

**Budget Review and Development Council (BRDC)**  
**February 15, 2017 9:00-10:30 am (BA290)**  
**Minutes**

Randy Harp  
Stephen Starnes  
Hunter Hayes  
Sarah Baker  
Tim Willett  
Rebekah Cooper  
Mark Giossi  
Tabetha Adkins

Brent Donham  
Greg Mitchell  
Donna Spinato  
Tomas Aguirre  
Mary Beth Sampson  
Ray Green  
Linda King  
Dale Funderburk

Michael Stark  
Tim Letzring  
Paula Hanson  
Tina Livingston  
Janet Anderson  
Tim McMurray  
Derryll Peace  
Erica Contreras

I. Welcome (Paula and Tina)

Tina reported on the status of the hiring freeze waiver and stated she would provide some updates on the bills that have been filed in the legislature that could have an impact on higher education.

II. Minutes (Tina)

One recommended change was made to the minutes by Mary Beth regarding the retention rate for graduate students. Amended minutes were approved.

III. Sub-Committee Updates:

- a. Develop a model for allocating additional operating budget (or one-time funds) campus-wide, taking into consideration the metrics-based operating model for academic departments developed last year. (Janet Anderson)*

Janet reported that Marshall had visited with their sub-committee and shared some insight on the previous year's model. The sub-committee looked at several different versions and options.

- b. Review the option of developing a one-time merit allocation vs. a permanent merit allocation.*

Paula presented a draft merit plan recommendation. She noted that we typically do a permanent merit, but one-time merit should be considered as an option based on the potential state budget cuts. She asked everyone for feedback and mentioned we had more time to discuss. There was some concerns expressed regarding confusion over the expectation of a permanent salary escalation.

Some members agreed that December is the preferred time of year for the merit to disperse. It was also discussed that the allocations could not be based on cost-of-living, but it must be merit-based. There was also a suggestion to provide a minimum amount like \$600.

***c. Develop an allocation method for meeting academic priorities as funding becomes available (i.e. faculty lines, adjuncts, summer school, GAs).*** (Shonda Gibson)

The sub-committee was not able to meet yet, but will be ready for discussion in the next meeting.

***d. Based on the strategic plan, allocate one-time seed money (approximately \$400,000) for innovative initiatives that would improve operational efficiencies and/or generate future revenues.*** (Greg Mitchell)

Greg noted the members on the committee, those returning and those new. When they met they started with going over last year's matrix decision, and then made some adjustments for FY 18. A timeline was included as to when we would notify and send out a proposal. People would have until March 31 to submit their proposals so the subcommittee would have time to review and bring suggestions to BRDC before it goes to the President. The factors changed slightly from last year, to include a minimum requirement of following an element of the strategic plan before moving onto a second weighted step. Then ROI was next. Greg then walked through the proposal form and talked about the importance of the return on investment using lightbulbs as an example. Brent asked how the deadline notification will go out. Greg said faculty/staff email. Ray asked for more specific wording to avoid jargon in the explanation.

The subcommittee had a financial report run and asked for feedback from whoever received funding last year. It appeared there were funds unspent. It was asked if regular updates, rather than a mid-year would be better. It was decided to send the initial announcement with the deadline for proposal submission that afternoon.

***e. Based on the strategic plan, identify a minimum of one percent of the annual budget to fund innovative new initiatives and/or meet University priorities, or if needed, to cover state reductions. Note: If one percent is not needed to cover budget reductions, this recommendation can be based on a reallocation within each division level.*** (Ray Green)

Ray mentioned that he had met with PAC and due to the legislative session they asked that the VP's hold onto the cuts in case they were needed for a state budget cut.

IV. Enrollment update (Shonda and Mary Beth)

Paula had just received a preliminary Spring enrollment report. *An updated report was emailed later in the week.*

V. Legislative Update (Paula and Tina)

Dr. Keck has been invited to testify in front of the House Appropriations Committee on Friday. Tina will send out the link to watch. We've been monitoring the bills filed regarding Higher Education, and there have been hundreds on bills filed and there will probably be hundreds more filed. Tina listed off several House and Senate bills that seemed the most interesting or applicable.

#### Closing the Loop Process (Janet)

Janet reviewed the Closing the loop document. No concerns were expressed. Ray moved and Tim W. seconded to accept the document.

#### VI. Reminders: Next Meeting(s)

Time: 9:00 – 10:30 am

##### Dates:

Mar. 1<sup>st</sup>

Mar. 22<sup>nd</sup>

Apr. 5<sup>th</sup> – Draft Sub-Committee recommendations due

Apr. 19<sup>th</sup> – Final Meeting/Final recommendations due (tentative)

May 3<sup>rd</sup> – PAC Presentations (tentative)