Enclosed are the SBPC recommendations for the FY13 budget, including an important enclosure that shows the ranking of each of the 24 items requested for funding. The Council realizes the nine priorities identified will likely exceed availability of new funding for FY 13. It is our understanding that as President you may choose to fund a proportion of one or more items or fully fund a subset of them. The Council considered potential funding sources that would be most suitable for several items, recognizing that the general fund may not be the only, or even an appropriate, funding source for some of these items. *Finally, the Council strongly recommends 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.* Furthermore, especially during these lean financial times, reallocation may be an essential strategy to ensure support for critical strategic priorities necessary to advance the institution.

Included in this set of recommendations are the following:

- An overview of the process utilized by the SBPC in formulating recommendations.
- Recommended funding sources for the 9 items.
- Comments from Council members on each of these 9 items.

________________________
________________________
Overview of Process in Developing Budget Recommendations

SBPC is submitting its recommendations, for the second consecutive year, for new financial investment priorities. The role of the SBPC is to ensure that the University’s strategic plan (including the Academic Plan and President’s transformational goals) guides resource allocations and investments, ensuring that financial recommendations thoughtfully advance the University’s strategic priorities and have a significant benefit.

A subcommittee of SBPC revised the scoring rubric that was used to rate each item. The rubric scored each item on a 5-point scale for strategic alignment to each of the 6 Academic Plan goals and for 6 University-wide benefit factors. In addition, each individual Council member was asked to rate each item as to high, medium, or low priority for new investment. The rubric also included recommendations from the raters for potential funding sources (e.g., RICAP, Fund 100, Fund 110, Auxiliary, etc.). The scores for each item were submitted electronically and tabulated in excel charts, which allowed them to be reviewed and considered in various ways by the Committee when it met in mid-July to review the data and formulate its recommendations. These funding recommendations are provided for each of the top rated priorities.

Again this year, a SBPC Budget Request Template was utilized to ensure that requests from each Division and Athletics would be submitted with attention to factors valued by the committee in making financial recommendations and to ensure consistency across divisions and units. These brief submissions are available if you wish to consider them. Requests submitted from each Division were to include information as follows:

- Summarize and connect the new financial resource request for FY 13 to it’s strategic goals and the Academic Plan
- Relate progress over the past 12-15 months on strategic goals and highlight financial reinvestments (i.e., reallocation within Divisions) made to strategic initiatives
- Provide any benchmark or comparison data (e.g., such as peer comparison data) relative to the request as justification.
- Project any anticipated financial requests for FY 14 and FY15;
- Articulate any capital projected needs.

Budget Priority Recommendations

As noted above, the Council, in their deliberations, utilized two different approaches of organizing the priority/benefit data from the completed rubrics. This resulted in considerable debate about whether an overall rank derived collectively from strategic alignment, overall benefits, and individual priority ranking or from the individually ranking only would represent a better process. A set of the same six common priority items in rank order emerged from both approaches (see below). The parentheses denote the funding source requested by the unit. A chart is enclosed of the compilation of the
committee’s recommendations by item for potential funding sources, which may differ from the unit’s requested funding source(s).

1 & 2 Student Aid to meet enrollment target (Fund 100)
   IRB Review Specialist –Office of Research Compliance (Overhead)
3. FT Faculty Tenure Track (12TT) FT Lecturers (4) ($260k AA cost share/remainder Fund 100)
4. Graduate Research Tuition Differential Program (50% OH; 50% Fund 100)
5 & 6 Senior Auditor (Fund 100)
   2 Full Time Web Developer Positions (Fund 100)

The next three items also emerged as priorities from the two different ranking approaches.

- Staffing/Operating new Fitness Center (Fund 100)
- New building janitorial and maintenance (Fund 100)
- Office of Experiential Learning & Community Engagement ($40k AA cost share/remainder Fund 100)

Consensus within the Council was that we should put all 9 items forward for further consideration.

**Description of Top Budget Priority Items**

The following are brief statements about each of the top priority items, a summary of the comments from Council members pertaining to the nine priority items, and possible funding source recommendations.

