

**Budget Review and Development Council (BRDC)**  
**March 22, 2017 9:00-10:30 am (BA290)**

**Minutes**

**Members in attendance:**

Stephen Starnes	Brent Donham	Tim Letzring
Hunter Hayes	Greg Mitchell	Paula Hanson
Sarah Baker	Donna Spinato	Tina Livingston
Tim Willett	Tomas Aguirre	Janet Anderson
Rebekah Cooper	Mary Beth Sampson	Erica Contreras
Mark Giossi	Ray Green	Matt Wood
Tabetha Adkins	Dale Funderburk	Coy Martin

**Invited Guests:**

Lisa Blackwell  
Deanna Daffron  
Edward Romero

I. Welcome (Paula and Tina)

Paula opened the meeting thanking everyone for their dedication and hard work. She reviewed the agenda and welcomed Edward Romero, Lisa Blackwell, and Deanna Daffron and explained they were invited to the meeting to answer questions regarding the one time merit.

II. Minutes (Tina)

Tina thanked the committee and explained there were two set of minutes to approve due to the special meeting called on February 20<sup>th</sup>.

-February 15, 2017 Motion to approve was submitted by Janet Anderson, seconded by Tim Willet and unanimously passed.

-February 20, 2017 Motion to approve was submitted by Janet Anderson, seconded by Tim Willet and unanimously passed.

III. Legislative Update

Tina reviewed the SFC budget recommendations. Tina stated they are proposing to cut higher education funding by no less than 6%, but no more than 10%. She pointed out we were cut by 6.4% because we do not have many special items which makes our cut a little less than others. Tina stated she had hoped that these would not be the final budget numbers. She reminded everyone that this was the Senate recommendations and the House version of the budget is much better. Tina explained in detail how the House and the Senate take turns and this year is the Senate year.

Tina mentioned there were 42 bills related to higher education at the moment. She reviewed the legislative bill list and asked if anyone had questions. Paula added that the set asides are still being discussed too, but none of them have been passed yet. Discussions continued on events taking place in Austin. Tina mentioned that Brent Donham would be testifying before the Coordinating Board on the electrical engineering degree. Tim Letzring mentioned there are several proposed bills that would help with competency based programs.

IV. Remaining Recommendation:

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

Paula stated that a merit allocation was still being discussed by Dr. Keck. He is very interested in developing a model for one time merit. Based on the last meeting, a draft merit plan was developed. Paula reviewed the draft in detail and covered the recommended effective dates by the committee. Paula then discussed the Workday implementation and how it may be bad timing if we tried to give merit in the middle of changing the payroll system. Lisa confirmed that Nov. 24<sup>th</sup> was the last payroll running in BPP and the next would start with Workday.

Tina said that Lisa and HR will assist with questions on the one time merit. Lisa explained in detail the affects it would have for payroll and TRS. Paula stated there would not be any additional taxes than with employees' regular payroll. She also mentioned we were not sure about any increases in health insurance, but she plans on keeping everyone updated. Paula asked if we want to recommend a minimum amount of merit. Janet stated it would be better for those processing the budget if we had a minimum amount on the budget worksheet. Paula and Tina mentioned it is a recommendation and can be changed. Stephen Starnes said it was discussed at a faculty senate's executive committee meeting. He stated that faculty senate had expressed concerns regarding the faculty pay scale. Edward Romero stated that if it is just one time we should use the term "merit payment" instead of "one time merit raise". He stated there is a significant difference between the two; merit payment meaning one time only or merit raise implies ongoing. Tina asked the committee if merit raise would help moral across campus. The committee agreed it would. Discussions started regarding how the merit would need to be relayed. Tina added health care cost is a concern and as those rates increase we would hope that salaries could increase as well. Tina asked Deanna if there is a set criterion for merit on performance standards. Deanna replied that the policy states the performance levels should be satisfactory or higher based on performance, but there is no defining limit or amount that is set. Tina asked if we should move forward with the recommendation on the table. Paula mentioned we could add the concerns expressed to our recommendation. Discussions continued on performance and pay increase and the lack of rate adjustments. Donna mentioned things discussed today are helpful and good information to take to administration to get the issue resolved. Mark suggested that we not concern ourselves with the one-time merit and let someone else figure it out since the state budget is not final. Tim L. seconded. Motion accepted for proposing a permanent funding for merit if funding is available.

- V.     **Suggestions for next year**  
Tina asked for recommendations. Compression could be a topic for next year if there is funding for it. Tina asked to please forward your suggestions if you think of any. Meeting concluded.
- VI.    **Reminders:** Next meeting(s) will be canceled unless further discussion is requested.