

President's Budget Advisory Group

November 22, 2016 - 8:30 AM

Minutes

Present:

President Stanley

Priorities and Planning Council

Rick Back

Dean Crawford

Jim Nichols

Dan Tryon

Faculty Assembly

Lisa Glidden

Union Representatives

UUP: Lori Nash

CSEA: Casey Walpole

Department Chairs

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences:

James Mackenzie

David Andrews

School of Communication, Media and the Arts:

Cynthia Clabough

School of Education:

Marcia Burrell

School of Business:

John MacDonald

Vice Presidents

Nick Lyons

Mary Canale

Walter Roettger

Deans

Adrienne McCormick

Jill Pippin

Julie Pretzat-Merchant

Administrative Appointment

Mitch Fields
Dan Griffin
Jerri Howland
Rick Kolenda
Mark Slayton
Mike Flaherty

Staff to the Committee

Vicki Furlong
Howard Gordon
Kristi Eck
Wayne Westervelt
Mehran Nojan
Rameen Mohammadi

Excused: Emily Nassir, Pam Caraccioli, Sean Moriarty, Frank Byrne, Jerald Woolfolk, Brad Korbemeyer, Pam Michel, Mike Ameigh, Pat Clark

The Digital Campus – Technology for an Enhanced Tomorrow:

Sean Moriarty presented on the IT Strategic Plan.

The IT Strategic Plan was started in January 2015. The IT Strategic Plan is aligned with the Tomorrow Plan – targeted to enhance budget and technology lifecycle plans. An IT steering committee was created to oversee the implementation of the strategic plan and ensure alignment with strategic goal.

Among the Goals – to create and implement a flexible multi-year IT budget to upgrade and improve campus infrastructure and address lifecycle replacement. Network, core router and firewall equipment upgrades are in progress now. We wanted a multi-year plan to upgrade equipment, maintain and purchase new. CTS funding comes from: a) a state line that handles some equipment and staff lines; b) Technology fee helps maintain and buy equipment but covers less than half of what the costs are, c) a RESNET fee helps pay internet bandwidth and upgrades in residence halls; d) telephone fees; and e) DIFR pays for all of their costs and some of the CTS staff. Technology costs - \$7 – \$8 million a year. Nick and Sean meet twice a month to review budget, talk about needs and upcoming costs.

Technology is seen as an enabler at Oswego. For Oswego to be a digital campus this is the investment we need to make. We can't grow without maintaining what we have. This is the future.

Special projects are funded by central administration. Nick: We take money from administrative fees and overhead from IFR accounts, this is about \$5m a year. This comes back to the campus and we don't lose it to SUNY. DIFR pays for upgrades in residence halls. Many campuses outsource these services but we have found it better to keep in house. Some of Sean's staff are on the DIFR budget too. About 6 years ago, there was a \$16 million upgrade to residence halls. Capital plans also allocate money to projects.

Campus Concept Committee also helps plan how new buildings will be equipped with technology. Our internet bandwidth compares favorably to other schools. We are lucky to have multiple internet providers, as other schools do not have this option. By using the bandwidth for the College in the day and the residences at night, costs are contained for students as we can monitor the service. Students come to campus with many devices but they have a good experience.

Another goal is to develop and implement technology lifecycle replacement plans for faculty and staff equipment in the labs, offices and classrooms to support their teaching, research and creative activities. Faculty PC equipment is better than it has been in the past, and we are better at getting the upgrades done in a more timely fashion. This includes new equipment for VAPs - VAPs who have been here 3 years or more are now scheduled to receive a new PC. There are 3 types of classrooms: no technology; analog equipment (which we are phasing out) and digital. CTS supports lab spaces. Coming up with sustainable lab plans is a project we are working with departments on and should be in the department's long term planning thoughts.

