Members in Attendance:
Chair Don DeHayes, Vice Chair Christina Valentino, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Ray Wright, Patricia Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Mark Higgins, Ellen Reynolds, Kim Washor, Sharon Bell, Linda Barrett, David Byrd, Thorr Bjorn, Tom Dougan, Naomi Thompson, Gerald Sonnenfeld, Annu Matthew, Scott Martin, Ken Kermes

Members Absent:
Michael Smith, Matt Kilduff, Steve D'Hondt

1. Announcements
   a. The carry-forward policy within major units, colleges or divisions subcommittee and the Long-Term Planning subcommittee have both met once. The pros and cons of a carry forward process have been explored and preliminary research has been done to explore potential long-term budgeting practices, both subcommittees will report in a future meeting. The FY2014 projected budget shortfall is mostly to the result of a decline in graduate student enrollment. URI has hit target marks in other enrollment projections. Academic Affairs is working to create a process that would incentivize Deans to develop strategies for increasing graduate enrollment numbers.

2. Approval of Minutes - November 14, 2013
   a. Minutes approved unanimously

3. Fund Balance Proposals for Consideration

   Provost: The strategic portion of the fund balance as of June 30, 2013 will be used exclusively for one-time-only strategic projects. There are four items that have been identified by the President's team for further consideration by the SBPC.

   a. Admissions Visitor, Welcome and Presentation Center (Planning Phase)- Outlined by Dean Libutti:
   b. Active Learning Classroom- Outlined by Provost DeHayes :
   c. LGBTQ Center- Outlined by Naomi Thompson:
   d. IT Campus-wide Security- Outlined by Mike Khalfayan:

General Discussion:

Provost (On a limit of projects or total dollars which can be spent on these projects): The President believed the University could possibly afford all four of these projects. Preliminary research shows the contingency fund, which usually would not be spent, should probably be in the range of 3-4%. The President believes these four items have merit. If the SBPC believes one could potentially be a waste of money, the President would pay attention to that comment. This Council is as wise a group that exists within the University structure, in terms of budget and strategic planning, and the President is mindful of suggestions and comments which come from it.
Vice Chair (On the potential for projects to run over budget and the process for addressing such a situation): The SBPC will always be kept abreast of construction costs associated with all of these items. At this juncture, there is a level of confidentiality in the competitive negotiating process, which limits the information that can be shared with the committee.

Provost (on balancing the budget): The nature of the contingency fund is that the President could make the decision to use part of the fund balance to bridge a shortfall. Linda read a portion of the existing policy: “The projects recommended by the President are then forwarded to SBPC for their information, review, and commentary, which are shared with the President.”

URI is often concerned with value engineering and, at times, it has led to buildings which are unable to meet the needs of the original plans. URI needs to get an idea of the dollar amount which would be needed to build a quality building and then decide if the cost is worth the potential benefits. This type of analysis needs to be applied to each item outlined here today. This line of thinking is important in cases where URI is faced with strategic budgetary decisions.

The SBPC will look into projects which were vetted by the President's team and were not presented to the council. There could be value in the SBPC analyzing these projects to see if the four brought before the Council are indeed the four most pressing items for the future of the University.

Provost: The President has not asked for an official recommendation on any of these projects. The projects will not move forward as SBPC-endorsed projects. The President has asked, per the current process, for comments on each project from the Council.

These projects are being presented as one-time-only costs, but the new buildings will require ongoing annual costs. The past year, URI has been talking mostly about shortfalls and now the conversation has moved to new costs. In deciding the value of these projects, it would be best to know the annual ongoing costs of each project and the estimated cost.

There was a question as to whether several projects were already committed. The Chair indicated that the President wants to know if the Council thinks a project has strategic value.

4. The Council was apprised of each project, asked questions, made comments and supported each project as there was no suggestion that any of the four projects should not move forward. However, the Council expressed interest in the opportunity to review the notes of the project discussion and, if desired, to offer further comments which would be shared with the President. Description and discussion of projects will be emailed to Council members and if they have any comments, on any or all projects they will email them to all members. If a member does not support a project, they will note that with their reasons.

5. **Active Learning Classroom**
   **Outlined by Provost DeHayes at 12.11.13 meeting:**

   A space has been identified in the Library for the placement of an active learning classroom. URI faculty and students are enthused about this idea. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee and the Instructional Development Program were engaged in the discussion of creating an active learning classroom. URI has
the capacity to add an interactive learning classroom on campus. Funding was earmarked for this in FY2013; but, intentionally not spent for other items when this project could not be done in FY2013.

A brief film clip from the University of Minnesota was played for the Council. The clip explained the various benefits of engaging students within an active learning classroom, including peer evaluation “on the fly”, instantly becoming part of a team and concept labs instead of lectures. The UMllass video clip was not shown due to time limitations; but, if there is interest from the Council it could be shown another time.

**Discussion at 12.13.13 meeting:**

Provost (On number of active learning classrooms the University envisions): As new buildings are brought online on campus, the new learning environments will be incorporated. The original plans for the new Chemistry building looked very much like the old Pastore Chemistry building. The discussion with the Chemistry Department was this: how will students be learning chemistry in 2020 and beyond? The new Chemistry building could now be a place where active learning classrooms are located.

This project is being presented as a one-time-only cost.

