**Planning & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

**March 7, 2018**

Present: Bates, Chan, Crowley, Glascock, Hendrix, Kalter, Lacy, Lewis, Mainieri, Martinez, Marx, Nikolaou, Roberts

Not Present: Meyer (sabbatical), Schaab, Noel-Elkins, Pryhuber, Rubio, Standridge

* Meeting purpose: Continue work on report
* Marx distributed survey of institutional priorities we brainstormed on 2/7/18 – asked each committee member to complete survey to help create initial draft of report
* Marx discussed institutional priority item related to starting an engineering program
  + Subcommittee has been formed to investigate based on past recommendation
  + Estimated 16 faculty total (10 new), proposed space is Green building
  + Don’t know yet cost of renovating the building or timeline
  + Glascock question: what is the rationale for this plan?
  + Marx response: market research indicates a high demand of students with high return on investment fairly quickly
  + Lacy: we haven’t seen a white paper from the subcommittee to present to administration
  + Marx response: white paper is in progress, still gathering information
  + Lacy: any estimate you receive for the white paper will really be a ball park, a lot of work yet to be done, does seem to be a viable market to attract students we can’t currently attract
  + Marx: Dr. Dietz should have the white paper in early summer to consider
  + Kalter: process is financial implications then curriculum
  + Could have a statement in report in support of that initiative
* Marx reviewed email from Hendrix about questions raised in 2/7 meeting
  + Clarification of definition of institution of support
  + Clarification of definition of payments on behalf of the university and how those are determined
* Marx addressed handout from Martinez presented in 2/7 meeting
  + Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability FY18 report about state liability for state employees’ group health and life insurance
* Mainieri intro idea to rethink what we’re asking for in the report so that we can hear from the VPs what their priorities are first
  + Bates: agree that we might be missing things without asking for what their priorities are because they’re just responding to what we’ve put in the report
  + Kalter: is there any reason not to skip a year? Delay to Fall of 2020?
  + Marx: administration has expressed some confusion about what was expected from the report – asking if the expectation is to do something between May and November on these items
  + Mainieri: need to rethink the directionality of the input to start with unit input
  + Marx: previous discussions have thought about distributing to the Deans in addition to the VPs
  + Lacy: end of this month are open budget presentations from colleges that will talk about progress and goals for upcoming year, all requests have to have direct connection to University Strategic plan, so by the time this report comes out too late to be meaningful to Deans, also a lot of the initiatives in the report are beyond the scope of an individual college, perhaps distribute more as an information item to Deans
  + Crowley: Need to hear from them what their priorities are, determine what our priorities are, see where there are overlaps, and use that information to determine who to invite for presentations; also in terms of process, meeting one: presentation (for part) then (committee take aways) then meeting two: committee draft that part of the report; would support delaying for a year
  + Kalter: current blue book says we have to produce a report every year, no reason we couldn’t change that to multiple reports related to multiple long term priorities, then maybe at end of year do a cumulative report
  + Crowley: at end of year collective report with summary of new items
  + Marx: if we would like to change the process, we would need to see this year through and do report this year as planned and institute changes next year
  + Kalter: would probably have to ask the Executive Committee to amend the Issues Pending
  + Martinez: motion?
  + Marx: motion is to change the process, inviting visitors to hear priorities, have the report process be more organic (produce a report when ready)
  + Committee not quite ready to vote
  + Crowley to draft proposed changes to distribute to committee for action item next time