UBC Meeting Minutes
5/2/2013

2:00-3:30 PM, UC 322-323

I. Opening. Brief introduction into the role of the UBC. Reminder that first part of the meeting will include presentation. Public comment will be open after the presentation of information and then move into decision-making from the committee members.

II. Old Business:
   A. Motion to accept 4/17/2013 UBC minutes (motion seconded)
      - minutes approved
   B. Update on five strategic work groups. These committees are still being evaluated for potential charge and composition, but at present, over 80 people have volunteered to VP Reid. Not all will be selected to serve, because several of those committees will likely be smaller than 10 people in size.
      a. Committee member Hagfors requested that at least 2 ASUM senators be given representation on each subcommittee. VP Reid said that would be given consideration, but 2 reps would be unlikely due to the scale of some committees, but ASUM representation would be given a minimum of one slot on each group.

III. New Business:
   A. Presentation on 2014 Budget Document entitled Projecting the 2014 Shortfall. This document was based on projections made in the beginning of March 2013 in which a net 907 FTE decrease was forecast. Since that time- projections are looking much more favorably. The adjusted projections on the back page, (updated April 24, 2013), which draws from new data, now reflects an FTE decrease of 464 students in FY14. Because of this adjustment, the newest revenue number will be higher than the previous numbers, which were based off of lower enrollment projections.
      a. Open to questions from the first handout:
         i. No questions from the audience or committee
   B. Next handout- 2014 Revenue Projection
      Highlighted areas on this handout are directly tied to enrollment numbers. The total numbers for 2014 are about a million shy of the FY13 budget. One of the main challenges is the increase in expenditures, including a $6.5M increase in Pay Plan. The state legislation only covers 80% of the Pay Plan Bill, and we have to include the remaining 20%.
      a. Open to questions from the first handout:
         i. No questions from the audience or committee
   C. Across the Board Reductions handout- This was the proposed plan based off of initial revenue projections. This plan proposed 5.45% for each sector and 4.73% for centralized funds.
D. *Alternative Reduction Method* handout- This handout is based off of the motion from the previous University Budget Committee meeting (see minutes). The new proposal targets $6M from non-instructional adjustments and the remaining $2.1M will come from instruction. In summary- All sectors will face an approximate 6% budget reduction except for Instruction, which will see a 3.84% reduction. Academic Affairs, minus Instruction, will still see a 6% cut. If expenditures go away- and revenues exceed projections- we will directly channel funds into this $2.1M from instruction.

   a. Clarification on the Centralized Funds adjustment of 4.73% in previous proposal and 5.73% in new proposal. This is a large fund and the targeted savings areas have not been identified yet- but will be researched from the Budget office.

   b. Open for discussion with the audience:
      i. no questions from the audience

   c. Open for discussion with committee:
      i. Clarification sought for line item “Enhanced Business Practices” on *Alternative Reduction Method* handout.
      ii. Provost Brown opens with a two part suggestion. In review of the *Strategic Reallocation* document from previous meeting- the first line contained a typo and the $34k engineer position has been previously committed. The Provost would like to add the $34k back into strategic funding because it was mistakenly stricken from the document last meeting. The second suggestion the Provost would like to make is to move the remaining money from the Strategic Funding line towards instruction funding. The Strategic Reallocation is currently budgeted at $500k with $319k in line item spending. The Provost would like to move that remaining $181k towards instruction spending.

   d. Both suggestions are put forward as a single motion- (Brown)
      Motion seconded.
      i. **Motion passes.**

   e. Moving discussion onto the Alternative Reduction Method:
      i. Comments that these increased cuts across non-instructional sectors does mean some service areas such as grounds and maintenance will be negatively impacted- but these sector cuts are reasonable, yet needed and difficult.
      ii. Audience response- VP Whittenburg voices in favor of the new proposal.

   f. **Motion to accept Alternative Reduction Method proposal**- (Hirstein)
      Motion seconded– (Gianchetta)
      i. **Motion passes.**

IV. Going Forward- This information will be conveyed to the Implementation Committee for implementation and dissemination of information.

   A. Comments: 
i. On FY15 budget from VP Reid- State funding is determined from 3-year enrollment averages. Because of this, we have some buoyancy with our base allocation funding because the positive years in the past. But as we move forward- these recent two down years will have more weight in our average. This process is still ongoing.

ii. On FY14 budget from Provost Brown- Academic Affairs went from a projected cut of $5.6M using March numbers to $2.9M with the Alternative Reduction proposal and updated April numbers.

B. Motion to adjourn
   i. Motion passes