Members in Attendance:
Chair Don DeHayes, Vice Chair Christina Valentino, Sharon Bell, Thorr Bjorn, Fay Boudreaux-Bartels, David Byrd, Steven D’Hondt, Mark Higgins, Annu Palakannathu-Matthew, Trish Morokoff, Ellen Reynolds, Naomi Thompson, Kim Washor, Ray Wright, Ann Morrissey, Linda Barrett.

Members Absent:
Matt Kilduff, Ken Kermes, Mike Smith, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Devon Swanson, Tom Dougan

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at:

http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc.html

1. Chair indicated that it appeared the Council may be able to cover all agenda items on June 18th and 20th meetings. As a result, he asked that the first item be approval of the May minutes.

2. Approval of Minutes – May 21 and 22, 2014
   a. Minutes approved unanimously

3. FY2016 Divisional Proposals: Process for Voting
   a. Review of previously approved process. Discussion will occur as needed throughout the process. Proposals are reflected in priority order within division.
      i. Council members will select 30% or 10 of the proposals, whichever is greater (there are 16 proposals, so 10 will be selected without ranking)
      ii. From the 10, based on frequency of selected proposals, 8 proposals will be determined to be in the final review list
      iii. A Likert Scale will be used for the 8 proposals; since there are five categories and 8 proposals, each category must be selected at least once and there may be no more than two proposals in any category
      iv. Selection of proposals is to be done taking into consideration the Academic Plan and the Benefits; members were reminded to think of investments that would strategically enhance the University. To look at what can potentially transform the University in a significant way.

4. FY2016 Divisional Proposals: General Discussion
   a. 50 Faculty (35Tenure Track; 15 Lecturers) FY16-FY18
      i. Bold, positive move; other Universities are also doing this
      ii. Substantial net loss of tenure track faculty; met enrollment targets; delivered seats
      iii. Part-time faculty teaching impacts yield and retention
      iv. Financial aid investment was successful; next step is additional faculty
   b. Gen Ed Initiative
      i. One time only funds provided in FY2015 by Provost
      ii. Will improve student learning
      iii. Maps is one program being used to improve graduation rates
c. Veterinarian
   I. Overhead funding may be appropriate for this item
   II. Important at land grant institution
   III. Look at funding models; most of the funding should be from research; Animal Care Facility is a cost center; with subsidy from Pharmacy. It needs to be a full-fledged cost center.
   IV. Related to regulations and compliance with the Animal Care Facility

d. Contract Specialist with Export Experience (see power point presentation)
   I. Related to regulations and compliance with export controls, international grants, as well as contract reviews

e. Associate Vice President, Research Operations

f. Project Management and A&E Support for CP&D and Capital Project Offices
   I. Delays in capital projects are costly; keep projects moving
   II. Cost of managing each project would be attributable to each project
   III. Noted that AMRC did not review Capital Projects/Planning Council recommended that a study be initiated for Capital Projects/Planning
   IV. Position dedicated to overseeing small projects would have more support

g. Chemical hygienist

h. Business & Real Estate Specialist

i. Police Sergeant

j. Immigration Specialist

k. Business Engagement Center
   I. Could be phased in
   II. URIF could cost share more; URIF or Alumni current personnel could be appointed prior to adding more staff
   III. Requires a contract with the URIF; if all funds not used contract could state there be a true up at the University’s fiscal year end
   IV. Some linkage to Academic Programs; connections need to be made; sponsorships; sponsors access expertise
   V. Research Office deals with corporate contracts; does BEC blur that line?
   VI. Should it have an arm in Research Foundation?; Ensure not duplicating efforts
   VII. Can they be self-sustaining?
   VIII. The University pays the Foundation $3.5M annually for fundraising.
   IX. The Foundation now returns 3.4% (2014-2015 academic year) on the value of each endowment (e.g., $50,000 endowment would receive $1,700).
   X. We need to get to the point where each endowment account is paying 5% on its balance. Thus, $2500 on a $50,000 endowment.
   XI. Management fee of URIF is 13%; rebuilding endowment by low payback; making up for 2008-9 losses.

