

January 21, 2010

Report for Subcommittee on Budget Transparency

In meeting of October 27, 2009, questions arose about the amount of appropriated funds listed on the University Budget webpage for Research and Sponsored Programs (Acct 127210) relative to Grants for Research and the Graduate School (Acct 127110) relative to Presidential graduate assistantships. After initial review, it appeared that funding for these accounts had declined in FY 2009 and then risen dramatically in FY 2010.

Grants for Research	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$88,000	\$85,000	\$165,256

Presidential Graduate Assistantships	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$111,928	\$100,980	\$163,296

Dr. Robert Chesnut, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, was contacted regarding changes in appropriated budget for Grants for Research. After discussions with Dr. Chesnut, Ms. Cathy Thomas, and Mr. Brad Green, it became apparent that the figures listed on the University Budget webpage for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were incomplete. The figures listed for FY 2010 were accurate. The figures that Dr. Chesnut and his staff provided actually showed that the budget for Grants for Research had increased each year. The figures provided by Dr. Chesnut and his staff follow:

Grants for Research	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>
	\$155,256	\$162,256	\$165,256

Dr. Robert Augustine, Dean of the Graduate School, was contacted regarding changes in the appropriated budget for Presidential graduate assistantships. After discussions with Dean Augustine, it again became apparent that the figures listed on the University Budget webpage for FY 2008 and FY 2009 were incomplete. The figures listed for FY 2010 were accurate. Dean Augustine provided the following history of the awards. When the Presidential graduate assistantships program was established in FY 2002, the appropriated budget was \$115,334 and was intended to support eighteen awards, three of which were allocated to campus offices and fifteen of which were for graduate programs. The Presidential graduate assistantship budget increased by 3% each year until FY 2009 and brought the balance to \$142,745. In FY 2010, President Perry allocated new funding to create three additional Presidential graduate assistantships for First Choice graduate programs. This brought the total number of awards to twenty one, with three awards allocated to campus offices and eighteen awards allocated to graduate programs. The new funding, plus the annual 3% increase, raised the total budget to \$163,256.

We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Chesnut and his staff as well as Dean Augustine for their willingness to openly discuss and clarify these budgetary issues for the subcommittee.

Re: Budget Transparency Subcommittee
Faculty Senate 2009-2010

As part of my duties on the Budget Transparency Subcommittee (BTS), I examined the Ledger 1, Appropriated Funds budget for the Honors College for the fiscal years FY08, FY09, and FY10 (the current budgetary year.) I compiled the following figures:

Budget line	FY08	FY09	FY10
128000 Honors College Dean	\$275,941	\$310,444	\$375,877
128010 Presidential Scholars	\$488,562	\$497,324	\$500,000
128020 PSAT Recruiting	\$2379	\$1570	\$2379

As this table shows, two of the three budget lines in the Honors College (128010 and 128020) have been relatively static across the last three fiscal years. There has been a substantial increase in one budget line (128000), which increased by 12.5% from FY08 to FY09, and increased again by 21% from FY09 to FY2010. Most of this increase appears to be localized in a category of funds called “Non-Pers Budget” in the FY10 budget. This amount (\$127,982) seems to be a substantial increase over the FY09 budget where the same category appears to have totaled \$40,277. However, it should be kept in mind that advancing the role and mission of the Honors College is one of the President’s stated goals for the institution. Also, most of this increase has apparently gone to travel funds for students to attend and present at research conferences nationwide. Again, this increase is congruent with the President’s objectives for this unit, and it shows that the budgetary process does result in increased funding flowing to those units within the institution whose mission has been prioritized. Thank you.

John Best

**Report for Subcommittee on Budget Transparency
Faculty Development Budget Changes: 2008-2010**

In an October 27, 2010, meeting questions arose regarding the change in appropriated funds listed on the University Budget webpage for Faculty Development Programs, relative to personnel and commodities accounts, since these accounts had risen dramatically in FY 2009 and were maintained at 2009 levels in 2010, and contractual and travel accounts had risen less dramatically.

Here are some details from the Faculty Development Budget:

Fiscal Year	Personnel Services	Commodities	Travel	Contractual	Telecom	Equipment	Total Non-Personnel	Total
FY2008	\$77,116	\$4894	\$6968	\$20,519	\$1,074	\$654	\$34,109	\$111,225
FY2009	\$173,208	\$15,069	\$11,615	\$26,608	\$1,684	\$110	\$55,086	\$228,295
FY2010	\$170,111						*\$56,628	\$226,739

***Non-personnel expenses were not broken down by category for FY2010**

Dr. Mildred Pierce, Director of Faculty Development, was contacted regarding changes in the appropriated budget for 2009. After discussions with the director, it became apparent that figures listed in the budget reflected one major change—increased personnel. An assistant and two graduate assistants account for the majority of the budget change from FY2008 to FY2009. Changes in commodities were accounted for in relation to publicity materials for presenters and evidence for participants in Faculty Development workshops and presentations. The budget remains stable for FY2010. The travel account and contractual accounts increased in FY2009, as well, and remain stable in FY2010. We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Pierce for her willingness to openly discuss and clarify these budgetary issues for the subcommittee.