

---

## **XIV. Expenditures: Administrative Sub-Functions**

**Nationally, colleges and universities are increasing expenditures on such administrative functions as computing technology and enrollment management, while trying to control expenditures on energy and facilities maintenance. Examination of CUNY's administrative sub-functions illuminates the differences in operations between the many diverse campuses within the system, as well as some significant differences in the way campuses allocate their administrative resources.**

### **Key Findings**

- Many CUNY campuses cite technology as a strategic priority; however, there is significant variation in the funds dedicated to technology across campuses, suggesting that broad differences in the degree to which technology has been integrated into academic and administrative functions across the campuses.
- The resources dedicated to enrollment management at the campuses seem somewhat high, given the centralized admissions and financial aid functions that support the university.
- CUNY has both traditional, multi-building campuses, as well as colleges with a few buildings located in busy urban areas. As such, spending on operations and maintenance is closely tied to the type of facility each college runs. Campus location and layout are also the most important drivers of security expenditures; in some places campus culture may also play an important role in a college's allocation for security.

**Many CUNY campuses cite technology as a strategic priority; however, there is variation in the funds dedicated to technology across campuses (see Table 26).**

**Table 26  
1997 Computing Costs**

| Institution      | Rank | Computing as a Percentage of Total Expenditures | Computing Costs (in thousands) |
|------------------|------|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>Senior</b>    |      |   |                                |
| Brooklyn         | 1    | 4.3%  | \$ 4,575                       |
| Lehman           | 2    | 3.1%  | \$ 2,055                       |
| Baruch           | 3    | 3.1%  | \$ 3,240                       |
| Queens           | 4    | 2.5%  | \$ 2,888                       |
| NYCTC            | 5    | 2.2%  | \$ 1,868                       |
| COSI             | 6    | 2.2%  | \$ 1,552                       |
| York             | 7    | 2.1%  | \$ 874                         |
| John Jay         | 8    | 1.8%  | \$ 1,092                       |
| Medgar Evers     | 9    | 1.6%  | \$ 651                         |
| City             | 10   | 1.2%  | \$ 1,620                       |
| Hunter           | 11   | 0.8%  | \$ 986                         |
| <b>Community</b> |      |   |                                |
| LGCC             | 1    | 3.1%  | \$ 2,438                       |
| BMCC             | 2    | 2.4%  | \$ 1,738                       |
| Hostos           | 3    | 2.4%  | \$ 857                         |
| Bronx            | 4    | 2.3%  | \$ 1,295                       |
| QBCC             | 5    | 1.3%  | \$ 674                         |
| KBCC             | 6    | 1.2%  | \$ 749                         |

- Most of the senior colleges are spending \$1 to 2 million dollars annually on administrative and academic technology. This level of funding has been matched at half of the community colleges.
- Brooklyn has dedicated 4.1% of its total expenditures to computing, far higher than any of its CUNY peers. Hunter's liberal arts focused curriculum may explain the small percentage of total funds dedicated to this area.
- LaGuardia's extremely high proportion of funds dedicated to computing is the result of the president's decision to charge all programs a flat tax which is then reallocated to fund technology priorities across the campus.

Source: CUNY

**Since admissions and financial aid are centralized functions within CUNY, individual college expenditures dedicated to enrollment management seem somewhat high (see Table 27).**

**Table 27**  
**1997 Enrollment Management Costs**

| Institution      | Rank | Enrollment as a Percentage of Total Operating Expenditures | Enrollment Expenditures (in thousands) |
|------------------|------|--|--|
| <b>Senior</b>    |      |  |  |
| York             | 1    | 3.2%   | \$ 1,325                               |
| John Jay         | 2    | 3.2%   | \$ 1,986                               |
| Medgar Evers     | 3    | 2.9%   | \$ 1,222                               |
| Brooklyn         | 4    | 2.3%   | \$ 2,394                               |
| Lehman           | 5    | 2.3%   | \$ 1,520                               |
| COSI             | 6    | 2.2%   | \$ 1,543                               |
| NYCTC            | 7    | 2.2%   | \$ 1,871                               |
| Queens           | 8    | 2.1%   | \$ 2,378                               |
| Baruch           | 9    | 1.9%   | \$ 2,025                               |
| Hunter           | 10   | 1.8%   | \$ 2,270                               |
| City             | 11   | 1.7%   | \$ 2,264                               |
| <b>Community</b> |      |  |  |
| LGCC             | 1    | 3.5%   | \$ 2,793                               |
| QBCC             | 2    | 3.5%   | \$ 1,892                               |
| BMCC             | 3    | 3.2%   | \$ 2,347                               |
| Hostos           | 4    | 2.8%   | \$ 1,034                               |
| KBCC             | 5    | 2.5%   | \$ 1,537                               |
| Bronx            | 6    | 2.4%   | \$ 1,398                               |

Source: CUNY

Campuses are spending more on average in enrollment management than in technology.

There are a few possible explanations:

- Colleges can increase their marginal funding by enrolling more students.
- A high percentage of CUNY students require financial aid and the student aid counseling is completed by colleges.
- The registrar function is campus based; this requires dedicated resources.

Given the significant resources dedicated to these functions in the campuses, CUNY should constantly monitor both the cost and enrollment performance indicators of centralized services.

\* Enrollment Management includes: Admissions, Registrar, Student Aid, Academic Counseling and Student Activities.

