

# **President's Budget Advisory Committee**

## **Meeting Agenda**

February 14, 2019  
2:00p.m. @ MH-3318

### **I. Call to order**

- Call for amendments to agenda

### **II. Information Item**

- January 31<sup>st</sup> Joint PBAC / AR&P / BRAT Meeting (Attachment 1)
- 2019/20 Budget Process
- Budget Open Forums

### **III. Reports**

- No Update

### **IV. Watch List**

- Master Plan Costs
- Graduation Initiative 2025
- IT Governance
- Infrastructure (electrical/steam)
- Mission Valley

### **V. 2018/19 Funding Requests**

- None

### **VI. New Business**

### **VII. Reminder**

- **Next Meeting Date – March 14, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. in MH-3318**

Joint Budget Session, Meeting #1  
PBAC, AR&P and BRAT committees  
January 31, 2019  
2-4PM  
Tula conference room

- I. Welcome and Introductions
  - a. Everyone introduced themselves and said which committee they belong to. The committee chairs named the purposes of the committees.
  
- II. Purpose and Goals for the Meeting
  - a. Create budget processes and discuss how we determine priorities.
  - b. Discuss how to share information.
  - c. AR&P had requested everyone's budgets so they could put everything in context.
  - d. Come away with some common ideas and meet again later.
  
- III. Budget overview: state and campus for FY 19-20, Q&A
  - a. Tom talked about the budget overview he emailed to campus this month (see attached).
  - b. Governor Newsom had said we should ask for what we fully need. His first budget that just came out is the best we have seen in decades. He values higher education. SDSU is about 7% of the CSU budget.
  - c. Tom presented the 2019-20 operating budget update which totals \$300M of base funding (see attached). Projected revenue growth over next three years averages at 3%. \$247M is for deferred maintenance (one-time funds). \$80M of base deferred maintenance funding is not included in that figure. It might be included in a ballot initiative this year.
  - d. Chancellor White sent a memo out about how appreciative he is of everyone's work.
  - e. Next steps – budget meetings in Sacramento, CSU budget letter end of February, and revised governor's budget in May.
  
- IV. Discussion breakouts and reports (see attached notes)
  - 1) What does budget transparency look like to you?
  - 2) What investments are best viewed as campus level rather than divisional? How might we go about identifying and characterizing these?
  - 3) What are the qualities of a fair process that ensures we have identified and are addressing the university's funding priorities?
  
- V. Divisional Budget Reports Discussion
  - a. Mark Reed and Agnes Wong Nickerson presented the budget summaries using Academic Affairs budget as a sample.

- b. Question asked about where IRA funding is reflected. It is in a separate budget.
- c. Benefits are in a central pool and are not reflected here as well.

#### Q & A and Discussion

- What information is most useful? – Being able to drill down to see more information like categories of expenses. What student fees do we have? Who do we talk to if we want to know more? Divisional budget associate vice presidents are Tony Chung, Radmila Prislin, Leslie Levinson, and Agnes Wong Nickerson. There is also a budget book online and more budget information on BFA's Budget and Finance website.
- What questions remain?
- Is the format accessible and informative? How might it be improved?

- VI. Next steps - Send any notes to Tom McCarron, Donna Conaty or Agnes Wong Nickerson. Then we will regroup.

# #1

- Transparency is a spectrum.
  - Also limitations to transparency.
- Need to understand "Why" →  
"What" → "How".
- Need to have common context & understanding of process, terminology, etc.
- Participation & Responsibility @ all levels.

# 1. BUDGET TRANSPARENCY:

Having an understandable and accessible budget, with known process allowing for input. Individuals should be able to understand BIG PICTURE, FUNDING SOURCES, HISTORICAL INFORMATION, TRENDS with a common budget LANGUAGE.

# 2. CAMPUS vs. DIVISIONAL INVESTMENTS

Tricky question; struggling with spirit & intent  
As result, more than one way to respond.

FUNCTIONAL POV: any investment in primary function (teaching, research, student success) is a campus investment.

ORGANIZATIONAL POV: investment in services used by all is campus investment. Investment in services used by segment is divisional investment

# 3. QUALITIES OF FAIR PROCESS

Perception that you have a voice in the process, whether directly or through representation. Process should be accessible and transparent and Stakeholders are informed.

① - Detail

- Sources + uses
- Totality (not just incremental)
- Funded + unfunded
- why/sets goals & makes priorities & how
- dynamic - includes future projections

② - Institutional = campus level

- non rivalry concept?
- local expertise = divisional
- cross campus = institutional

③ - Transparency

- Participants are broadly representative, engaged, capable, trained, in a position to fully understand issues, public spirited, will share information.
- Clarity of goals & priorities of institution
- measurement of success

## Budget Transparency

- 1) Baseline info in an accessible format
  - a) Consider financial tools (Dashboard) for queries
  - b. neutral budget expert
- 2) Clarity of terms
- 3) Ability to drill down (Excel vs PDF)
- 4) ID & alignment of priorities with campus values

## Institution vs Divisional -

a) All Divisions need to be integrated & clear.

b). clarity of what institutional mean - dumping ground or pre-identified

c. Effect of change backs on priorities

Unintended Mechanism to shift \$

d. Auxiliaries need to be incorporated

## FAIR Process.

- 1) Data Available to all
- 2) transparent
- 3) Multiple Arenues / groups for input on priorities.
- 4) Neutral Analyst. Available
- 5) Clear process w/ boundaries
  - a) Deviation must be open & explained
6. Snapshots of data insufficient  
Trends over time / analyses must be available