We agreed to the following revised version of our January proposal.

Our task was to propose a process for making new spending requests. This involves:

- Develop a format for VPs to make new spending requests
- Propose a procedure for presenting these requests to the SBPC
- Propose a procedure by which SBPC members will adopt recommendations for new spending

We reviewed problems from last year. These included:

1. A three person committee had been formed to make the presentation that did not include the VP. Some VPs preferred to make their own presentations.
2. The form that VPs filled out to identify new spending requests was cumbersome because each spending proposal had to be justified by each element of the academic plan and benefits list.
3. Voting on proposals did not require that an even distribution of ratings was made.

The following proposal was agreed to by this group:

1. The President and each VP submits a written proposal and budget. The written proposal should clearly identify (a) what is being requested, (b) rationale for the request, including benchmarks if relevant (c) associated costs, and (d) possibility of alternative (partial) funding source(s), including reallocation and/or cost share by division. The Proposal should also identify (e) how the request relates to the University’s strategic academic plan and (f) benefits URI (but with no requirement to address each point in the Academic Plan and Benefits individually)

2. Presentations are made to the SBPC according to the following schedule:
   a. 15 minutes allotted for the President or VP to present. The Budget Office will create a standard Power Point slide summarizing the budget information, i.e. dollar amount requested in the proposal to aid in this presentation.
   b. 15 minutes allotted for a two person team (drawn randomly from SBPC members who are not VPs) to provide an objective dispassionate critique addressing the pros and cons of the proposal. Rather than an endorsement or rejection, this critique should address the following:
      i. Benchmark data
      ii. Issues and criticism
      iii. Alternative suggestions
      iv. Potential benefits or drawbacks
      v. Suggestions for creating cross-divisional efficiencies
   c. 30 minutes for questions and discussion.
3. In order to reduce the number of proposals for detailed, final consideration, each SBPC member will be asked to identify (in non-ranked order) their top 30% of proposals (or top 10 proposals, whichever number is bigger).

4. A frequency distribution for all selected proposals will be created in order to provide data for selection of proposals for further consideration. The subcommittee recommends that approximately the top 25% (or top 8, whichever number is bigger) of all proposals based on frequency of endorsement at step 3 be selected incorporating flexibility to take advantage of clear breaks in frequencies.

5. The selected proposals will be discussed by SBPC members.

6. SBPC members will rate the final proposals on a 5-point Likert scale. Raters will be required to distribute their ratings across the 5 response alternatives of the Likert scale. Raters should be guided by the elements of the academic plan and benefits in making their ratings. We reserve the option of creating quartiles for rating such that there would be a requirement to rank two proposals for each quartile.

7. There will be a meeting to review proposal ratings and decide which proposals to recommend to the President. At this meeting, the SBPC will also discuss whether to forward to the President any of the suggestions for cross-divisional efficiencies or for revenue generation that arose during the evaluation process. Finally, the meeting will end with a critique of the evaluation process, focusing on improvements for the next year.