University Senate Budget Committee
Minutes
February 12, 1998

Attendance: Yezdi Bhada (for Sidney Harris), David Boykin, Tom Clark, Tim Crimmins, John de Castro, Bill Decatur, Sherry Gaines, Janice Griffith, Ramona Hasan, Charlene Hurt, Mark Jones (for Reid Christenberry), Amy Lederberg, Charles Marvin, Fred Massey, Al McWilliams, Jerry Rackliffe, Carolyn Robison, Paula Stephan, Edgar Torbert, Bill Waugh.


The meeting was called to order at 1:00 by the chair, John de Castro.

II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January meeting were approved after the following corrections were noted: Edgar Torbert was present; Dr. Lederberg's name is Amy; Correct spelling for Charlene Hurt. A number of other spelling errors in the Attendees list were indicated. In the Library paragraph, delete the word "are" and set off the phrase "in one sense" with commas in the first sentence. Third sentence reads "When questioned. . . rather than build on the old plan."

III. FY98 Budget Status
There was no update on the state of the budget beyond December 31 because the OASIS system was down. As of December 31 there was a projected $610,000 available for contingency fund expenditures. Of these funds $567,000 will be devoted to Computing infrastructure upgrades.

IV. Board of Regents Budget Request Presentation
This year's redirection plan differed from prior years in that the University was required to redirect $2.8 million in real money back to the Board of Regents. An additional $5.4 million was redirected internally. The redirection plan for the funds returned to the Regents consisted of $1.7 million in amounts targeted by the Provost from non-academic areas. The remaining $1.1 million was obtained by assessing a tax of .00615% of the each units' total budget for both academic and non-academic units. It was noted that, as had been requested by the Budget Committee, the academic units were spared the major portion of the redirection; with only $729,000, 25% of the total, coming from academic units.

The second portion of the presentation to the Regent's staff consisted of Georgia State University requests for redirected monies. During discussion on requests for redirected funds, it was noted that the PeopleSoft implementation is expensive. It as observed that the July 1, 1999 target date for implementation is optimistic. The Chair reported that the Board of Regents had a positive response to the fact that more than half of the staff on the migration team are from GSU.
Tim Crimmins explained that the requests for support were ordered by the Provost according to what are perceived to be Regents' priorities; the list went to the Dean's group, then on to CBSAC. He noted that total request cannot exceed 4 million dollars and the total GSU is requesting is 3.5 million, and that linking requests may help increase the likelihood of receiving funding.

More discussion about PeopleSoft ensued. A question arose as to whether things will be simpler once the migration has been accomplished. There is an expectation that this will be true, particularly for business processes. It was predicted that not much staffing change will occur in central administration although there will be savings in departments as shadow systems can be eliminated. The Chair observed that EFTs do not necessarily reduce as systems improve. A future concern will be how do we help current staff move into the more technology-oriented positions.

Charlene Hurt underscored the need for more work stations in the library and training for people to use them.

It was observed that there appears to be political motivation to try to request items that the Regents are likely to fund, and that the Chancellor is moving toward strategic budgeting and away from formula budgeting.

The plateau fee structure was discussed. GSU requested a 4-year phase-in plan but the Regents said this is too long. There is a concern that this method of structuring fees will punish schools like GSU where there is a large population of part time students.

A review of MRRF allocations' percentage of building replacement cost for FY 1996 through 1999 indicated that the research institutions are funded well below other colleges and universities in the system. 38% of the budget goes to the institutions that have 65% of the buildings. The rationale for this is that larger universities have larger budgets and smaller institutions do not receive indirect funds.

The Chair reported that the presentation went well, but that at present the Regents are negative toward fee requests, and that the technology fee appears to be dead.

V. Action Plan for the Strategic Plan
Tim Crimmins noted that the Status Report for 1997 Action Plan for Strategic Plan traces out the status of all actions in the Strategic plan. A lengthy discussion took place concerning whether items highlighted as priorities in the 1998 Action Plan Narrative for Strategic Plan do not appear to jibe with the Action Plan. It appears that this may be a structural/semantic problem. It was observed that areas highlighted in the narrative are already underway without additional funding, and that an important piece of the strategic plan is redirection, and that it might be helpful to more clearly link these items.

VI. Athletics Budget Shortfall
A large shortfall in the Athletics budget was discussed. It was noted that overspending occurred in operations and that there was a large shortfall in the fund raising. The Athletics Department has been told that the $125,000 over expenditure in operations will have to be made up within their own budget. The fact that such an unrealistic expectation for fund raising was used in determining the initial budget was discussed. The notion that the strategic effort with athletics could be as successful as the Rialto and capital campaign projects was
expressed. It was noted that those two projects took several years to accomplish.

Please send questions or comments to Mary Nell Stone