Enclosed are the SBPC recommendations for new funding priorities for the FY16 budget, including an excel spreadsheet enclosure that details project submission specifics. The Council’s budget proposal and deliberation process this year benefitted from past years of experience and refinement. Again division/unit heads made both written and oral presentations, a subcommittee of the Council was assigned to provide a balanced review of the proposal, and this was followed by a discussion and question and answer period.

The deliberation and evaluation process involved:

• Further discussion of the 16 strategic proposals submitted by divisions/units, a rating by each member as to their top 10 proposals (the results of which generated a listing of 8 top priorities);
• A 5-point Likert scale, which was used by each Council member to rate each of the 8 highest rated proposals (with a requirement to use the full spread of the scale) to elicit data showing weighted totals of each item and frequency of ratings per project in the very high and high categories.
• SBPC opted, once again, to not rate proposals by the average score on the Likert scale. Rather, the number of “very high” and “high” scores was tallied for each proposal and, in addition, a weighted priority score was calculated by summing the Likert scores from each member for each proposal. For example, the “faculty positions” proposal received 14 of 14 “very high” (a score of “5” on the Likert scale) for a weighted priority score of 70. These two metric combined were utilized to produce the final ranking of proposals.
• Strong consensus was reached as to the top 8 proposals within 3-tiered categories of priority importance as noted below in the Council’s recommendations. Those in Tier 1 are clearly the Council’s top priorities and had the broadest support from nearly all members. All items within each tier are listed in rank order. (See chart next page.)
The summary of the output of the Likert Scale is displayed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Weighted Priority Score</th>
<th>Frequency Sum of Very High &amp; High Columns</th>
<th>Tier Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Basketball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Engagement Center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute/Center of Gen Ed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud Athl Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Mgt A&amp;E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council realizes that funding beyond Tier 1 items will be challenging given the magnitude of the requests. The Council urges the President and his senior team to consider other sources of funding beyond the general operating budget to fund some of these important 8 strategic items.

The Council once again reiterates that reallocation (reductions of functions and expenses to support new strategic priorities) within and across Divisions and units needs to be a primary strategy utilized by the leadership in each unit for securing potential sources of funding related to these important strategic requests.

**FY 2016 Budget Priorities and Recommendations:**

**Tier 1 – Highest Priority**

These are clearly the agreed upon highest priorities, receiving the highest weighted total and frequency of people who rated them as high or very high.

1. **50 new faculty hired over the next 3 years (FY ’16, ’17, ’18) - $4,452,600**

   Total cost is $5,202,600 less a co-share from Academic Affairs of $750,000. Thirty-five Tenure Track; 15 Lecturers with a total cost of total of $1,484,200 per year. *This item received unprecedented support from the Council (unanimous). It was recognized as a financially significant investment, but a necessary and bold initiative. The total very high/high Likert rating was 14, all
of which were in the “very high” category. Weighted priority score = 70, which is the maximum possible.

2. Men’s Basketball - $319,475
Total cost is $335,750 less a co-share from Athletics of $16,275.
This item includes: Charter Flights ($200K), Team Travel Increases ($25K); Recruiting Increases ($25K); Uniforms & Equipment ($10K); Advertising/brand exposure $25K; Video Coordinator $50,750. Request includes 1 FTE. The total very high/high Likert rating was 12. Weighted priority score = 54.

Tier 2 – Medium Priority

1. Business Engagement Center (BEC) - $250,000
No co-share.
Director of Industry Engagement and Sponsorships ($75K; Asst. Dir Health Industry Engagement ($50K); Marketing, Social Media & Events Coord. ($80K); Collateral materials (annual report, qrtly newsletter); on campus events for industry groups. The total very/high Likert rating was 8. Weighted score = 54.

*Recommendations and notes by the Council relative to the BEC proposal
The Council recognized the importance of such an initiative, but offers the following broadly shared recommendations:

Multiple funding sources, other than the general fund, should be considered and leveraged for this initiative initially.