The goal is also to develop a campus-wide strategy for general and departmental lab spaces that supports learning and research objectives and complements the technology required in the programs. We are investing in computer labs on campus. Departments need to help ITC and CTS decide what process best supports their students: maintain computer labs or maintain equipment that the students bring? ex: Shineman labs and Tyler upgrades.

Are we better off investing in the cloud and maintaining students' equipment/PCs than maintaining labs? We realize that we can't have a one size fits all approach to labs or no labs because some disciplines need the labs to support specialized software, special equipment and support for equality and inclusion. We must continue to have conversations with the programs to make sure we provide what is required. Course fees help cover the extra equipment software some courses need. Reminder: some software can only be installed on college owned computers.

CTS has purchased a new backup system for disaster recovery. Have systems on 2 sites on campus. May move one of the systems to an off campus site such as the Metro Center. Another possibility is that this could be an example of how one SUNY campus helps another by hosting each other's disaster recovery systems. SUNY has been working on data centers and moving into the cloud. We have internet with Time Warner and Verizon which helps protect us. Cynthia: Do you see SUNY trying to help campuses buy technology and

supplies at a cheaper rate? ex: ink for Epson printer. Will we go back to collective buying? The SUNY CIO group has a contract committee and has been working on new contracts for SUNY. An example is the Adobe cloud and Lynda.com. Oswego saved \$18k by going to SUNY contract for Adobe cloud. The SUBOA group is working at a new purchasing system which will help with buying commodity items such as ink for printers. It is being piloted in Western New York right now.

SUNY doesn't have a cache of money to support campuses. They use the money they have to support the staff they have. SUNY has started its own Foundation. SUNY as a consortium can have a lot of power. ex: SUBOA, CIO group, etc.

Campaign/Endowment Report

Mary Canale and Mark Slayton presented an update on the success of the campaign, *With Passion and Purpose*, and the impact it had on campus, including the growth of the endowment.

They reviewed the major activities the donors supported, which included unrestricted gifts (7.6%), current use – restricted gifts (22.3%), endowment gifts (40.0%) and future bequests to SUNY Oswego (30.1%). In total, the campaign raised nearly \$43.5 million.

Unrestricted gifts allow the campus the opportunity to direct the funds where the need is greatest. The majority of these funds were reinvested back into engaging donors and supporting student activities, such as programs such as Alumni in Residence (AIR), Alumni Sharing Knowledge (ASK) or the annual NY City Career Connections event.

Current Use – Restricted gifts help support over 200 campus department and program funds, as well as non-endowed scholarship dollars given to areas such as the Possibility Scholars program.

Endowed gifts helped create over 75 new donor endowed funds, primarily student scholarships. This brings the number of donor endowed funds managed by the Foundation to 250 and the overall endowment for Oswego to now over \$30.8 million, a nearly 168% increase since the beginning of the campaign.

The endowment is managed by the Foundation Board of Directors, including its Investment Committee, with daily oversight by Mark. Our investment results have been industry leading for over a decade. Our endowment doesn't "keep the lights on" like many other colleges, our endowment supports our students. Five years ago we paid out \$375,000 per year. This year will be over \$1 million.

We use the Commonfund as our asset custodian, but our Investment Committee and Board select the assets and set the asset allocation strategy. We have an all volunteer Board. Last

year we reviewed our investment managers with an RFP process and decided to stay with the Common Fund.

The Foundation Board has established a spending formula used to determine funding available for each year. This formula focuses on matching spending with long term investment returns, with a goal of spending an overall 5% annually. The spending formula is focused on maintaining a stable, consistent growth in endowment spending.

Future bequests represent commitments donors have made towards gifts in their estate plans. These campaign gifts were discounted to their present value using actuarial methods.

Although the formal named campaign has concluded, the fundraising work never stops. We will continue to raise money for Oswego with the same pace as we have the past 5 years. The success of the campaign and how we manage our endowment enhances our reputation, which then pays dividends through both student and faculty recruitment, which should then yield more exceptional graduates who then go on to incredibly successful careers, hopefully providing enhanced future giving back to Oswego.