

**Attendees:** Co-Chair Jane Hudak, Co-Chair Gebe Ejigu, David Curtis, Shannon Dermer, David Diers, Rupert Evans, Judy Ferneau, Ellen Foster Curtis, James Howley, Rosemary Hulett, Karen Kissel, Joseph Matula, Sandra Mayfield, Lydia Morrow Ruetten, Linda Samson, Karen Stuenkel, John Stoll, Jeff Slovak, and Rebecca Wojcik

**Absent:** Karen D’Arcy, Robert Donaldson, Maribeth Kasik, Gary Lyon, Eric Martin, Daniel Nearing, Charles Nolley, Susan Rakstang, Adam Taylor, and Peggy Woodard

**Documents:**

1. Agenda
2. FY10 Operating Budget Development Process
3. Timeline for FY10 Budgeting Process
4. FY10 Operating Budget Request

**I. Introduction**

Hudak informed the committee that Ejigu will present information regarding the budget-building process for FY10.

**II. Discussion of Timelines for the FY10 Budget Development Process and the Larger Context of Budgeting for FY10**

Ejigu discussed the budget timeline. He referred to the two-page document that contains information about guidelines and timelines for developing, submitting and considering FY10 budget proposals. This document is substantially similar to last year’s version, and involves no serious changes from last year in the budget-building process. The deadline for submission of FY10 budget requests to the Budget Office is May 1, 2009. Release of documents to the budget units will take place during the third week of March, giving the units forty five (45) days to develop their formal budget requests.

Submissions should address the questions displayed below and should not exceed ten pages in overall length:

- Contextual – What are the major issues that your college/unit will face as we move into and through FY10? What are the issues specific to your college or unit, as opposed to those facing the university as a whole?
- Current Resources – What is your current budget level? How are you using your current allocation of resources, and to what effect?
- Possible Resource Reductions – Given revenue and expenditure issues in the state of Illinois, a substantial mid-year rescission during FY10 is a definite possibility. What if the unit was asked to reduce its budget? How would you go about it? What measures you would take? How would those measures affect enrollment? P

- Overview/Justification – What resources do you need to achieve you unit’s goals in FY10? How will you use those resources, if they are allocated to you?

Ejigu does not to implement uniform, across-the-board budget cuts, even in difficult times. He thinks them unhealthy, producing proportionally more harm than good for the university as a whole.

Ejigu then offered a formal presentation on the state of the state within the economic downturn being experienced across the nation. Illinois’s projected deficit of \$8 billion ranks sixth highest in the nation, and the Governor’s Office has said that that figure could reach \$9.5 – \$11.5 billion for FY10.

What are other universities doing to handle this likely development? Most are laying off personnel, eliminating programs, closing satellite operations, freezing compensation increases, freeze hiring, and curtailing travel and equipment purchases. GSU has not been required to implement or even seriously contemplate most of these steps, because the current financial position of the university is fairly healthy. GSU is enjoys this relative health because of our planning last year and in prior years. Good fiscal management is about making good decisions.

We have taken the following steps in response to the state’s fiscal difficulties: a limited hiring freeze with some exceptions to be determined by the President and her cabinet; close monitoring of expenditures; and continuous engagement in contingency planning as more information becomes available from Springfield.

Ejigu noted that, at its recent February meeting, the GSU Board of Trustees received President Maimon’s recommendations on mandatory fee levels for FY10. The fee recommendations were those developed and forwarded by PBAC, with one exception: an increase in the Technology Fee from \$10/credit to \$17/credit. The Board approved these recommendations. The primary purpose of the Technology Fee increase is to provide funds sufficient to support ongoing costs for the upgrading/replacement of the University’s ERP System. A steering committee for this project will be formed in the near future, and will be reporting its progress to PBAC.

#### **Summary of Committee Reports:**

1. ***Strategic Planning Committee: Co-Chairs, John Stoll and Karen D’Arcy***

This committee has been trying to develop a set of benchmark indicators against which to measure progress toward achievement of the goals included in **Strategy 2015**.

2. ***Facilities Committee: Co-Chairs, Susan Rakstang and Eric Martin***

Slovak spoke on behalf of the Facilities Committee. He reviewed their strategic plan they are developing and the categories to be used to assign priorities to specific projects. He also mentioned that the committee is trying to develop a subcommittee on sustainability.

3. ***Committee on Continuous Quality Improvement and Accreditation: Co-Chairs, Eric Martin, Sandy Mayfield, and Rebecca Wojcik***

The primary focus of this committee is preparation for the upcoming visit from the Higher Learning Commission pursuant to a ten-year reaffirmation of the university's accreditation.

**4. Committee on Budget and Finance: Co-Chairs, Jeff Slovak and Peggy Woodard**

This committee is creating a finance plan for use in achieving the goals of **Strategy 2015**, and should be ready to present that plan to PBAC at its March meeting.

**IV. Extended Committee Reports**

**1. Information Technology Committee: Co-Chairs, Linda Samson and John Stoll**

Stoll presented the strategic plan developed by the committee in light of the goals enshrined in **Strategy 2015**, focusing explicitly on the scheme of priority rankings developed for all of the information technology projects on the agenda for the near- and intermediate-term future. Mayfield moved to adopt the plan. Matula seconded the motion. Discussion focused heavily on the project to upgrade/replace the university's ERP system, and on the possible five-year duration and \$10 million cost of such a venture. The composition of the Steering Committee to direct the effort was announced. Committee members include: Diane Dates Casey (Library), Karen Kissel (Financial Services) Colleen Rock (Student Services), Linda Buyer (Institutional Research), Greg Kain (Information Technology) and Tracy Sullivan (Procurement), ex officio. The motion to adopt the committee's strategic plan was unanimously approved.

**2. Enrollment Management and Student Services: Co-Chairs, Linda Buyer and Sherilyn Poole**

Buyer presented an enrollment planning template developed by the committee as a planning tool to project actual enrollment relative to the enrollment goals that are specified in **Strategy 2015**. The academic deans are already working with the Provost to develop college-level plans that will dovetail with the larger institutional plans and goals. Buyer also introduced the co-chairs of the Student Enrollment Task Force (Nick Battaglia and Nancy Burley) to present a report on dual-admission. Battaglia and Burley detailed the resources that will be needed to reach the aggressive goal set for dually-admitted students in **Strategy 2015**.

**V. Upcoming Issues and Meetings**

Slovak reviewed the timeline for budget development, and noted that units' budget proposals must have the approval of the appropriate vice president before they are submitted to the Budget Office on May 1.

The next meeting of PBAC is scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 2009 from 10am-Noon in the Hall of Honors.