Faculty Meeting: Review of State Budget Allocations

Wayne Clough & Jean-Lou Chameau
September 14, 2004
Budget issues

• Governor recalls “payroll shift.”
• Leaves $170 m budget hole; USG “share” is $68 m; Tech “share” $7.3 m.
• Timing – very poor.
• Midyear tuition increase?
• Layoffs expected; enrollments capped?
• Total GT budget cuts to date, $45 m.
• FY06, formula funding restricted
Fall enrollment

Over 650 students are at other campuses or online
Retention improves

Percent still enrolled or graduated

Year enrolled as freshmen

- 1996
- 1999
- 2001
- 2003

2nd year  3rd year  4th year  5th year  6th year
Research awards
(in millions)
Budget expenditures


State funds = 34%

State funds = 25%

12,900 students

16,813 students

(in millions)

$0 $100 $200 $300 $400 $500 $600 $700 $800 $900

Total State

State funds = 34%

State funds = 25%
Public Peer Institutions
In-State Undergraduate Tuition and Fees
2003-2004

Peer Weighted 75th Percentile=$6,822
Peer Weighted Avg.=$5,805
Public Peer Institutions
Out-of-State Undergraduate Tuition and Fees
2003-2004

UT-Austin
Texas A&M
Florida
Virginia Tech
NC State
Georgia Tech
Washington
Purdue
Illinois
Penn State
Minnesota
Michigan
Penn State
Michigan
Berkeley
UCLA

Peer Weighted
Avg.=$17,144
Peer Weighted 75th Percentile=$19,328
Public Peer Institutions
In-State Graduate Tuition and Fees
2003-2004

Michigan
Penn State
Minnesota
Illinois
Washington
Virginia Tech
Berkeley
UCLA
Purdue
UT-Austin
Texas A&M
Florida
Georgia Tech
NC State

Peer Weighted Avg.=$7,057
Peer Weighted 75th Percentile=$7,800
Public Peer Institutions
Out-of-State Graduate Tuition and Fees
2003-2004

Michigan
Penn State
Illinois
Berkeley
UCLA
Florida
Purdue
Washington
Georgia Tech
NC State
Minnesota
UT-Austin
Texas A&M
Virginia Tech

Peer Weighted Avg. = $17,034
Peer Weighted 75th Percentile = $18,660
University System of Georgia
Projected enrollment

Source: System Capacity Study Presentation, November 2003
“The choices we make and the solutions we devise must support one key principle – we will maintain and strengthen academic excellence!...

The choice we must make is either to adjust to a funding shortfall or alter policies to compensate. As we consider this choice, let me remind you – quality is our guiding principle…

The choice we must make is we live with the effect of reduced resources on academic quality or we change our tuition policies. Again – quality is the guiding principle.

The choice we must make is to either live with the effects of keeping the doors open to all those prepared for college or revise our policies to reflect the size of the student body we can serve well.”

Chancellor Tom Meredith, USG
“This is our long-term strategy in light of what the state is realistically able to afford:

• Increasing tuition to manage a portion of the funding gap;

• Adjusting student enrollment and admissions to our actual physical and financial capacity to deliver high quality in instruction and research;

• Continuing to find efficiencies and savings whenever possible; and

• Cutting support personnel costs to handle part of the shortfall.”

Chancellor Tom Meredith, USG
New approaches – some examples

• Generate revenues (GATV, Exec Ed, Royalties, Ownership positions, etc.)
• Get agreement with state to delegate authority for operations, facilities.
• Agree on market value approach for tuition.
• Use 3rd party entities to acquire land.
• Work with state to create new approach to fund facilities critical to research and economic development.
• Continue to look for cost efficiencies.
Faculty honored

**National Medal of Technology:** Russell Dupuis, elec and comp engineering

**Presidental Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers:** Julia Kubanek, biology

**National Academy of Engineering:** Fred Juang, elec and computer eng, and Jeff Wu, industrial/systems eng

**Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award:** Charles Eckert, chemical & biomolecular engineering, and Charles Liotta, chemistry