

Allocation of Administrative Funds

Query – 06.07.2011

Query:

As you may know, the current budget cuts may *potentially* affect the SAHE administrative funds this fiscal year. Most states have allocated a portion of their administrative budget to subsidize the Title IIA coordinator's/director's salary.

I know there is a lot of flexibility in how each state may use these funds, but generally speaking, **I was wondering what percentage of the administrative budget you have allocated to cover the following costs:**

% for salary and/or benefits;

% for travel;

% for operation costs (reviewers' fee, postage, supplies, etc.)

Thank you so much.

From: Saeed Sarani (OK)

Responses:

Teddi Safman Utah	I use some portion of mine for travel and some portion for meetings that are in some way either directly or indirectly related to professional development. None of it is used for my salary or benefits. This gives me the freedom to fund a nascent project or do more professional development.
Marta Coll-Rivera Puerto Rico	<p>We do not allocate by % but rather by past year level of expenses per budget item. But based on the past 2 years the % allocation would be:</p> <p>For salaries and benefits: around 64% (coordinator & assistant)</p> <p>For travel: around 3.5% (USDE-NCLB & SHEEO annual meetings in the US, per diem for 2 monitoring visits per project)</p> <p>For operation costs: the remaining 32.5%</p>
Mark Bergeson Washington	<p>In Washington, under the old (pre-cut) funding model, we used about 50-65% of our admin money to pay for salary and benefits corresponding to about 0.3-0.4 FTE of my time (65% and .04 FTE apply for years during which we issue an RFP). About 7% would be for travel (including conferences and 1 monitoring visit/project/year), and the rest would be for operations, including hiring consultants to help us develop an RFP, evaluate proposals, and report program results.</p> <p>Right now, we have enough unspent prior year money that we can maintain pre-cut spending levels for probably as long as the program exists in its current form. However, if we were forced to "pay as we go" under the new (post-cut) funding model, we would use about 60-80% of our admin money to pay for salary, 7% for travel, and the rest for operations. We would make up for the reduced budget by reducing our use of consultants.</p>
Suzanne Mitchell Arkansas	In Arkansas the administrative funds are as follows: salary and benefits - 77% (part time person)

	<p>travel - 6%</p> <p>operations - 11%</p> <p>consultants/reviewers 6%</p>
<p>Susan Lee Mississippi</p>	<p>Our budget breakdown is as follows:</p> <p>0% for Salaries</p> <p>54% for Travel</p> <p>11% for Contractual Services</p> <p>21% for Commodities</p> <p>14% for Capital Outlay</p>
<p>Melinda Vann Maryland</p>	<p>Maryland ITQ SAHE Admin Funds:</p> <p>0% salary/fringe</p> <p>37% (approx \$20K) travel/review panel honorarium/printing/postage etc. direct costs of administering the program</p> <p>63% (approx \$34K) indirect costs such share of general phone expense, rent, electric, gas, etc.</p> <p>This isn't exactly the breakout you are looking for but you get the gist...</p>
<p>Russ Utgard Ohio</p>	<p>Ohio administrative funds are used roughly as follows:</p> <p>Salaries and benefits (coordinator and assistants)-50%</p> <p>Reviewers – 10%</p> <p>Travel – 7%</p> <p>Operational costs -33%</p>
<p>Paula A. Gregg South Carolina</p>	<p>The approximation I have for the budget for SAHE administrative funds is:</p> <p>25% for salary</p> <p>18% for travel</p> <p>57% for operation costs</p>