

## **Agenda**

### **Budget and Planning Committee**

**November 3, 2010**

- Budget Reductions
- FY 2011 Stimulus Funding
- FY 2012 Budget Planning
- Purpose of Committee

## **Budget and Planning Committee**

**November 2, 2010**

**Meeting Time 3:30 – 5:00**

Attendees: All members were present except for Ryan Hebert, Anthony Koyzis

Agenda Items: Budget Reductions, FY11 Stimulus Funding; FY12 Budget Planning; Purpose of Committee

Kathy Worster opened the meeting by suggesting that everyone present introduce themselves. Kathy then opened the discussion regarding whether to do a 1% budget reduction in the current year or not and the impact of doing a cut this year. A 1% reduction in 2011 will save the institution a 2% reduction in FY2012.

Ken Perkins mentioned two possible reasons that the state may be requesting the budget reduction in this year.

- 1) Due to the current budget/ revenue situation
- 2) To redistribute to other institutions

Ken Perkins said he had discussed the issue with Rick Hurley at Mary Washington, and Rick thought that the current budget situation was driving the state's request for budget cuts in 2011.

Keith Rider questioned the process for how the decision of what cuts to make will be made and what the budget committee's role is in that process.

Kathy Worster reminded the committee members that tuition increases could and should be a strategy that is submitted to the state.

Norman Bregman and Troy Austin both suggested that the decision should be made at a macro level and that all areas of the University should be examined for cuts. Norman Bregman suggested that all Vice Presidential areas submit plans for a 10% reduction to the President and then let him make the decision of what areas to cut what percentage.

Ken Perkins reminded everyone that while looking at the academic area for reductions the new "Academic Master Plan" should be considered and that Dee Jones and Chuck Ross are Co-Chairs of that committee.

Norman suggested that the committee should re-examine how things are done and that when the committee was established there was no charge given to the committee. Troy Austin suggested that the committee create its own charge and get the President to approve it.

Phillip Gapinski said that the committee needs to identify its role, then decide how to identify the priorities, and where the information would flow to, and identify time constraints. He also requested information and the agenda be distributed prior to the meeting so that the information could be reviewed in advance.

Kathy Worster then suggested that the 2% and 4% reduction could be covered with tuition increases; however the 6% reduction would require a cut in discretionary spending. Then she stated the first decision to be made would be if the University wanted to submit a 1% reduction plan for 2011.

Ken Perkins suggested creating a subcommittee would be a more effective way to proceed in the future.

Paul Barrett recommended three separate committees- revenue-reductions-planning.

William Stuart motioned that the targets presented be forwarded to the President for approval. The motion was seconded by Paul Barrett and approved.

Ken Perkins closed by asking for agenda items and said that he would be asking members to serve on the draft committee.