Members in Attendance:
Chair Don DeHayes, Vice Chair Bob Weygand, Peter Alfonso, Abu Bakr, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels (via phone), Ray Wright, Peter Larson, Nancy Eaton, Cheryl Foster, Patricia Morokoff, Steve D’Hondt, Thorr Bjorn, Trish Casey, Ron Jordan, Scott Martin, Michael Smith, Winnie Brownell, Linda Barrett, Ann Morrissey

Members Absent:
Bob Beagle, Ken Kermes, Jeff Johnson, Stephanie Segal, Tom Dougan

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc/Membership%2011.pdf

Meeting Minutes
1. Chair calls meeting to order at 9:05 am.

Agenda Items

1. SBPC Team Budget Presentation: Division of Administration and Finance
   a. Presented by Ron Jordan, Scott Martin, and Bob Beagle (Excused)
   b. Ron Jordan indicated that he and Scott Martin met with Bob Weygand and as a result of that meeting, the Vice President decided to change his divisional request.
   c. Ron Jordan presented the factual overview of the Division’s revised request.
      i. The team questioned the percentage of the Division’s total unrestricted budget represented by the original request.
      ii. A question (discussed in prior meetings by the council) was raised: Does the rubric for requests put divisions other than Academic Affairs at a disadvantage in terms of evaluating requests?
   d. Critique of Request presented by Scott Martin
      i. Outside companies manage many URI projects and this seems inefficient. Hiring a project manager may save the University money with increased efficiency in project management.
   e. Chair invites Vice Chair of SBPC and Vice President of Finance & Administration Bob Weygand to comment on the presentation
      i. Vice Chair thanked the presenters for a thorough and objective presentation.
      ii. Vice Chair thinks this type of third-party review is important, not just for new requests, but for current budgets as well.
      iii. Administration and Finance was able to reallocate funds within the divisional budget to fund an Internal Auditor position, which SBPC had determined last
year to be a priority, but the funding needed to be found within the existing budget. Trish Casey currently acts like an auditor.

iv. Administration and Finance is working to develop a fraud hotline to become available to the URI community in the near future.

v. Outside project management can be very costly. URI can reduce expense with an internal Project Manager.

vi. Rather than invest more resources in staffing, the Budget & Financial Planning Office should not respond to every request.

e. Question and Answer period

i. Fleet issues (work trucks, police vehicles) are a huge issue for the entire University. Ron Jordan requests that a spreadsheet with a long-term maintenance plan be developed and compared with other institutions in terms of resource investments in this area. Bob Weygand responds that they have replacement plan for vehicles, but are stringing out replacements longer than the plan indicates.

ii. Sworn officers are not the same as security officers. The comparative data in the presentation does not take into account the number of security officers dedicated to the various URI campuses.

iii. The revised Administration and Finance budget request, which was presented, has not yet been distributed to the Council (Note: Revised request and accompanying presentation have since been circulated to all Council members).

iv. There is a discussion to clarify when an auditor position was switched to a chief accountant (Note: The reclassification was detailed in the BFPO Review of the Administration and Finance Budget Request). There were two Internal Auditors; one was assigned to work on Ryan/Boss finances. When they left, a Chief Accountant replaced the Internal Auditor and works on Ryan/Boss finances.

v. Discussion on the fiscal efficiency of outsourcing management of Ryan Center and Boss Arena. There is concern that if we need an internal auditor to monitor the management, then perhaps the management is not needed. Vice Chair explains to the council that Global Spectrum, who currently is under contract to manage the Ryan Center and Boss Arena, has done an excellent job maintaining the condition of the facilities and saves the University a lot of money in doing so. That being said, he added that it is still worthwhile for the University to monitor Global Spectrum's performance under the contract.

vi. The Vice Chair shared his concern that many Fund 101’s have no systematic way of accounting for their accounts receivable. Specific control concerns relate to the verification of appropriate rate charges and amounts owed.

vii. Chair: (Commenting on the request for additional Sworn Police Officers) the safety of URI staff and students is critical.

viii. In response to questions, the Vice Chair clarified that new police officers, if request is granted by the Council, would primarily be serving in Kingston. Hiring
of these officers will cut down on overtime costs. It is unclear, at this moment, how much savings will be realized in reduced overtime.

