**UAS Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC)**

**March 3, 2014 Meeting Notes**

In Attendance: JPugh, MCiri, RCaulfield, JNelson, BHyde, KGerken, DMeador, CHedlin, JBlanchard, MSousa, DLo, VFredenberg, ETomlinson, DBlankenship, JKramlich, BHegel, PTraxler, GRichardson, JHansen, PSchulte, WMiles, and MMoya

**UA & UAS Budget Overview and Update**

JPugh reported the Legislature’s House Finance subcommittees concluded their work. The university subcommittee decreased the university’s budget by another $1 million dollars. (UAS’ likely share would be $80,000, on top of the $1.8M already proposed for reduction). He added that the House Finance subcommittee also removed funding for Alaska’s Learning Network--AKLAN. The full House Finance committee is currently taking public testimony. AKLN funding will likely be addressed again in the Senate.

**FY15 Budget – Possible Revenue Enhancements & Identified Reductions (up to 6%, by unit)**

RCaulfield explained he sent out a memo asking Deans and Directors to work with faculty and staff in their units to come up with revenue enhancements and identify cost reductions. The response to this memo is due March 13th. He stressed that it’s important to anticipate how to deal with future budget reductions. The Chancellor added an important way to increase revenues is to attract local students to UAS’ two year programs and get them to complete their GERs locally.

**Review of Ongoing Expenditure from Carry-Forward Funds**

RCaulfield explained that supporting material was posted on the SPBAC website about ongoing UAS expenditures from UFB (aka carry-forward funds). BHyde added that UFB was originally used to fund short duration projects (e.g. ACRC), but more recently has been used to fund ongoing endeavors such as Summer Bridge, accreditation, various remodeling projects, public relations and marketing campaigns, and the Learning Center. She added that less UFB anticipated is anticipated in the future. The committee discussed the option of each unit retaining a portion of any UFB they might generate so they could retain latitude within their units to address one-time, high cost expenses. While no action was taken on this point, the SPBAC may want to make a recommendation to the Chancellor about this idea in the future.

**Review of FY15 TVEP Proposals**

RCaulfield reported he sent to SPBAC members background information about TVEP and UAS’ current FY15 TVEP funding requests recently submitted to Statewide. He added that TVEP funds are generated from interest earned by the state’s unemployment insurance funds and is used primarily for workforce development (career-technical education) to respond to industry employment needs. He explained UAS’ internal TVEP funding request process and how TVEP funds are reviewed and distributed within the UA system. He added that the Legislature is currently reviewing re-authorizing legislation for TVEP.

**Non-resident/WUE Tuition Discussion**

RCaulfield explained management is considering ways to change non-resident/WUE tuition parameters in ways to increase student enrollments and to enhance revenues. One idea under consideration would offer resident tuition to all non-residents whose parents or grandparents were born in Alaska. This could attract more students who have family ties to Southeast Alaska—including Alaska Natives (Sealaska shareholders and others) in the Pacific Northwest who are interested in rekindling cultural ties with their home region. SPBAC discussed other possible variations and their target audiences.

**FY16 Proposal Ranking Form and Process**

RCaulfield presented a set of draft criteria for reviewing new budget proposals was forwarded to SPBAC. He added the criteria ties budget requests to UAS’ mission and strategic plan, and would be used as a vehicle for scoring and vetting new proposals. SPBAC members offered several ideas and suggested modifications--including adding weights to each criteria. VFredenberg questioned the value of numeric scores since they are not very applicable in most circumstances. PSchulte added that a scoring system could inadvertently constrict careful consideration of budget requests. RCaulfield noted he has seen a similar structure work effectively elsewhere, emphasizing that such scoring was only the beginning of a conversation in the SPBAC about funding proposals.

SPBAC agreed that the scoring mechanism will only be the starting point for committee discussion about priorities and recommendations. The SPBAC agreed to test the draft criteria for FY16 proposals and then to revisit the criteria and scoring process if necessary.

**Proposed SPBAC Secure Website for Committee**

The committee discussed the idea of having a secure SPBAC website that could be created that would allow the committee to consider draft work product. The committee came to the conclusion that a separate website might send the wrong message to faculty and staff. The existing open website will be used for sharing information.

**Next SPBAC Meeting**: The next SPBAC meeting is scheduled for April 14th 2:00 to 3:30pm (in GVR and via audio conference).