

Budget Review and Development Council (BRDC)
February 4, 2016 9:00-10:30 a.m. (BA290)
Minutes

Members in Attendance:

Linda King	Tara Tietjen-Smith	Ray Green
Tim McMurray	Marshall Campbell	Dina Sosa
Sal Attardo	Greg Mitchell	Tim Willett
John Humphreys	Paula Hanson	Fred Fuentes
Brent Donham	Tina Livingston	Derryle Peace
Derald Harp	Janet Anderson	Betty Block
Sean Anderson	Erica Contreras	Mary Beth Sampson
Stephen Starnes	Barbara Corvey	Tomás Aguirre
Tim Letzring	Ricky Dobbs	Salvatore Attardo

- I. Welcome (Tina) – Tina welcomed the committee back and thanked everyone for their time and dedication.
- II. Minutes (Tina) – Motion was made to approve the minutes from January 20th by Brent Donham and Tim Willet seconding. Minutes approved.
- 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 continuing to meet and review GA classifications. He reviewed 4 types of GA's the committee had identified to distribute the GA baseline funds. Marshall stated the committee is looking at adjusting pay structure to be more competitive. He stated they are still in the conversation phase and pulling together data. Marshall began to discuss extra funding within academic affairs that could be distributed fairly. He continued to describe the model to use in funding areas of need. Coming up with a weight system using FTE's and semester credit hours. Marshall continued to explain the committees plan to develop a metrics and identified weighted areas to use with the assistance of deans and department heads.
 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 reviewed his committee charge. He stated the committee is trying to judge what is innovative and mentioned it can be difficult. He gave several examples of what could be considered as innovative. Greg mentioned his committee will put out a call for proposal in mid-February. He gave a timeline of when proposals would be due back to BRDC. He began describing the matrix and how it fits with the strategic plan and how it will demonstrate a return on investment. Greg stated the committee is looking for

a plan that is realistic. Greg mentioned the responsibility of relaying the plan and its importance. Paula suggested promoting this at UEC.

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) Dr. Dobbs explained the handouts. He described how the committee has developed the forms and continued reviewing them. Dr. Dobbs reviewed the charge and described how to identify innovative areas. He continued to explain how the committee would prioritize areas and make recommendations. Dr. Dobbs gave an example of how a search committee utilizes a search matrix and stated they were looking for that numerical break to identify high needs areas. Paula explained the summary document and how it should be used to prioritize the requests. She also suggested promoting this to UEC also. A discussion began regarding one-time funding and reoccurring funding to make sure it was clear. Janet mentioned there have been requests in the past that asked for one-time funding with a long term plan to get it started.

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) Dr. Donham described the proposed committees they are reviewing. He stated there were 22 different items to review and stated his committee was down to 8 or 9 of them. Dr. Donham explained how his committee was working towards identifying proposals that could be recommended. A discussion began regarding recommendations and resubmitting these committees for funding. Discussion began on different types of money to fund them. Tina gave several different examples of funding. Dr. Donham mentioned that his committee may need to go back to the departments who made the proposals and have them submit their reasoning and purpose to give more weight for their proposals. All agreed.

A discussion started regarding SSC and if they were weighted on performance appraisals. Tina explained the terms and conditions of the contract. Construction concerns were discussed. Paula mentioned some of the terms should be the same as before. She mentioned Brian McGinley is the person to contact regarding the contract. Tina asked the committee if we should invite him to the next meeting. All agreed. Discussions continued around SSC.

IV. Spring Enrollment Update (Dina Sosa) Dr. Sosa reviewed the enrollment report included in the packet and mentioned we are doing well on enrollment. She mentioned she would have a subsequence report ready for the committee at the next meeting. Discussions began about enrollment and the different types of enrollment and the type of growth. Dr. Sampson mentioned some enrollment counts are taken at different times of the semester and gave examples. Dean Sosa stated she can provide the data for the different types of enrollment. She mentioned bringing back the summer task force to the table to gather summer data. She thanked everyone for their teamwork regarding enrollment. Dean Sosa explained the charge from Dr. Jones regarding the summer task force. A discussion began regarding Steel Branding for our Hispanic Serving Institution recruiting. Dean Sosa reviewed enrollment percentages for H.S.I. and mentioned Lisa Martinez may have specific details to publish for advertising.

- V. State Economic Update from TASSCUBO (Paula and Tina) Paula gave an update from the TASSCUBO conference and reviewed handouts from the packet. She mentioned Glenn Hegar, Texas Comptroller, has been trying to provide assurance that our state budget is diversified and still stable for this biennium. Paula shared comments from Glenn Hegar and where we ranked in our economy. She continued to review several key points that impact our economy. Paula reviewed the Moody investors report and described how Hegar countered the report. Tina explained the revenue projections report for the FY 16-17 biennium. She stated this report is also a political tool and explained in detail how the projections were made. Tina continued to explain our position in this biennium and stated our enrollment would likely save us. She continued to explain our budget will likely be fine because of our geographical location and the impact the oil industry. Tina began to explain HEF funding and where our university is at. She continued to review details on the tuition revenue bond and formula funding. Tina gave an update regarding the THECB recommendation for a graduation bonus that was made based on the success of at-risk students.
- VI. Timeline - Paula stated the Strategic Initiatives are due back to BRDC by February 24. She mentioned they need to be completed for a vote by March 2nd. She reviewed the timeline and being flexible with the timeline. A short discussion took place regarding proposal pathways and the different areas in this year's charge.
- 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 11-15, 2016)
- VII. Reminders: Next Meeting(s):
- i. February 17th
 - ii. March 2nd