ix. Graduate School of Oceanography (GSO) at Narragansett Bay Campus (NBC) is within Narragansett Police jurisdiction while the Kingston Campus is not. GSO at NBC has four security officers and one supervising security officer. Providence Campus has one sworn officer and the person often has to report to Kingston for meetings. Alton Jones has no sworn officers. Regarding Providence, there is heavy coordination with the Providence Police, given the location of the campus. NBC coordinates extensively with Narragansett Police when police presence is needed. Security at Providence Campus discussed; designed security system at that location; extra level of cameras, voice alerts; initially involvement from Providence Police; our commitment for a Lieutenant provides the link; we pay into city fund for security; additional personnel are assigned when students are moving. Vice Chair indicated that if a change was warranted, he would reallocate personnel to Providence.

g. Chair Motions for 15 minute extension of discussion and extension is unanimously extended.

i. The Chair suggests that signage is something that could be handled at the end of each fiscal year with any fund balance left over within the Administration and Finance existing budget.

ii. Discussion ensued on how intra-divisional requests should be handled in the future. Perhaps there should be a separate presentation dedicated to these types of requests? The Vice Chair notes that it is the responsibility of the VPs to collaborate before requests are submitted to hash out funding splits to avoid more time of the committee with additional presentations. The Chair urges that coordinating requests with other divisions is not only done to produce savings, but also to improve organization and administrative efficiency.

iii. The Vice Chair affirmed the greatest need for police presence is on the Kingston Campus. If that changes, the distribution of police officers on each campus will be adjusted.

iv. The Vice Chair informed the Council that the cost for preparing the Administration and Finance request was $8,000. In response to a question about how this figure was arrived at, the Vice Chair indicated that more specific information would be provided to the Council, such as the number of work hours this equates to. The Chair pointed out that whether or not there was an SBPC process, resources to organize and evaluate new budgetary requests would be needed within each Division. Costs such as the $8,000 spent by Administration and Finance may not be directly tied to the existence of the SBPC process.

v. The Council appreciated the format of the Administration and Finance request, in tiers of priority, made it very easy to digest.
vi. In response to the Vice Chair’s expressed concerns about the Request Template, it was noted that the criteria for the scoring rubric for all requests was the foundation for the factors developed in the Request Template. The intent was to allow the VPs the opportunity to explicitly provide a rationale relative to the voting rubric criteria. The process also allows for internal and external accountability, provides each Division with a third party, objective analysis, and greater accountability overall. The quality of the Council’s discussions is notably improved this year. This was discussed and voted on by the Council at prior meetings. The process will be debriefed for potential improvement before the next round of budget requests.

vii. It was suggested that changing the signage of the campus at a cost of $220,000 within a $300 million University budget should be done all at once instead of phased in over several years.

viii. The Chair noted that once SBPC completes all rubrics, scores for requests will be presented to the Council and SBPC will then hold a discussion and consider how or whether requests might be potentially altered. For example: The request for two police officers could be reduced to one police officer.

ix. It was noted that there are interdivisional issues and an apparent need for greater collaboration between division heads prior to finalizing requests that come to the Council.

x. The Chair noted the overall value of the SBPC budget process. The University is anticipating a very lean year and perhaps a budget shortfall. As the Council’s process occurs it allows for the vetting of campus needs and the education of the Council as to what it takes to run a University. There is value in sharing priorities and needs from all across campus. There will probably never be 100% agreement on what the rubrics and templates should entail, but we will improve it over time.

xi. It was noted by a Council member, that there is still opportunity for the Council to be even more forward thinking if we took a multi-year view.

xii. The Vice Chair noted that the Council currently considers only one or two percent of the unrestricted budget and suggests that, in a period of diminishing state support, we need to look at other opportunities. Total enrollment will not be changing dramatically year to year. We need to look at how we spend the entire budget, not just the one or two percent related to new requests. The Chair commented this would be particularly challenging for the Council and the hope is that each of the divisions have in place a process that carefully examines such factors as the use of resources through data collection, study and benchmarking, strategic planning and a corresponding divisional budget process, including potential for reallocation of resources within the division.

2. Announcements
   a. Next Meeting: May 30, 9:00am - 12:00pm, Memorial Union, Student Senate Chambers (Note: Change in Location).
b. 10:47am- Meeting adjourned.
3. Meeting adjourned.

Request for Information:

None

Information to be provided:

Per Vice Chair: The cost for preparing the Administration and Finance request was $8,000. There will be a future report on how many work hours this equates to.

Minutes by: John O’Lerio