

Minutes, Budget Committee of Academic Senate

Meeting of March 27, 2001 (as approved May 8, 2001)

Present: Charles Parrish (chair), Marc Cogan, David Edelman*, Nancy Greger, James Kaltenbach, Michael McIntyre*, Hiroshi Mizukami, Vanessa Rose*, William Volz, Shirley Walkowski*

Absent with Notice: Richard Beltramini, Charles Elder, Linea Rydstedt.

Absent w/o Notice: Marlyne Kilbey*, John Ofenstein, Scott Ransom, Louis Romano, William Slater, James Woodyard.

*Liaison

1. The meeting convened at 3:16 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of Feb. 6, 2001, and January 23, 2001, were approved, subject to amendments.
2. *BOG Materials.* Budget Director Rose reviewed with the committee the materials going to the Board of Governor's Meeting on March 28. Most of the discussion focused on the General Fund Budget Performance Report. Ms. Rose explained that most of the differences between the budgeted amounts for the budget approved in September, 2000, and the revised budget being presented to the BOG were due to carryover amounts. The "revised" budget did not reflect changes in the budget made by the BOG but rather reflected the way the budget was presented for internal auditing purposes. Requests were made to Vanessa Rose for details regarding total actual expenditures for Fringe Benefits, and for a details regarding the projects included in the expenditures for Interim Funding for Plant Projects. Vanessa Rose agreed to provide these details.

It was noted that the spending items going to the BOG for approval were coming to the Budget Committee just the day before the BOG meeting, after the Administration had already made its decisions on the various proposals. Ms. Rose acknowledged that these items had not been discussed with the Budget Review Committee. After discussion, the following motion was made and seconded:

That the Administration be urged to bring proposals for spending from year-end balances to the Budget Review Committee in timely fashion so that the Committee could review the list of proposals and make recommendations on priorities.

The motion carried without opposition.

Some discussion followed on the plan to build a student dormitory and to include in that dormitory administrative space for the housing office. A question was raised about how students would be selected for the new housing if demand exceeds supply. It was noted that University Towers has a long waiting list. One member suggested that undergraduate

students are likely to be given a preference, given that the Administration has been promoting the housing proposal on the ground that it would attract undergraduate students. The chair indicated that he would raise the issue about priorities with the Provost.

3. *Humanities Center.* The chair announced that the committee's proposal for recommending re-chartering of the Humanities Center had been modified by the Policy Committee to limit the renewal to two years. The action was taken because of the issues that had been raised by the Budget Committee in its report to Policy. The chair indicated that the two-year period would give the Humanities Center time to decide whether it would become involved heavily in fund raising. The Policy Committee's recommendation must be approved by the Senate and the Administration before it can go to the BOG.

4. The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for some time in around three weeks.

By Michael J. McIntyre