

# Longwood University Planning Council

## Minutes April 29, 2013

Present: Ken Copeland Charles Ross  
Mark Lenker Wayne White  
Dick Bratcher Ruth Meese  
Penny Howard Chris Register  
Ken Perkins Charles White  
Tim Pierson Troy Austin  
Bryan Rowland Matt McGregor  
Suzy Palmer Tracy Nelson  
Jeannine Perry

Absent: Paul Barrett  
Joe Garcia

Minutes from the March 18 meeting were approved.

Ken Copeland discussed the timeline for developing the University's Operating Plan for FY14. The Board will approve tuition and fees on May 11. At that time, Finance will be able to predict institutional revenues for the coming year. Finance has between May 13 and early June to prepare the University's Operating Plan, which must be approved by the Board at its June meeting. Ken shared that Longwood's tuition proposal is consistent with increases that have been approved at other institutions. It is not anticipated that the Operating Plan format will change drastically from prior years.

Ken referenced FY13 budget documentation that was previously provided to UPC members. Documents provided were offered to aid understanding the existing budget structure and "self-funding" considerations. Again, he asked VPs to be creative in looking for efficiencies/savings, reallocations, or cost-sharing ideas. Consideration should also be given to initiatives that increase costs, but increase revenues to a greater extent. Ken also went over strategic initiatives that were previously identified for FY14 (and included in the President's presentation to the Board in March). VPs were asked to let Ken know if there are other initiatives that are deemed more important than the initiatives identified.

Mark Lenker asked Council members for comments on the draft UPC Proposal Scorecard. The scorecard is intended as a basis for ranking future UPC requests. It is meant to be a tool for ensuring sound criteria is utilized in evaluating funding requests – to assist UPC members in prioritizing requests for discussion purposes. Members provided many comments, including whether the Council should be considering "needs" or "wants". It was recommended that fundamental needs (such as safety) should be considered at the administrative level, as opposed to being considered by the UPC. It was also pointed out that, in the spirit of transparency, the UPC should be made aware of such funding decisions. It was emphasized that funding proposals should consider all costs to implement a particular project/program.

VPs were asked to be prepared to discuss “self-funding” considerations at the next UPC meeting. Additionally, each VP is to email Ken the **top 5 priorities** from their respective areas. This information should be provided by COB May 3.

The next UPC meeting is scheduled for May 9 at 3:30 pm. Finance will provide Council with revenue projections at that meeting.