidiscipline funding does not mean we will stop pursuing single disciplinary funding. More funding is becoming available in multi-disciplinary

problem areas, we need to have people who can come together and take on that kind of research.

3. M. Choi reported on the Vision Committee for the Technology Park that included faculty members and industry partners. The committee reviewed areas that the university needs to make investments in such as: advanced manufacturing, pharmaceutical sciences, and systems technology. Based on this, the university has identified areas in which small businesses will need access to advance instrumentation. The committee solicited input from department heads on who they already have industry partnerships with. There are partnerships that have already been formed and that have provided equipment to the university. It is imperative that the university grows the Technology Park correctly to ensure future buy-in from the State. The university is being evaluated on industry partnerships. The technology Park has enough space for ten buildings, the first building is paid for entirely with State funding.
4. R. Gray reported that for fiscal year 2015 the university received a \$15 million dollar addition to the block grant to help with the operating side of Next Generation Connecticut. R. Gray cautioned that just because the funding is now in the budget, that does not mean it will be next year or will not be subject to rescission in future years. There is a large capital expenditure program included as part of Next Gen. UConn's contribution to this effort is the uncommitted monies from the current UConn 2000 program. Every year in June the Board of Trustees (BoT) approves a proposed capital budget, the Governor then takes a positive or negative action.

R. Gray stated that a master plan for infrastructure/physical /deferred maintenance is underway. The university's Chief Architect, Laura Cruickshank, has a firm that will conduct the study and present a plan. A good thing about UConn 2000 money is that there is some flexibility in the use of the funds with BoT approval. The university also has the ability to issue revenue bonds capped at \$65 million dollars. R. Gray stated that the university will be asking for that cap to be lifted so that dormitories and other revenue generating activities can move forward. R. Gray has already been in contact with the Office of Policy and Management and the Treasurer's Office and they appear to be in favor of it. P. Mannheim asked if the university needs to maintain a debt service reserve. R. Gray responded that it does and that the university's reserve is currently at 1.25 above the annual debt service requirement.

5. L. Teal reported on the work study program. In fiscal year 2012, 52% of work study students held positions. For this year, 65% have positions. L. Teal will work with Katrina Spencer and Mona Lucas to get more current numbers on work study positions, loans, and scholarships. She also stated that students may receive a work study award but opt not to take it or they may choose to work off campus. P. Mannheim questioned if the 35% of students who did not take work study positions were because of a lack of funding available in the departments to cover the 25% the department must pay. L. Teal responded that does not appear to be the case. E. Jockusch requested that graduate students be tracked carefully because she believes that they will simply stop applying for work study awards. M. Lin stated that the School of Business always hires work study students first. L. Teal stated that historically the university awards more than it receives in the federal grant.
6. M. Choi reported on the budgets at the regional campuses. He stated that regional campus enrollment fell by 18% and their budgets remained the same. M. Choi reported that starting in fall 2014 the university will be providing funding for faculty lines directly to regional campuses. Regional faculty awards will be made to the regional campus and not the department. The faculty are to meet the needs of the regional campus first, and the department second. With the exception of the Stamford campus, there are no plans to increase the student population at the regional campuses. P. Mannheim asked if moving the West Hartford campus to downtown Hartford was related to growth. M. Choi responded

that the primary reason for the move is to have a presence in Hartford and to close the Greater Hartford campus.

7. M. Choi reported on spousal hires stating that the difficulty is that often the spouse has specialty in an area that is not needed or planned for at the university. Spousal hires are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Steps are being taken to share with finalists information about faculty positions at other local schools/colleges as well as open staff positions. His message to the department heads is to let the Provost's Office know as soon as possible so that funding sources can be found. The deans have also been asked to be proactive in this area. M. Choi pointed out that the university hired 125 tenure track faculty last year. It would be difficult for the university to find the resources even if only a small percentage of those hires included spousal hires. E. Jockusch stated that women in science are far more likely to have a spouse or partner in academics than a man in academics and therefore there may be unintended consequences when attempting to attract female candidates.
8. M. Choi reported that faculty can help increase diversity at the university by sending information about open positions to colleagues across disciplines at other institutions. M. Choi stated that we need to change thinking across the university about what it means to become a diverse university. Upper-level administrators, such as deans and department heads, need to reject search-committee results that do not include a diverse pool. The search committee and department heads are to come up with a proactive plan to contact minority caucuses – a top PhD-granting Hispanic institution for example. The Provost's Office wants to see the plan in advance and every two weeks will monitor the progress that has been made. If departments and committees are not making good progress, then the final steps for hiring will not be approved. When these new requirements are in place, then there will be a larger pool of diverse candidates. Another proposed change is for search committees to continue to serve as a mentorship committee for the new faculty member. M. Choi acknowledged that this will be extra work on the part of search committee members but if the university is committed to recruitment and retention, then those involved should be willing to do this. M. Choi stated that diversity must be looked at across the entire university – just because one department has a diverse faculty, it does not make up for the lack of diversity in another area.
9. M. Choi reported that no final decisions have been made concerning the building plan and status of UConn 2000 projects. There are discussions about which buildings we need to fund for equipment. It is a work in progress and some decisions will be made before the master plan is complete. T. Bontly inquired about the fate of Monteith. L. Teal responded that the university needs space so it will probably be renovated. Current thinking is that it may be able to be used as swing space to accommodate the influx of new faculty but it will cost approximately \$15 million to renovate. R. Bansal asked why there is a shortage of space on campus when there are so many new buildings. L. Teal responded that there has been an increase of the number of people on campus. L. Teal stated that cost to renovate the Torrey Life Science building is shocking and a plan to address issues in Gant and Torrey is part of the Next Generation planning.
10. M. Hussein stated that the next meeting of the University Budget Committee will be held at 2:00 p.m. on December 11th in the Hall Building, room 123. Tom Callahan is the invited guest. K. Spencer will also be in attendance.
11. The meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.