



## Budget Council Meeting

March 28, 2012

Lee Campus Taeni Hall Room S-119

2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

*Minutes*

Attendees Present: Stephanie “Sam” McCartney King, Gina Doeble, Dr. Pat Land, Dr. Robert R. Jones, Suzanne Buntic, Dr. Russell Watjen, Ron Dente

Attendees Absent: Erin Harrel, Steven R. Nice, Crystal Perez, Tobias Discenza

Start Time: 2:00 p.m.

### I. Update on Operating Budget

Gina Doeble opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. She referred to the handout for Fund 10, Operating Budget of the proposed budget for FY 2012-13. She explained the proposed budget breakdown by sources of funds, uses of funds, expenditures and transfers as well as the additional new budget requests that have been received as provided in the agenda packet. She indicated that the proposed budget does not reflect a tuition increase and is based on a 5% enrollment decrease from last year. She explained the anticipated reduction of adjuncts in the budget saying that we anticipate hiring new faculty positions from the courses that are currently being taught by adjuncts.

She brought to the attention of the Budget Council members the job that they have ahead of them as it relates to the total budget gap of -\$656,982 emphasizing the decision making required to recommend a balanced budget to the Board of Trustees.

She responded to some ideas that were brought up at the last meeting:

- Addressing the 4-day work week: She indicated that she discussed this matter with the Interim President Goodlette and the Board Chair stating that they did not feel they had sufficient time to implement the 4-day work week for this summer. They indicated that they will need to talk more about this and review the numbers.
- Management of class sizes with less than 12 students: This matter has been discussed with Dr. Harrel, VP of Academic Affairs. Dr. Harrel will discuss



enforcement with the Deans. Allowing classes to be run with less than 12 students is costly to the College.

## II. Review of New Budget Requests

Gina Doeble reviewed the new budget requests and the dollar amounts consisting of new positions, mandatory increases, new initiatives and new public safety positions. She commented that Toby did a nice job of summarizing the requests by type, program and campus as provided in the agenda packet. She mentioned that the majority of the requests were for new positions.

She clarified that the renovation, furniture & equipment and technology requests are dollars that are separate from the operating budget stating that they are in support of the College as an institution as a whole. She indicated that these types of requests are reviewed by her, Steve Nice, Director of Facilities, the College President and executives and stated that these dollars lapse over from last year.

She indicated that the Financial Services Office will do an analysis of the mandatory increases and make recommendations to the Budget Council for those types of requests.

She indicated that the Budget Council will have hearings from the requestors for new initiatives, new position requests and reclassification requests. She mentioned that she will create a ranking form to be distributed to the Council members for the upcoming hearings asking each member to individually prioritize in rank order each request (see attached).

Since this is the first year that the Budget Council has been initiated, Gina provided the members with a better understanding of the overall types of 1st priority requests to expect in the College budget as being related to SACS, Student Services Support, Technology and Safety/Security types of request. She went into detail about the complexity of why there are a few higher dollar technology requests and the need for the College to stay current mentioning the 20 year old phone system, the CRM manager software system for student services that piggy backs onto the current Banner system and virtual technology “on the cloud” with everyone eventually logging direct to the server verses the refresh program of having to purchase PCs on a regular basis and explained the long term cost savings and benefits to the students. Gina responded to an inquiry that Technology Services will address the needs of the entire College verses the departmental needs in an effort to balance the College technology requirements. Some funding is allocated to the departments – the rest to the College. Discussion was held.

Gina mentioned that the budget is only good at a point in time; it is a moving target - not a check book, saying that plans change. The projection provided is a planning tool and is our best guess for the future. The goal is to show the Board of Trustees and the College President that our revenue and expenditures are balanced – to present a balanced budget.



### III. Discussion of Budget Hearings

Gina Doeble indicated that the Budget Council members will listen to hearings from the requestors for new initiatives, new position requests and reclassification requests.

#### a) What information should be provided

Gina Doeble and the Budget Council members generated ideas for a list of parameters to be sent to the requestors as a guideline for what type of information they are looking to be addressed by each requestor.

Below is the list of parameters that the Council would like to be addressed:

- 1) How does this request support the Mission of the College?
- 2) How does this request impact the student body of the College?
- 3) Will a cost savings to the College be generated initially and/or in the future (provide timeline if possible)?
- 4) Why this request is a priority and/or impact to College if not funded.

#### b) Should materials be provided prior to meeting

Toby will send the Budget Council members a listing by requestors' name and requests sorted by the appointment time scheduled.