Self-sustaining financial goal – revenue-generating models to plan for this initiative to be self-sustaining should be thoughtfully planned out and articulated. An MOU should be developed with the URI Foundation that clearly accounts for expenses, personnel, and contract fees from the University against expected goals. Remaining balances unused by the Foundation (such as for unfilled positions) should be returned to the University rather than carried forward by the Foundation. The management fee paid to the Foundation needs to be accounted for and benchmarked to ensure the fee is within the right range.

Alternative ways to fund and staff these new BEC positions. Given the related mission and resources between the Alumni Association and the Foundation, consider whether the Foundation or Alumni funding sources could be leveraged to help support this position. Consider whether current staff positions could be utilized in Alumni, the
Research Office, or the URI Foundation to assume any of these responsibilities rather than create other new positions.

Potential overlap between the BEC and the Research Foundation. Careful study is warranted to coordinate the work and mission of the Research Foundation in their business generation efforts and the BEC so that duplication and overlap is avoided. A clear articulation as to potential collaborations between staff and functions and the need for further investments should be carefully considered.

Consider phasing in of any new positions over time and re-assessing needs for positions with additional time and experience and the aforementioned collaborative efforts.

2. **Women’s Basketball - $153,000**
   Total cost $175,750 with co-share from Athletics of $22,748
   This item includes: Women’s Basketball-Charter Flights ($40K), Team Travel Increases ($25K); Recruiting Increases ($25K); Uniforms & Equipment ($10K); Advertising/brand exposure $25K; Video Coordinator $50,750. Request includes 1 FTE. The total very high/high Likert rating was 7. Weighted score = 46.

   *Recommendations and notes by the Council relative to the WBB proposal*
   The Council recognized the legal and equity issues relative to MBB and understands that if MBB was funded, so should WBB. Whether these proposals should have been presented as one, given this equity/legal issue was discussed and recognized in hindsight by the Director. Given the rating process used, however, WBB came out lower in priority.

3. **Institute/Center for Innovation in General Education Initiative and Director of General Education- $220,000**
   Preliminary investment from AA of $50K in FY ’14 and $150K in FY ‘15. Proposal is $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. The total very high/high Likert rating was 5. Weighted score = 42.

**Tier 3 –Lower Priority**

1. **Student Athlete Welfare Needs – $88,377**
   Total cost $234,392 with co-share of $146,015 from Athletics. Items included are: Athletic Trainer ($67,741); Athletic Trainer 10 mths ($56,451); Strength...
& Conditioning Coaches (2.00) The request includes 3.77 FTE. *The total very high/high Likert rating was 3. Weighted score = 34.*

2. **Veterinarian – $125,000**
   Total cost of $181,250 with Research Office co-share of $56,250. The request includes 1 FTE. *The total very high/high Likert rating was 2. Weighted score = 40.*

   **Recommendations and notes by the Council relative to the Veterinarian proposal**
   The animal care facility should be treated as a cost center model. Subsidies need to come from the research office and heavy users of animal care research facility. Research Office should negotiate respectively with those colleges that most utilize animal research.

3. **Project Management and A & E Support for Capital Planning & Design—$200,000**
   No co-share. Additional CP&D Project Management support to assist the Director and Assistant Director with managing the >50 projects advancing at any given time. Similar A&E support is also required in the Office of Capital Projects. Staff time limitations have resulted in continuous project delays due to backlog, delaying decision-making and extending project schedules. *The total very high/high Likert rating was 2.6. Weighted score = 5.*

   **Recommendations and notes by the Council relative to the Project Management proposal**
   Consider adding the project management cost into smaller projects and their budgets as done for larger projects, expensing them to units requesting work. Consideration should also be given to re-organizing and dedicating resources to an FTE position that oversees small projects and this could be funded by the former suggestion. The area of Capital projects was not reviewed by AMRC and the Council endorsed a plan for future study, which VP Valentino assured was underway.

   **Additional Recommendations**
   • The SBPC reiterates its recommendations relative to the AMRC report, made earlier in the year to the President, pertaining to the area of Human Resources, which, to its knowledge has not been undertaken. SBPC would like to draw the President’s attention to those important recommendations made in an earlier report. VP Valentino assured the Council this was underway. Perhaps, in the fall, there could be an update on this issue to the Council.