University Senate Budget Committee
Minutes
April 30, 1998


The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by the Chair, John de Castro.

I. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the April 16, 1998 meeting were approved as distributed with one correction.

II. FY98 Budget Status
This discussion was tabled.

III. Corrected Regents Formula Calculation
John de Castro presented a corrected Regents formula calculation that subtracted out fringes. With this correction the degree of under funding from the Board of Regents is clearer. The actual allocation of the Colleges is 83% of the amount indicated by the board of Regents Formula. A further calculation using the formula indicated that the overall University budget should be 26% higher than the current allocation.

IV. FY99 Budget Allocation
The final allocation of funds to the units as approved by the President were discussed. It was reported that a large proportion of funding for the College of Arts and Sciences came from the success of funding initiatives put before the Board of Regents by the University. These initiatives were chosen by the Regents for funding according to their strategic objectives. GSU was particularly successful in obtaining these funds.

An analysis was presented comparing the final allocation of the FY99 budget to the Fiscal Advisory Committee to the President's recommendations. The majority of the college budgets equaled what FACP had recommenced. The largest variance from the FACP recommendations occurred in the Provost's budget. This was primarily due to the allocation of BOR holding and targeted accounts in this budget line. However, $347,036 was allocated that had not been discussed by FACP. Other variances occurred as the result of the allocation of funds for building maintenance, operation, and rentals and increases in rents and insurance. These items had not been discussed in FACP. It was reported that the Board of Regents did not provide funds for new space. In the future campuses must ask for this specifically and include it in their strategic initiative.
A discussion ensued of the reasons for the discrepancies between the FACP recommendations and the final allocation. It appears that the problem arose due to the delays in receiving notice from the BOR of the allocation to the University. As a result FACP was forced to complete its recommendation in a very short period of time. As a result a number of items that should have been discussed, were not. FACP was assured that in the future all the funding would be presented to the committee regardless of the type of funding.

An analysis of the final funding and its relationship to the budget priorities of the Budget Committee was presented and discussed. It was noted that there was an excellent correspondence between the Budget Committee's priorities and the amounts allocated.

An analysis of the amounts allocated to the units in the final allocation was presented and discussed. It was noted that the College received an increment of 3% in their budgets while the other units received a 5% increase. It was suggested that some of the money currently in the Provost's budget and the VP for Research budget will be allocated to the colleges. This should to some extent mitigate the difference.

V. 1997/98 Academic Year Budget Committee Critique and Discussion

The process by which the funding is allocated to the units seemed to the committee to be somewhat flawed. The follow-up of budget allocations and the need for the committee to be more involved in the program review process was also discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.