#### c) Proposed schedule

Toby will provide the Budget Council members with the proposed schedule prior to the hearing meetings.

### IV. Open Discussion/Questions

Budget Reduction Ideas:

Ideas received by Suzanne Buntic:

- Offer more online courses. Transition for students is better than offering no class.
- Raise the parking ticket fine. (It was discussed that the College does not have a parking system to enforce tickets. To move forward on this, it was suggested that it be presented to the executive council. The student IDs are not connected to the parking system - the vehicle decal is not associated in any way to the student ID. Students do not get parking decals. The current system is based on good faith only.)
- Build a parking garage and charge an annual fee to faculty and staff.
- Complete an audit analysis of faculty on special contract stipends for course releases.





- Instead of hiring consultants for special project we should use the faculty and staff on board that are trained individuals.
- Stop adding layers of upper management positions.
- Cut back on grounds keeping. (Gina mentioned that we could look into the grounds positions that are all outsourced under contract to make some changes in the level of service. She indicated that we have cut back on the grounds in the past.)
- Charge for the use of our facilities rentals. (Gina stated that she is hesitant to include the revenue from facility rentals to balance the budget because it is an unknown. She would like to turn that over to Judy Pultro in Auxiliary Services to review for next year. Discussion was held.)

Gina Doeble mentioned that these kinds of ideas should be rewarded - suggesting that if a budget idea creates a cost savings to the College, that the person who brought up the idea should get an incentive for the idea. Suzanne Buntic mentioned that it would be a win-win. Sam King indicated that we could advertise and offer an incentive of perhaps \$20 saying that would help get people more involved – a virtual suggestion box.

Gina passed out literature for WEPA, Wireless Everywhere – Print Anywhere as a printing solution for our students which list the value for the students and benefits to the College. WEPA interfaces with the ID/Connect Card. The cost to the College is minimal. They pay for the machines, they provide toner and paper. You can print from other colleges. It cost the students \$.10 per copy – \$.07 to WEPA and \$.03 to the College. The literature provides the on-campus presentations and responses, College costs and revenue generated (attached). The drawback is the additional \$.05 more to print in color. It is recommended that the College commits to one system. If we went entirely to WEPA, we would have to remove the lab printers because they would be printing for free. What the College spends for lab printing would have to be determined as the College pays for the toner, paper and cost and repair of the printers. Suzanne Buntic suggested we discuss with SGA and other students who have used the system. Sam King liked the idea that the students could print from anywhere with a swipe of the card – print and go, wireless everywhere. Dr. Watjen stated that there is no cost to the College. The College pays for the data drops – we get a return on it – a win/win. Ron Dente asked if we buy or lease the machines – Gina responded that we lease them. WEPA offers ways for the College to advertise by using our logo, etc. We could show some savings there. Discussion was held.

Gina mentioned the administrative printing pilot of the Biz Hub Solution as a way of reducing the number of printers in a department. She mentioned that could be a cultural change where employees have to get up and maybe walk down the hall for their printing job. There is a 30-40% cut on administrative printing solutions – saying that the President was in support of that. She said we would have to sell it. Suzanne Buntic mentioned to have a trial on the Lee campus in the spring and a contingency

plan. Gina Doeble indicated that we could develop a plan and phase it in – some of these machines are already here. Discussion was held.

In order to address the budget gap of -\$656,982, Gina made some more cost cutting suggestions of suspending or reducing the employees 403B plan, using laps dollars from this year to help pay for next year's requests and/or sharing dollars or reducing the employee tuition reimbursement plan. Dr. Watjen mentioned that could be a morale issue and others agreed. It was suggested to implement the lapsed dollars to roll over to July 1 for big purchases at this time.

Meeting ended at 3:45 p.m.

Budget Council  
Hearings for FY 2012-13  
April 2 & 3, 2012 in I-122 (Lee Campus)  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Presenter's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Request Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Budget Council Member: \_\_\_\_\_

1<sup>st</sup> Priority: \_\_\_\_\_ (SACS; Student Services Support, Technology, Safety/Security)

2<sup>nd</sup> Priority: \_\_\_\_\_

3<sup>rd</sup> Priority: \_\_\_\_\_

Not Recommended: \_\_\_\_\_

1. How does this request support the Mission of the College?
2. How does this request impact the student body of the College?
3. Will a cost savings to the College be generated initially and/or in the future (provide timeline if possible)?
4. Why this request is a priority and/or impact to College if not funded?

Notes/Comments:

# WEPA

Wireless Everywhere. Print Anywhere.

