

Budget and Staff Allocation Committee Final Report: Academic Year 2006/07

Committee Membership: A. Brady (student); B. Cappella (SOE); M. Ceprano (SOE); S. Gellin (SOP); P. Ghee (Professional Staff); S. Goodman (SNSS); W. Grieshofer (Professional Staff); A. Hotchkiss (SOP); J. Kaye (SAH); G. Marinaccio (Library); A. Nicholls (SNSS); R. Schenk (Administrative liaison); T. Schmidt—Chair.

1. BSAC met once during the fall semester with vice president Kardonsky to review and discuss the College's state budget allocation and "Investment's in the Future." A report was given in the Senate which made the following suggestions:
 - The Budget Priorities Task Force should be included in the "weeding out" process when evaluating investments, otherwise their input is meaningless. In the last case, the amount of funds exceeded requests, so there was no need for substantive debate on the proposed investments.
 - Proposed "investments" should require a more rigorous cost-benefit analysis, with benefits focused on factors that influence our state budget allocation (enrollment, research, etc.).
 2. BSAC evaluated a proposal to raise the student Health Fee by \$40/semester.
 - a) A motion was made and passed in the Senate in support of the fee increase.
 - b) A second motion was made (and passed) to have the administration or its designate:
 - provide an assessment of the fee increase one-year from its inception, including the impact on services and financial impact on students;
 - investigate the possibility of indexing the fee to an appropriate price index;
 - investigate alternative sources of funding, specifically insurance reimbursement; and,
 - perform a survey of student needs to determine appropriate hours of operation, including weekends, and additional services.
 3. BSAC reviewed its charge for possible changes. The committee agreed that it is both encompassing and concise, so no changes are recommended.
 4. Report on meeting with the dean of Enrollment Management.
 - Tuition comprises about 70% of state budget allocation, so enrollments are crucial to BSC's future.
- Issues addressed:
- a. How are enrollment targets set?
 - BSC has a MOU with SUNY. VPC derives targets by category (freshmen and transfers), then negotiates with SUNY.

- SUNY reviews targets against system objectives and state higher education allocations – targets are adjusted accordingly. BSC’s F07 projected target was cut from the F06 actual of 1495 to 1411 for freshmen (most coming from STARS reduction), and transfers were slightly reduced. The SUNY approved targets reduced our projected targets by roughly 40 new undergraduate students and 10 new graduate students.
- Enrollment Management (EM) still believes we can achieve the projected targets and hopes to close freshman admissions by 8/1. Helps create a new perception in the market, that BSC is selective—long term view.
- The main argument for exceeding targets is to generate more tuition revenue—short term view.

b. The decline in Erie County HS graduates.

- Erie and Niagara counties are BSC’s largest markets, and with a declining population, graduation rates are projected to decline by 18% from 2009—2014.
- Based on this and other enrollment issues, EM has reduced the 2005-06 5-year projected targets by updating the MOU this past January. F08 is 11,327, and F2011 is 11,420.
- To hit these targets with the decline in Erie & Niagara counties, we will need to increase recruitment in other markets. Targeting Canada and downstate.

However, both have issues:

- Canada: Significant cost differential in tuition of \$13,000/year. We do have “Canadian incentive grants” of \$5,000 / year per student but the program ends with the Fall 2007 entry cohort. We also haven’t marketed in Canada either.
- Downstate: Anyone who lives more than 35 miles outside of BSC is required to live in a dorm. Dorms are at capacity now. If we intend to rely on external markets to offset the drop in Erie & Niagara counties, we will need more dorm space. **Conversion of Cassety helps alleviate the current problem, not the medium and long term problem.**

c. MOU and improved profile.

- SUNY’s MOU requires BSC to improve its student profile. HS students are put into five categories based on academic performance (SAT, HS avg., etc.), G1 being the best, and G5 the worst. The MOU has eliminated accepting students from the G5 category (about 4.2% currently) and reducing the G4 category (from 27.3% to 20.0%). BSC will increase percentage in the other 3 categories.
- There is a possible conflict with this change. BSC currently has an “automatic admit” policy if one has either an 85 HS average or is in the top quartile of the class. This could include G5 profiles. Do we need to change this policy?

d. EM needs a new marketing and communication plan.

- Currently entire marketing budget is in College Relations (CR). Both good and bad: creates economies of scale (more efficient to have it all in

one place); but final decisions are driven by CR. Need more collaboration.

- With one budget, there is also a built-in conflict between marketing campaign (to meet short term enrollment goals) vs. image campaign (influence is long term).
- Suggestions: 1) Dean of EM should be part of final decision-making process; 2) identify a specific amount for EM marketing.

e. Other issues:

- Need a comprehensive Distance Education plan. We are losing out on this market (grad and non-traditional). Focus has been on courses, not programs.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted P. Schmidt, Chair
May 2007