

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Budget Advisory Committee****Tower Hall 110**  
**12:00 – 2:30**

---

---

**MINUTES**  
**July 9, 2001****I. The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. and attendance was noted. Ten members were present.**

Present: Brent, Donoho, Goodman, Kassing, Manning, Nellen, Peter, Rascoe, Stacks,  
Thames

Absent: Caret, Gorney-Moreno, Martinez, Nuger, Pour, Rickford

**II. Decision regarding the Lottery Proposals**

The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) discussed decisions regarding the 2001/2002 Lottery proposals.

Chair Brent received emails regarding the Lottery proposals. The majority recommended keeping the proposals funded at 100%.

There was discussion on the legality of using lottery funds for budget shortfalls.

There was discussion about funding the same programs year-after-year.

Chair Brent suggested that the BAC should move forward with the Lottery recommendations as it is already two months past the normal timeline.

There was discussion about the fact that a state budget has not yet been signed. It was suggested that the BAC recommend 80% funding of the Lottery proposals, since we don't have an approved budget yet.

There was discussion regarding two issues. The first issue was legality and ethics in how the lottery funds are used. The second issue was the senate's responsibility to use the lottery funds as they were intended to be used. Members of the BAC acknowledged that the Lottery Committee had done a superb job in evaluating the lottery proposals, and it was recommended that the BAC defer to their recommendations. It was suggested that the BAC consider other proposals in the fall, but expend the lottery funds now.

There was discussion about the university's budget for energy costs. It was recommended that the BAC wait until a budget is passed before recommending expenditure of the lottery funds.

There was discussion as to why the BAC was re-deciding the Lottery Committee's decisions on the lottery proposals.

There was discussion about the Governor redlining more funds. It was suggested that it might be as much as 4 million, and the university doesn't know what will be redlined yet.

There was discussion about why we couldn't use funds set aside last year by the Lottery Committee in case of a budget shortfall. Chair Brent said that these funds were already included in this year's budget.

It was noted that the usual amount of cushion in rollover funds is 10%. The Lottery Committee reserved much more than that last year. Members commented that they realize that university officials are trying to protect the university, but question whether the Academic Senate should support using lottery funds for an energy funds shortfall. Is this really a wise thing to do in the long run.

There was discussion as to whether the BAC should wait until the budget is approved before using the lottery funds.

There was discussion about the use of funds on campus for purposes other than those intended. It was noted that this happens in other areas.

There was discussion about whether the President would sign anything before we had an approved state budget. It was suggested that the Budget Advisory Committee recommend 80% funding and revisit the issue after the budget is passed.

Chair Brent stated that the Budget Advisory Committee needed to go forward with the recommendations. The President can make his decisions whenever he sees prudent. Chair Brent said the committee should take an initial vote today on the amount of funding (80% or 100%), and whether the funds should be rank-ordered.

There was discussion about whether there might be some proposals that are already too late to be funded. Chair Brent stated that there are none that he is aware of. A question was asked as to whether the BAC could contact the programs and see if they could accomplish their goals with 80% funding versus 100% funding. Chair Brent said we would not be able to get this information today.

A motion was made to endorse the Lottery Committee proposals at 100% and rank-order them.

The motion was seconded.

There was a comment that we could revisit the recommendations if we are facing a budget shortfall.

Chair Brent said that if budget cuts have to be made, the Budget Advisory Committee still wants a voice in where the cuts are made. This is why he recommends rank-ordering the lottery proposals.

A comment was made that we may not have the funds if the budget gets cut. Therefore, the BAC either recommend 100% financing of the Lottery Committee's recommendations, and let the President decide what gets cut if there is a budget shortfall, or the BAC can recommend 80% financing now.

The actual amount of rollover money set aside by the Lottery Committee last year was questioned. The actual amount is \$340,000. No funds were set aside for a deficit.

A question was asked as to whether the Lottery Committee had rank-ordered the proposals. The motion to vote for 80 or 100% financing, and rank-ordering the lottery proposals was repeated.

A comment was made that it would be extremely time-consuming to try and rank-order each lottery proposal. An amendment to the motion to rank-order the lottery proposals by High Priority, Medium Priority, and Low Priority instead of 1,2,3, etc. was made.

A question was raised as to how high priority was to be determined. Is there set criteria for determining high, medium, and low priority. Chair Brent said that the criteria used is in the Lotte Committee Guidelines. There was discussion as to whether rank-ordering changes the criteria that was used to award funding.

Chair Brent recommended using Lottery Committee Guidelines for ranking the lottery proposals.

Some members raised ethical concerns with recommending 80% funding. However, it was acknowledged that politics is the art of compromise. The administration won't approve any of the proposals until the budget is approved anyway, therefore, the BAC should rank-order the proposals that the committee has some say in how the cuts are made, if necessary.

A member suggested that if the Lottery Committee had known there might be some budget cuts, they would have rank-ordered the lottery proposals.

A member stated that the BAC is obligated to use the same guidelines that the Lottery Committee used.

The motion was repeated and a vote was taken. The motion passed to recommend 100% funding, to rank-order the lottery proposals using the high, medium, and low priority ranking system. The criteria used to determine high, medium, and low priority is to be the same criteria used by the lottery committee.

The lottery proposals were ranked as follows:

<u>Highest Priority</u>	<u>Medium Priority</u>	<u>Low Priority</u>
Professional Development	Career Forum	Faculty Publication
Honors Convocation	Spartans Scholars	Campus Tour
Faculty Mentor	Showcase for Learning	Coop. Educ. Peer Adv. Pos.
CSU Future Scholars	Step-to-College	Spartan Connection
Inst. Global & Int. Studies	Div. In Curriculum Fellows	
Enhancing Library Coll.	Tech. For Fac. Dev.	
	Major Hub	
	Program and Tech. for MOSAIC	
	Multicultural Ldrshp. Retreat	

- III. Senate Retreat:** Vice Chair Nellen announced that the topic for the Senate Retreat would be Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness.
- IV. Provost's Taskforce Recommendation:** Provost Goodman wants a taskforce setup to evaluate ways to reduce faculty workload. He asked Chair Brent if he would nominate faculty/non-faculty members for the taskforce.
- V. Update Spartan Jewels:** Senator Stacks gave an update on the Spartan Jewels. She said that they are considering ways of expanding the student booster association to serve in this capacity. The Spartan Jewels are considering a name change, and are working on expanding their functions membership.

**VI. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.**