## Value Added for Students:

- Higher Quality Printing
- New Wireless Printing Added – Students can print from any device (laptop, iPad, iPhone, etc.) to any kiosk on campus
- Additional printing locations campus-wide. Kiosks can now be placed in high traffic student areas across campus
- 24 hour user support for students provided by WEPA
- Connect Card payment – elimination of multiple cards to carry
- Students can print from home and pick up on campus at ANY kiosk
- Advertisement/Coupon printing for FREE
- Lab fees (if applicable), can be placed on a student's Connect Card for an allotted amount of printing per semester.

## Benefits to College:

- No cost to College to install (except data drops)
- Current solution (ITC) has had a long standing history of poor customer service and poor support. Also, there is no integration with the Connect Card available. Parts needed must come from Canada.
- Hardware/Software support provided by WEPA
- No more paper/toner/support costs to College for pay for print program
  - Existing Pay for Print Locations:
    - 2012 YTD - \$29,425.57
    - 2011 - \$32,775.43
  - ***Unknown Student Free Printing Areas (Labs/Classrooms/Student Services): Many of these areas have printers located in them where students can print unrestricted. In some cases, a lab fee is assessed to the student which a department uses to cover the costs of paper/toner. However, there is currently no mechanism to track the amount of printing. In many cases students have figured out where to print free – the cost is then absorbed 100% by the College.***
- Revenue generation
  - Advertising – Auxiliary would work with WEPA regarding potential advertisers on the kiosks. A percentage of cost to advertise would come back to the College
  - Up charge on cost per print (currently in negotiation with WEPA, hoping for .07 per B&W). College to increase to .10 per B&W. (we are currently at .05 for B&W)

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>B&amp;W</b>	<b>Color</b>
FGCU	.09	.28



<i>Florida Keys Community College</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.65</i>
<i>Florida State College</i>	<i>.10</i>	
<i>State College of Florida</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.15</i>
<i>Broward Community College</i>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.50</i>
<i>College of Central Florida</i>	<i>.10</i>	
<i>Chipola College</i>	<i>.10</i>	
<i>Daytona State College</i>	<i>.10</i>	

**On-Campus Presentations:**

- **November 15<sup>th</sup>** - WEPA provided a demonstration to Enterprise Applications, Instructional Technology and Auxiliary Services. Purpose was to identify whether WEPA could be a workable solution for the College from a technology standpoint and a Connect Card integration standpoint.
- **February 15<sup>th</sup>** – WEPA provided expanded demonstration to potential stakeholders. Representatives from academics, administrative services, student services and the library were invited, as well as additional representative of instructional technology. Of those who attended, the feedback was extremely positive and encouraged us moving forward.
- **March 21<sup>st</sup>** – WEPA returned to campus for a demonstration specifically for the **Dean’s Council**. Again, feedback was extremely positive and we were encouraged to move forward. The increase in cost to the student was discussed and the increase immediately to .10 per B&W copy was supported. One concern was for students with financial difficulties, although no current solution is provided under the existing pay for print. However, will the integration to the Connect Card; there are workable solutions that the College could decide to initiate.

Following the Dean’s Council meeting, WEPA set up a demo area in the lobby of the S-Building to meet and talk with students. Overwhelmingly the student feedback was extremely positive. When we shared the increase in cost to the student for printing, all we talked with stated they had no problem with the increase due to the expanded services. Students were thrilled to hear about the wireless printing opportunities provided by WEPA as well as the addition of kiosks around campus. Students did not like to have to go to the library every time they needed to print...especially if their class was on the opposite end of campus.

**College Costs (recommended):**

- Wrapping of WEPA machines to Edison State College brand (\$350 per kiosk)
- Generic WEPA cards – for community patrons...these would be purchased annually by Auxiliary Services and re-sold, so revenue will offset expense.



PRINT HERE



EDISON STATE COLLEGE



INSTITUTION:		JOB NUMBER:	
ITEM#		PROOF 1:	
REV. DESC.			
KIOSK:	Standard	CORNER RADIUS	
COLOR(S):	CMYK	ARTIST	MB
		DATE:	
<b>PROOF APPROVAL</b> PLEASE PROOFREAD CAREFULLY. MARK ANY CHANGES ON PROOF. <input type="checkbox"/> OK AS IS <input type="checkbox"/> REPROOF W/ CHANGES <b>APPROVED BY:</b>			
NOTE: COLOR PROOF IS APPROXIMATE. ACTUAL PRINTED INK COLORS MATCHED TO SPECIFIED PMS COLOR STANDARD. * SIGNED PROOF INDICATES ACCEPTANCE OF KIOSK WRAP AND DESIGN			