I. Welcome (Tina) Tina welcomed the committee. Dina Sosa gave an update on the D.O.E. Program Review. She mentioned the auditors seemed to be very pleased with their findings and extended her appreciations to all who were vital in gathering information for the extensive audit. Dina stated there were a few items remaining, but overall it appeared to be successful.

II. Minutes (Tina) Minutes were approved by the committee.

III. Sub-Committees Updates:

1. **Develop a zero-based (metric driven) budget for allocating GA budget and Develop a new metrics-based operating budget model for academic departments.** (Marshall Campbell) Marshall stated the committee is still gathering information, but are making progress and hoped to have additional information out to the committee soon. He reviewed the timeline in which his committee hoped to present their findings to the committee on April 13th then to PAC thereafter. Marshall stated the plan is to implement the operating budget model for future years, stating there isn’t enough time to put in place this year.

2. **Based on the new strategic plan, allocate one-time seed money for innovative initiatives that would improve operational efficiencies and/or generate future revenues.** (Greg Mitchell) Greg stated his committee didn’t have any updates at the moment to report. Brent stated there would be no problem getting applications. Discussions began on tentative timelines for presentations.

3. **Based on the new strategic plan, reallocate a minimum of one percent of the annual budget to fund innovative new initiatives and/or meet University priorities.** (Ricky Dobbs) Ricky reviewed several handouts the subcommittees used and how the committee developed the point system for the ballots. He continued to explain in
detail how the points system works. Ricky thanked everyone who helped in developing the rating system. Ricky stated the assessment needed to be quantified. He urged people to view this as important and take it seriously. He and Paula stated the president was supportive of the new process and does review it. Discussions began regarding additional items that are not listed on the matrix. Tina explained the role of the BRDC sub-committee being similar to a search committee using a matrix. She stated recommendations are given to BRDC for their consideration. Mary Beth expressed concerns regarding a proposal to support our doctoral students. A discussion began regarding the need for such support and other areas in need of support like UPD officers. Discussions continued regarding another avenue to address university needs like faculty and UPD officers. Ricky stated the guidelines from the president were clear and his committee tried very hard to follow those guidelines. He explained how the alignment fits with the goals outlined. Discussions continued around the format and the process in which the ratings are tallied. Tina offered an explanation and stated that there is only a limited amount of funds. The voting timeline was discussed and she stated the revised ballots would be sent out and they would be due back to Erica by Friday, March 4th. Tim Willett and Barb Corvey will help review the ballots.

4. **Review last year’s recommendations (start-up funding, marketing, accountability measures) and prioritize initiatives to be considered if additional funding is available.** (Brent Donham) Brent stated finalized details from his committee are forthcoming.

IV. Review and vote on Strategic Initiatives

V. Timeline Paula reviewed the timeline and mentioned the committees with recommendations still pending.
   a. Budget is due to A&M System March 7th
   b. 1% Reallocation needed for Budget
   c. Other recommendations needed by end of March
   d. Tentative timeline for Presentations to PAC-April 25th? Or May 10th?

VI. Reminders: Next Meeting(s):
   i. March 23rd
   ii. April 13th