Strategic – accommodates new way of teaching/learning

6. **Admissions Visitor, Welcome and Presentation Center (Planning Phase)**

*Outlined by Dean Libutti at 12.11.13 meeting:*

Many universities are showcasing their campuses for visitors with a Welcome Facility. URI needs to do the same. Visitors to the Kingston campus are sent all over campus during visits. Visiting URI for the first time can be a disjointed and confusing process. URI now has as many as 60,000 annual visitors; a few years ago there were 20,000 annual visitors. URI is behind in developing this idea. The return on investment for this project would be realized for years to come. A welcome center is essential for future recruitment and retention of students. The project can be done affordably and will provide URI with a facility which can be dedicated daily, from 8am-10pm, and ensure visitors have an excellent experience at URI. Will allow the University to welcome, present and have events; have spoken with Graduate School, Events and Planning office and others. The Chair reminded the Council that following last year’s CIP presentation to the Council, the Council suggested moving this item up in the priority list.

**Discussion at 12.13.13 meeting:**

The Institute of International Sports was considered as a place to be used as a Visitor, Welcome and Presentation Center. The issue is the location of the building. It is poorly situated on campus for visitors to see all the things they commonly want to see. A shuttle system would need to be implemented for it to be viable. Enrollment Services vetted several scenarios of using existing buildings for a Center and there were serious issues with each one. A Center would be driven by the needs of Admissions. Secondarily, the building could be used as a venue for special events. The Graduate School, in particular, is in dire need of space for events. Enrollment Services has studied best practices in admissions processes and has incorporated these findings into the plan for a Visitor, Welcome and Presentation Center. It is important to conceptualize all the needs of the Center and then budget for a building which meets all of these needs.
This project is being presented as a one-time-only cost, but the new building will require ongoing annual costs. In deciding the value of this project, it would be best to know the annual ongoing costs of this project.

The Chair reminded the members that last April, during the CIP presentation to the Council, the Council noted that this project should be moved up to a position of high priority, higher than was reflected on the CIP.

Planning costs are estimated at $200,000. Construction costs are estimated from $8M-$9.5M.

Admissions Visitor, Welcome and Presentation Center

- Engage everyone; Admissions is the focus; all stakeholders; but, not offices for all
- Gateway to the University
- A building we can use in the future yet solves immediate challenge
- Return on investment on several levels

7. LGBTQ Center

Outlined by Naomi Thompson at 12.11.13 meeting:

LGBTQ resides under Community, Equity and Diversity (CED). Everyone probably has a connection with someone associated with CED. Having a LGBTQ Center sends a message to the external community that this community is a priority for the University. The history of the University's relationship with the LGBTQ community is not all positive. Since 2010, the University has taken action to change this perception. Over the past year and a half, there have been over 50 programs offered by the Office of Community, Equity and Diversity to create a welcoming and inclusive community and promote an environment of understanding. The proposal calls for a brand new, stand-alone building for LGBTQ, which would be located near the Women's Center and synergy is expected between the two entities. The building would provide a safe place for members of the URI community. URI leadership made a commitment to build the first free-standing structure for LGBTQ in the U.S. Training and classes will be held in the building. The construction of the building would signify a visible and public statement to the world of URI's love and support for all members of the community. About 10% of the population identifies as LGBTQ. This initiative also has recruitment and retention implications.

Discussion at 12.13.13 meeting:

Vice Chair (On the potential for projects to run over budget and the process for addressing such a situation): URI has entered in competitive negotiation with the three lowest bidders on the LGBTQ project. There is hope that value-engineering could lower some of the bids. The SBPC will always be kept abreast of construction costs associated with all of these items. At this juncture, there is a level of confidentiality in the competitive negotiating process, which limits the information that can be shared with the committee.

URI is often concerned with value engineering and, at times, it has led to buildings which are unable to meet the needs of the original plans. URI needs to get an idea of the dollar amount which would be needed to build a quality building and then decide if the cost is worth the potential benefits. This type of analysis needs to be applied to each item outlined here today. This line of thinking is important in cases where URI is faced with strategic budgetary decisions.
The original plan for the LGBTQ Center was to fully renovate Ruggles, which was expected to cost $900,000. At that time, it was believed that for a modest additional cost, a new building would provide more value. At this time, the bids are so much higher than the initial expectations and URI needs a full explanation of why this is the case.

This project is being presented as a one-time-only cost, but this new building will require ongoing annual costs. In deciding the value of these projects, it would be best to know the annual ongoing costs of this project.

- University is making a statement
- University is taking concerns seriously
- Council informed of approximate cost of $1.4M to $2M at this time; and they urged the University to do the project the right way and not to compromise quality
- Council urged that the project not be diminished in its purpose
- Council was comfortable with the project

8. IT Campus-wide Security
Outlined by Mike Khalfayan at 12.11.13 meeting:

Sensitive information is disbursed throughout the URI campus. There are daily threats to steal information. About four months ago, URI tested the defenses of the University using the Fire Eye equipment. The test showed instances of potential data theft and there was at least one URI-owned machine which had become remotely controlled by an outside party. There were more than 150 malware binaries. This appliance has exposed issues with the URI network which were previously unknown.

Provost: In the name of full disclosure, this machine has already been purchased by Academic Affairs. The rationale for the purchase was that giving this machine back, after it had been loaned to us for the test, would be a mistake. This item is on the agenda because Academic Affairs would be reimbursed for the purchase using fund balance dollars.

Discussion at 12.13.13 meeting:

The President believes this item has merit.

This project is a one-time only item with no continuing costs.

Important to protect and safeguard sensitive information

9. Review of new process for new requests for funding from divisions
   a. The rubrics subcommittee, comprised of Ann Morrissey, Linda Barrett, Trish Morokoff and Tom Dougan, reviewed the new process that was originally discussed last year. The revised process is based on input from the SBPC. The revisions were aimed to streamline each division's annual process for submitting requests to the SBPC. Description of process was distributed. If the new process is utilized this spring it will relate to new strategic items for the FY2016 Budget Request.

10. Chair mentioned that AMRC Report will be released soon and SBPC will discuss the report.
Meeting adjourned at 10:36am