



**UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING**  
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Friday 04/07/06	<b>Time</b>	2:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.
<b>Meeting Location</b>	Corbett Conference Room		

<b>Co-Chairs:</b>	
x	Rick Vrem
x	Saeed Mortazavi

<b>Voting Members</b>	
x	Greg Crawford
	Susie Dodson
x	Nancy Kelly
	Thomas Koesterer

<b>Voting Members</b>	
x	Judith Little
x	Wayne Perryman
x	Mark Larson
x	Laurie Sheppard

<b>Voting Members</b>	
x	Nicole Alvarado
x	Glenn Sonntag
x	Rosemary Smith (Proxy)

<b>Observers</b>	
	Anda Webb
x	Steve Butler
	Andrew Delgado
x	Carl Coffey
	Burt Nordstrom

<b>Observers</b>	
	Rollin Richmond
x	Linda Mortenson

<b>Ex Officio</b>	
	Randi Darnall-Burke
x	Karen Earls
x	Carol Terry

**AGENDA RECAP**

	<b>Agenda Topic</b>	<b>Led by / Materials to Review</b>
1.	Review & Discussion of Decision Package Priority Listing	Discussion
2.	Discussion of Next Step	Discussion
3.	Additional Discussion	Saeed Mortazavi

**DISCUSSION NOTES****University Budget Committee Meeting****Friday, April 7, 2006****2:00 pm – Corbett Conference Room****Item #1: Review & Discussion of Decision Package Priority Listing**

At the March 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, Rollin Richmond mentioned it would be nice if the University Budget Committee would bring forward their top ten augmentation recommendations to the President. To accomplish this, it was decided that each voting member would be given 40 voting points to allocate over what they thought was best for the campus. The committee was reminded that the top University priorities are enrollment strategies, university advancement, and strategic plan initiatives. This meeting on April 7<sup>th</sup> was the committees first opportunity to discuss the results of the augmentation request survey they had par taken in.

**Key Points from the meeting:**

- Glenn Sonntag felt that a larger pool of points for allocation would have afforded a more sensitive and accurate priority assessment.
- Laurie Sheppard liked the one to five scale used last year for determining a preliminary recommendations.
- Several committee members agreed that it appeared different strategic approaches were taken while allocating points. Some committee member spread points evenly, while others put all 40 on one line.
- Nancy Kelly hoped that the preliminary recommendations provided in the survey results never got forwarded on. She was not in favor of budget reductions, nor the re-allocation of funds to cover new initiatives.
- Wayne Perryman wasn't happy with the process either. He liked last years one to five rating scale, and didn't support budget reduction in order to fund these augmentation requests.
- Mark Larson felt both methods are flawed, but noted that the number one priority for each division was still within the top ten.
- Carl Coffee mentioned that the preliminary recommendations provided in the survey results reflected the make-up of the committee.
- As a possible solution, Greg Crawford mentioned throwing out the top and bottom initiatives to help balance out the results.
- Saeed Mortazavi supported the 40 point allocation process.

**Item #2 Discussion of Next Step**

According to the university annual budget process the preliminary resource allocation is to be published for review and comment prior to a final recommendation to the President.

UBC Budget Process: [http://www.humboldt.edu/~budget/Archives/HSU\\_Budget2\\_Process.pdf](http://www.humboldt.edu/~budget/Archives/HSU_Budget2_Process.pdf)

Having completed, reviewed, and discussed the preliminary recommendations, the UBC committee noted concern with regard to publishing the results of this survey to the campus community in its entirety. In addition, the fact that there was a tie between Decision Packages 10, 11, and 12, made it difficult to only forward the top 10.

As a solution, it was recommended that only the top 12 be forwarded to the campus for feedback. If the campus community was interested in viewing the results in their entirety, they should feel free to contact the University Budget Office.

A short narrative will also accompany the augmentation request summary explaining the process the committee experienced, and that the augmentations were based on additional funding. If budget cuts are necessary in order to fund these initiatives, several members of the committee would oppose funding anything new.

### **Item #3 Additional Discussion**

In the future, Saeed requested that more information be available for committee analysis including such things as campus breakeven point and fixed costs.

To allow time for feedback, the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting will be canceled and the next meeting would be on April 21<sup>st</sup>. In that meeting, the committee will finalize its FY06-07 budget recommendations to the President.