Present: Paul Olin, Beth Nunnally, John Connett

Absent: Helen Hansen, Yusuf Abul-Hajj, David Lee

Ms. Nunnally distributed a collection of pages from the Internal Budget Model Status Report that is available on the Budget and Finance website. She discussed each section of the budget model, which included:
· Working principles
· Earned income/full cost model
· Allocation pools
· Allocation recommendations
· Revenue attribution recommendations
· The state subsidy
· Development timeline

Nunnally stated that many cost categories are managed at the central level. She also handed out the fiscal year cost pool charges that delineate the University's charges per year by category including cost comparison of the current fiscal year and the 2009-2010 fiscal year. The current model was designed to support decision-making, policies and procedures. It does not interfere with leadership or priorities and working principals. There are nine central cost pools, which are, in essence satellite, offices of function. These cost pools belong to the following departments:
· Facilities
· Utilities
· Debt & Leases
· Office of Information Technology
· Administrative Service Units
· Research
· Libraries
· Student Services
· General Purpose Classrooms

Smaller satellite budgets are rolled into the central pool that attributes out to other various departments based on formulas developed and deemed reasonable. These are defined in the new budget model. The Central Administration unit allocation seems the most challenging. The Institution Review Board has questioned what they are paying for in the various areas of administration because administrative positions are not as linear as most other units. The most common complaint regarding the current budget distribution system is the lack of control to where the money is being distributed.

Mr. Connett relayed his experience with the Information Technology Department in regard to their funding as well as services provided. As members had discussed in previous meetings, the ITV classrooms are going to need their technology updated rather soon. The current classrooms that offer ITV technology are few, in high demand and have poor quality. Connett has spoken with Info Tech staff regarding the possibilities and costs of upgrading the classrooms. He was quoted an approximate $100,000 per classroom for upgrades, which he thinks is overpriced, but states that there is no obligation from Info Tech to provide verification of what they are charging for services. He stated that no one is able to question this department and thinks it's necessary to find out who oversees Info Tech to get some solid answers. There was discussion about receiving outside bids for the upgrading but Info Tech would not support the system if it was installed by an "outside" company and he said if the job was going to go out for bids, Info Tech wanted an opportunity to bid on the job as well.

Chair Olin would like to know who has oversight on the Information Technology Department, who uses their services, who instructs them and who schedules them. He is also interested in how to go about scheduling ITV rooms. Mr. Connett said he does not believe there is one central office or person who schedules ITV rooms for the whole campus. Olin thinks Barbara Brandt's office may have some of these answers and will inquire there.

Chair Olin adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Lisa Towry
University Senate Office