**CUNY has both traditional, multi-building campuses, as well as colleges with a few buildings located in busy urban areas. As such, energy expenditures are directly tied to the type of facility each college runs (see Table 28).**

*Table 28*  
**1997 Energy Costs**

| Institution      | Rank | Energy as a Percentage of Total Expenditures | Energy Expenditures (in thousands) |
|------------------|------|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Senior</b>    |      |  |                                    |
| COSI             | 1    | 2.9%   | \$ 2,084                           |
| Lehman           | 2    | 2.9%   | \$ 1,919                           |
| York             | 3    | 2.8%   | \$ 1,139                           |
| City             | 4    | 2.7%   | \$ 3,704                           |
| Hunter           | 5    | 2.5%   | \$ 3,285                           |
| Queens           | 6    | 2.4%   | \$ 2,810                           |
| Brooklyn         | 7    | 2.2%   | \$ 2,307                           |
| Baruch           | 8    | 1.3%   | \$ 1,358                           |
| NYCTC            | 9    | 1.2%   | \$ 1,065                           |
| John Jay         | 10   | 1.2%   | \$ 767                             |
| Medgar Evers     | 11   | 0.9%   | \$ 392                             |
| <b>Community</b> |      |  |                                    |
| KBCC             | 1    | 3.9%   | \$ 2,433                           |
| BMCC             | 2    | 3.4%   | \$ 2,475                           |
| Hostos           | 3    | 3.4%   | \$ 1,220                           |
| QBCC             | 4    | 2.8%   | \$ 1,481                           |
| Bronx            | 5    | 2.6%   | \$ 1,497                           |
| LGCC             | 6    | 1.9%   | \$ 1,545                           |

Source: CUNY

- City, Staten Island, and Kingsborough top the list for energy spending, which is not surprising given their campus layouts.
- The high ranking of BMCC, with relatively consolidated facilities, is less clear.
- Because energy is paid for by a central administration fund and not charged to the colleges, campuses have little incentive to monitor or reduce energy costs.

**Campus location and layout are the most important drivers of security expenditures; in some places campus culture may also play an important role in a college's allocation for this function (see Table 29).**

**Table 29  
1997 Security Costs**

| Insitution       | Rank | Security as a Percentage of Total Expenditures | Security Expenditures (in thousands) |
|------------------|------|--|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Senior</b>    |      |  |                                      |
| York             | 1    | 3.6%   | \$ 1,456                             |
| COSI             | 2    | 2.9%   | \$ 2,086                             |
| Lehman           | 3    | 2.4%   | \$ 1,606                             |
| Brooklyn         | 5    | 2.3%   | \$ 2,426                             |
| Baruch           | 8    | 2.0%   | \$ 2,092                             |
| City             | 4    | 1.9%   | \$ 2,587                             |
| Hunter           | 6    | 1.9%   | \$ 2,476                             |
| NYCTC            | 7    | 1.7%   | \$ 1,508                             |
| Medgar Evers     | 9    | 1.6%   | \$ 677                               |
| Queens           | 10   | 1.4%   | \$ 1,671                             |
| John Jay         | 11   | 1.4%   | \$ 890                               |
| <b>Community</b> |      |  |                                      |
| Hostos           | 1    | 4.8%   | \$ 1,759                             |
| KBCC             | 3    | 2.8%   | \$ 1,748                             |
| Bronx            | 2    | 2.7%   | \$ 1,570                             |
| BMCC             | 5    | 2.1%   | \$ 1,553                             |
| LGCC             | 4    | 1.9%   | \$ 1,533                             |
| QBCC             | 6    | 1.4%   | \$ 768                               |

- York, COSI, Hostos and Bronx have the largest proportion of expenditures dedicated to security -- though five of the senior colleges are dedicating over \$2 million per year.
- All campuses provide or contract for security independently; most is personnel-intensive, with little technology being used to automate this function.

Source: CUNY

**There are large variations in maintenance spending—with some colleges running as high as 12.8% of total expenditures while other spend as little as 3% (see Table 30).**

**Table 30  
1997 Maintenance Costs**

| Institution      | Rank | Maintenance as a Percentage of Total Expenditures | Maintenance Expenditures (in thousands) |
|------------------|------|---|---|
| <b>Senior</b>    |      |   |   |
| COSI             | 1    | 13.4%   | \$ 9,507                                |
| York             | 2    | 12.6%   | \$ 5,153                                |
| Hunter           | 3    | 10.3%   | \$ 13,321                               |
| Lehman           | 4    | 10.2%   | \$ 6,876                                |
| Queens           | 5    | 8.8%  | \$ 10,164                               |
| Brooklyn         | 6    | 8.3%  | \$ 8,831                                |
| Medgar Evers     | 7    | 7.5%  | \$ 3,107                                |
| John Jay         | 8    | 6.8%  | \$ 4,219                                |
| City             | 9    | 6.7%  | \$ 9,177                                |
| Baruch           | 10   | 5.0%  | \$ 5,158                                |
| NYCTC            | 11   | 4.4%  | \$ 3,840                                |
| <b>Community</b> |      |   |   |
| KBCC             | 1    | 12.3%   | \$ 7,676                                |
| BMCC             | 2    | 11.2%   | \$ 8,130                                |
| Hostos           | 3    | 10.5%   | \$ 3,821                                |
| Bronx            | 4    | 8.9%  | \$ 5,096                                |
| QBCC             | 5    | 8.3%  | \$ 4,465                                |
| LGCC             | 6    | 5.0%  | \$ 3,932                                |

Source: CUNY

- Like energy and security, maintenance spending is directly tied to the type of campus, as well as its age.
- These amounts also reflect individual college decisions in any given year on how much of their operating budget to allocate to deferred maintenance.
- In general, there seems to be a great deal of variation between campuses regarding the amount of funds being dedicated to deferred maintenance. Anecdotal evidence suggests that inadequate funding of this area has resulted in substantial capital expenditures dedicated to repair and replacement of older buildings that have not been properly maintained.