l. Men’s Basketball (MBB)
   I. This is the trademark and the rest of Athletics will ride on MBB a drain on the University
   II. MBB is what will “pay”; if it is not successful, it will be a drain on the University
   III. Institutions are investing far more than URI
   IV. Suggestion that uniforms be funded from private funds

m. Women’s Basketball
   I. Men’s and Women’s Basketball should go together; unfortunately, at this point, it is not appropriate to merge or extract the proposals

n. Student Athlete Welfare Needs
I. Clearly important
II. Relates to safety
   o. Athletics Operating and Repair Needs
   p. Athletics Department Support Staff Needs
   q. Other/General
     I. Information requested from Research Office at May 22, 2014 meeting not yet received. Linda will follow up.
     II. Every year the University struggles to move into a new year without reductions; value has been placed on the new strategic initiatives as seen by the inclusion of new initiatives in each year’s allocation budget. Other existing items have been reduced in order to retain the new initiatives.
     III. Different proposals can be looked at as investments that bring positive results or as investments that keep us in compliance and, for example, avoid penalties
     IV. Administration and Finance proposals driven by transactional types of work
     V. Overhead funding mentioned for supporting requests from Research & Economic Development and the need for changing the portion of total overhead that is currently allocated to each category. The Chair reminded the Council that under the old model, SPA was funded off the top and while all other areas were asked to take reductions, SPA was held harmless. The new Overhead Policy anticipated that there might be leaner overhead years in the future and an overhead balance of approximately $600K in the year prior to the new policy was to be reserved and used as a bridge.
     VI. Divisions can still fund any items through reallocation from within their division that are not ultimately included in the Budget Request as new strategic initiatives
     VII. Given all the work of the Council regarding the proposals, it is appropriate to provide the President with a recommendation that clearly states the highest priority proposals of the final eight proposals.

5. Identification of Top Eight Proposals and Recommendation to President
   a. Highest Priority:
      I. 50 Faculty (37 Tenure Track; 15 Lecturers) FY16-FY18; FY2016 Request is for 17 Tenure Track and 5 Lecturers for a total estimated cost of $1,734,200 off set by Academic Affairs co-share of $250,000 resulting in a net estimated cost of $1,484,200. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 14, the highest possible score.
      II. Men’s Basket Ball - Charter Flights ($200K), Team Travel Increases ($25K); Recruiting Increases ($25K); Uniforms & Equipment ($10K); Advertising/brand exposure ($25K); Video Coordinator ($50,750). The request includes 1.00 FTE. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 12.

   b. Medium Priority
      I. Business Engagement Center at a total estimated cost of $250,000. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 8.
      II. Women’s Basketball - Charter Flights ($40K), Team Travel Increases ($25K); Recruiting Increases ($25K); Uniforms & Equipment ($10K); Advertising/brand exposure $25K; Video Coordinator $50,750 at a total estimated cost of $175,750 offset by Athletics co-share of $22,748 resulting in a net estimated cost of $153,002. The request includes 1.00 FTE. Total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 7.
      III. General Education Initiative - $45,540: 75% instructional release time on full Prof salary; $44,500: supplement and summer salary; $40,000: 20 faculty summer stipends; 10 student help; $40,000: conferences, workshops, speakers; $35,960 books, technology, supplies, communications and marketing at a total estimated
cost of $220,000. Academic Affairs has funded the FY2015 costs from one-time only funds in FY2015. Total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 5.

c. Low Priority

I. Student Athlete Welfare Needs - Athletic Trainer ($67,741); Athletic Trainer 10 mths ($56,451); Strength & Conditioning Coaches (2.00) at a total estimated cost of $234,392 offset by Athletics co-share of $146,015 resulting in a net estimated cost of $88,377. The request includes 3.77 FTE. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 3.

II. Veterinarian - at a total estimated cost of $181,250 offset by Research co-share of $56,250 resulting in a net estimated cost of $125,000. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 2.

III. Project Management and A&E Support for Capital Planning & Design and Capital Project Offices at a total estimated cost of $200,000. The total of the Very High and High ratings on the Likert scale was 2.6. Chair indicated that the Council will be provided with the draft recommendation to the President.

7. The Council asked that the Chair include and reiterate to the President the importance of contracting for an outside evaluation of IT and HR.

8. Critique of Evaluation Process
   a. Each Fall, prior to first SBPC meeting, hold orientation for new members to review process used the previous year
   b. Positive feedback on the process
   c. Council agreed to provide any other comments via email to Ann
   d. Faye’s recommendation was to add the two highest ratings (very high and high) together and that led to a clear indication of the levels of priority. The Council found this tool very useful.

9 Improvements for Next Year
   a. New members will be added as old members rotate out of the Council
   b. Faculty Senate Chair currently serves for the year they are Chair; suggestion that recommendation to President (for him to recommend to Faculty Senate) indicate that it be changed to the prior Chair and the term be for at least 2 years. The past two Chairs have extended their participation through the June meetings although it is not officially required.
   c. Chair DeHayes mentioned the importance of attendance at all Council meetings. He indicated that it may be good to remind all members in the Fall of the importance of attendance. Meetings are set at the beginning of each semester after a review of the calendar for each council member.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:15pm
Minutes by Linda Barrett, Budget & Financial Planning