University Senate Budget Committee
Minutes
March 5, 1998

Attendance: Cleon Arrington, David Boykin, Carol Clark for James Scott, Tom Clark, Tim Crimmins, John de Castro, Bill Decatur, Ann Emanuel, Sidney Harris, Charlene Hurt, Mark Jones for Reid Christenberry, Fred Massey, Jerry Rackliffe, Bob Shuford for Janice Griffith, Paula Stephan, Edgar Torbert, Joanna White.


The meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m. by the Chair, John de Castro

I. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes of the February meeting were approved as distributed.

II. FY98 Budget Status
   Savings from fringe benefits and utilities plus the actual student tuition fees that were above budget leaves a bottom line of $132,717 available for contingency fund release.

   There has been no feedback from the Board of Regents for probable funding for FY99.

III. Discussion of Strategic Recommendations for FY99

   Accreditation A status update was requested from the College of Business regarding their accreditation needs.

   It was noted that in the requests for FY99 the number one priority from the College of Business was accreditation needs. It was explained that the reason for this was the full request was not met last year.

   A committee member asked that the board also take into consideration how these requests relate to the strategic plan and in particular the Action plan.

   Unit Inequities
   Certain units have been underfunded based upon the application of the Regents funding formula. This is the same formula that is being used to determine underfunded units in the Budget Committee model. It was noted that although this model is controversial, it is the best model available. The particular problems that were noted with this model were a distortion when looking at support position, a misrepresentation of the smaller units, and the fact that the model was based on credit hours rather than head counts.

   The report that was handed out at the meeting reflected the individual units at GSU. It was suggested that a report be generated reflecting the University as a whole. Dr. de Castro said that as a follow-up he would generate a report taking into consideration the University
as a whole.

It was felt by committee members that additional extended analysis be conducted to this formula to fairly determine unit inequities. It was the hope of the committee that with support from Institutional Research such analysis would be able to occur.

Dr. de Castro asked that if the 6 categories that he collapsed form the FY98 priorities (Research, Student Support, Infrastructure, Library, Academic Program Needs, and Revenue Enhancement) were a reasonable subset of priorities.

Sidney Harris proposed a "friendly" amendment to be included under the research priority as section"c" entitled" research related accreditation needs."

Fred Massey moved that the proposed priorities, including the "friendly" amendment be presented to FACP. It was seconded and passed by the committee.

**Budget Priorities for FY99**

1) Research
   a) Individual program and faculty needs
   b) Infrastructure - Laboratories & Administration
   c) Research related to accreditation needs

2) Student Support
   a) Graduate student financial support
   b) Undergraduate student recruitment, retention, & services

3) Infrastructure
   a) Computing and Information Technology
   b) Maintenance
   c) Administrative program review

4) Library
   a) Pullen Library
   b) Law Library

5) Academic Program Needs
   a) Program review action plans
   b) Accreditation needs
   c) Unit inequities

6) Revenue enhancement
   a) Development
   b) Unmet demand

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
Please send questions or comments to Mary Nell Stone