

The Development of the State University System Legislative Budget Request

On April 21, 2005, the Florida Board of Governors (BOG) adopted policy guidelines for the development of the 2006-2007 State University System (SUS) Legislative Budget Request (LBR). Board members contended that the LBR should be need-based and should provide flexibility for the BOG and university boards of trustees to jointly manage the System to meet the critical needs of the State, to achieve the statewide goals and objectives of the SUS *Strategic Plan*, to address specific institutional concerns, and to demonstrate accountability/justification. Board members specified that individual university proposals needed to address the following goals and objectives of the SUS *Strategic Plan*:

1. Access to and production of degrees.
2. Meeting statewide professional and workforce needs.
3. Building world-class academic programs and research capacity.
4. Meeting community needs and fulfilling unique institutional missions.

The LBR guidelines and instructions for submitting university issues were issued on April 22, 2005 with a requested submission date of June 3, 2005. The universities submitted issues in excess of \$267 million. This did not include other issues such as cost-to-continue items, enrollment growth, major gifts, and other priorities of the Board included in the LBR guidelines. Using the Board's guidelines as the point of reference, staff developed a number of questions that were used in analyzing university proposals to determine which would be included among final recommendations. Questions used in analyzing each university issue included:

1. Is the issue a cost-to-continue issue (i.e., an issue that needs to be funded to continue current necessary operations of the state universities)?
2. Is the issue a restoration issue (i.e., an issue that restores reductions or that was funded from non-recurring appropriations in 2005-2006)?
3. Is the issue a high priority of the University Board of Trustees?
4. Does the issue address one or more of the BOG goals listed above?
5. Does the issue address an unmet SUS or State need?
6. Is the issue duplicative of another SUS program?
7. Does the issue have measurable outcomes?
8. Is the need clearly stated and the cost clearly justified?
9. Is there an existing facility or space to support this issue?
10. Does this issue require a new facility?
11. Does this issue require additional funding beyond 2006-2007?
12. Have other supporting comments/documentation been provided?

Given the total cost of all of the submitted proposals, staff then focused on each university's top three priorities. Then, staff looked at other proposals to determine if they addressed a specific State need or BOG goal.