1. **Student Aid to meet enrollment target – Request: $7m – Fund 100**
   Increasing student aid is essential to remaining competitive and reaching strategic enrollment and quality goals, which impact every area of the University. This financial investment is expected to return significant financial, quality, and reputation gains in FY 2013 and beyond as well as other nonfinancial benefits as was demonstrated this year. Council members commented on the need for increased Foundation funding to support scholarships and the demonstrated return on investment linking specific increases of financial aid funding strategies to enrollment/yield. This is essentially a tuition discount accounting line in Fund 100.

**Recommended Funding from Council:** (see enclosure chart for specifics –avg % = # votes/all votes. Numbers indicate the average percent for each funding source, including 0’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg %</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**
- Essential to meet the university’s revenue and quality goals
- We must support this initiative to sustain a talented and diverse student body.
Offering substantial scholarships has been proven to generate money in FY12. It has had the added effect of increasing the quality of the incoming class. V.Provost Libbutti has employed innovative approaches to analyzing the aid packages that are given to different populations of students, while keeping the overall growth of the institution in mind. He has also done long term analysis to project future needs that will help us to increase our diversity and quality of students.

I don’t think this initiative will enhance diversity, as it will mainly fund mainstream students. To the extent that we bring in more students than we would have otherwise, it will be associated with other costs including instructional costs and student services.

As long as this investment is directed to attracting a qualified AND diverse pool of candidates, then the goals of the academic plan can be achieved, most notably, Ensuring an Equitable and Inclusive Campus Community. If this goal is achieved it enhances the University's ability to also achieve, most notably, academic quality and value, preparing students for a changing world and global citizenry. The University has done an admirable job of providing maximum support for in-state students who are admitted through the Talent Development Program. We must also use these resources to aggressively recruit and support high performing undergraduate and graduate out of state diverse students.

It is essential to continue to support investment in the tuition discount rate, as this will sustain our supply of out of state students and the income they bring. It also insures equity and diversity by attracting more working class students, as good aid packages allow them to attend URI.

2. **IRB Review Specialist** - Request: $90K – Fund 110

Comments included: Acknowledged as an important institutional investment for research, but is less visibly presented at this time than it needs to be. Consensus is that the university needs to add an IRB Coordinator position at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Funding from Council:</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg % = 5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**
This is a critical need.
A compliance officer is absolutely necessary to sustain URI research and its funding streams.
However, a compliance officer has been required for decades; can't this position be funded by re-allocation of funds from an existing position?
Not sure which funding category this falls in
Long overdue
A critical appointment that must be made as soon as possible to alleviate the backlog of mandated reviews essential to research on and off campus.

3. **Faculty Tenure Track (12) Lectures (4) – Request: $1.2 m- Fund 100** – Cost is $1.46 – Academic Affairs Cost Share of $260K = $1.2 m

Over the past decade or so URI has added more than 4300 FTE students, while the number of full-time faculty, including tenure-track faculty and lecturers, has remained essentially constant. The expanded teaching needs have largely been met by the efforts of part-time faculty. On a per student expenditure basis, URI invests less in instruction than all of our regional peers. The proportion of institutional budget spent on instruction is also the lowest in the region and among the lowest nationally for 4-year public institutions. URI needs to increase the number of full-time faculty in strategic areas to ensure value and remain competitive in the higher education market place and to expand our research as well as teaching programs. The proposal seeks support for "clusters" of 3 tenure track/clinical faculty hires in each of these 4 thematic areas resonating with the Academic Plan. A process is underway to define the specific need and investment
areas within the broad thematic emphases. AA proposes to co-invest in these positions through a strategic reallocation from within the Division.

**Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg %</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**
- begins to restore URI's disinvestment in the academic core mission
- It's great that Academic Affairs will cost-share.
- We have shifted more of our FTE to lecturers when we need tenure stream faculty to deliver the research and graduate education missions. We must support this initiative.
- These additional positions will be good for the University in a number of ways. I envision faculty and deans from across colleges and departments in the areas of Health and Wellness, Environment and Green Economy, Science and Technology, and Liberal Learning and Scholarship getting together to talk about exciting ideas that cannot be accomplished by a single department. While defining the job descriptions and interviewing candidates, our strengths and weaknesses will be identified and collaborations will be designed, making way for innovations in these areas. This is a good way to make progress on our goals in the Academic Plan.
- Number 1 by far, second and everything else is far behind.
- The University needs to make a serious impact toward the $10 million it has requested from the URI Foundation for the President's Venture Fund. This Fund can be used to help attract new faculty, especially in areas that directly apply to the President's Transformational Priorities and the Academic plan. Venture Fund monies could be used as a match toward institutional funds.
- This is a very high priority item for me.
- Recruiting and hiring 32 additional full-time faculty over the next three years in focus areas, in addition to the benefits listed above, also creates other unique opportunities. Pres. Dooley has allocated $ to hire a faculty recruitment and retention specialist assigned to the division of Community, Equity and Diversity. This specialist can work cooperatively with academic colleges to devise innovative search strategies to create diverse pools of qualified candidates, thereby increasing the likelihood that the University will be able to increase the diversity of its current faculty. Although $ has been allocated to create a quality recruitment program, it remains to seen whether those funds will be adequate. Also, the program to orient, support and retain new faculty has not been determined and will undoubtedly require additional resources.
- URI lags behind its peer institutions in New England in terms of investment in instruction and research. Expanding the full time faculty, especially the tenure stream faculty, not only improves commitment to the instructional and research operations of the university; it raises morale and allows us to serve the students more fully, as faculty with tenure often establish form and lasting connections to non-academic aspects of the university. We are far too dependent on poorly paid part time faculty, especially in the delivery of the General Education and Arts and Sciences sides of the institution. As these programs and colleges have a strong impact on all areas of the institution, investment in faculty for these areas especially is imperative.

4. **Graduate Res. Tuition Differential Program – Request: $150K - $75K from Fund 100 and $75K from Fund 110**

In FY2010, Academic Affairs and Research and Economic Development reallocated internal funds in an effort to foster greater support for graduate assistantships supported on research grants, enhance faculty research, and create more vibrant graduate programs at the University. A Graduate Research Tuition Differential Fellowship was established and provided faculty with matching funds to pay the difference between out-of-state and in-state tuition. By all measures, this Fellowship program has been a success and is being utilized heavily by our faculty and graduate students. An additional investment of $150,000, split equally
between OH funds and GF, will grow the fund to $1.6m. The goal is to grow this fund to $2 m.

**Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg %</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**

- Through this program, URI has tremendously enhanced its support for national and international graduate student participation and its support for the research enterprise. If funded as requested by modest increases over the next three years, the program should then be fully funded. Note: this funding is anticipated to be matched by an equal amount from overhead.
- Better funding opportunities for our graduate students is desperately needed. URI's stipends to graduate students are so low that we are not in the market for the brightest most talented students.
- This is a very high priority for me as it allows us to be competitive in the research and grants marketplace and also in attracting graduate students.
- An important priority for attracting stronger out of state students and building the reputation of the graduate school. That said, the question of URI's duty to serve in state students equitably through graduate education needs to be addressed: the entire culture of graduate education on campus needs serious examination and perhaps some hard choices need to be made about which areas to prioritize.

5. **Senior Auditor- Request: $112,000 – Fund 100**

This is an investment to oversee the development of compliance and ethics codes and implementation of expanded accounting and fraud requirements and investigations.

**Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg %</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**

- The duties of the position would be to fulfill obligations and requirements of the University. This position must be filled.
- This is a critical position not merely to monitor inefficiencies, illegalities and potential fraud, but also to uncover areas of improvement in budget management.

6. **2 Full Time Web Developers- Request: $135,054 – Fund 100**

Expanding web development and marketing efforts are critically important to achieving our strategic goals. Our website is our primary means of communication with prospective students and families.

**Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg %</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**

- Our web presence is very important. How do these web positions relate to the many web-based positions scattered about the campus -- should this be coordinated with ITS and other departments?
- Would one full-time web developer be helpful? Or must it be two or none?
- Web development is becoming increasing crucial
- I think this request should be for one web developer to determine overall effectiveness. I also think that the University could consolidate some of its decentralized web development resources
In today's marketplace of education is there ANY question about the acute need for serious investment in our virtual presence? This would be my top priority right after financial aid and faculty: URI on the web IS an extension of URI itself - and we MUST invest immediately in professionals who know how to build our presence online.

Items #7-9 not in rank order:

- **Staffing/Operating new Fitness Center - Request: $321,000 – Fund 100**
  These funds would support staff for the new Fitness Center. Recreation is important to retention goals and the Center was built to offer more competitive square footage of recreation space in comparison to peer institutions. This need is directly tied to construction of the new Fitness Center. The Council was generally not in favor of creating a student fee to support these positions at this time. Council members felt that further analysis and justification would be needed to institute a new fee.

  **Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **SBPC Comments:**
  - I have concerns about supporting these and other positions on fee funding. Also, the additional cost to students by adding a fee is a concern. Creating a new fee is not an additional revenue stream, but rather a restricted general fund allocation. I recognize the need for these positions to staff the fitness center, but have concerns about adding a fee to support this.
  - Ample opportunities here for private fundraising to support staff, programming, and equipment. The facility offers many naming opportunities, which can be used to generate private support for an array of reasons and purposes.
  - This is a worthy and important project at the heart of wellness and campus morale. Staffing for a state of the art center is important to the development of classes and programs that will breathe life into the center and thus on campus. Some aspects of the center's operation should be for-profit - whether these be specialized fitness classes, private fitness coaches, events, registration fees for courses, fitness accessories, etc.

- **New building janitorial and maintenance personnel- Request: $383,000 – Fund 100**
  The construction of new buildings (CBLS and Pharmacy) and renovated buildings (Swan and Lippitt) has enlarged the square footage of maintained space, infrastructure and technology systems and related contractual services. URI needs additional staffing to maintain campus buildings and it was reported that we are behind our peers in staffing.

  **Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **SBPC Comments:**
  - This request contradicts the Sightlines data, which stipulates that URI averages 4.3/5.0 for cleanliness vs 4.2 for its peers. This puts URI in the "in line" category and half way towards the "outperforming performing category. While an important item, this requires further justification given the comparative data provided by Sightlines that was cited to support this request.
  - Increases in maintenance and janitorial staff are clearly required for new buildings (CLBS and Pharmacy). But do renovated buildings (Swan and Lippitt) also require increases in such staff? Query for broader consideration: On a longer perspective than that of a single year, to what extent could
positions be reallocated by de-commissioning of older buildings elsewhere at URI? Of course, this question applies to other building-related costs as well.

- Consider hiring 1/3 to 1/2 of those requested and repeat the same next year.
- The janitorial and maintenance resources are currently spread very thinly throughout the campus, and it show. New buildings deserve real upkeep. It is obvious that this cannot be done under the current budget of this department.
- While I think that building janitorial and maintenance is very important, when comparing it to the other urgent needs on campus I rank it lower in priority.
- Based on the Sightlines report, it appears that we are outperforming our peers on janitorial and maintenance dimensions. It is unclear from this request whether this additional allocation is required to maintain the current level of maintenance on new square footage coming on line in the next 1-2 years.
- I think we need more data to project specifically how this increase will impact future service levels.
- While investment in janitorial and other maintenance functions for new buildings makes sense - as does a clean, well-kept environment - assessments as to our current performance seem to be in conflict with each other, and exact figures on staffing could not be provided. A more precise accounting of needs and projections should be developed - too vaguely articulated at this time.

**Office of Experiential Learning & Community Engagement** – Request:

$120,000 – Fund 100. Cost is $225,000 – Academic Affairs Cost Share (reallocation) of $40,000 plus investment of $225,000 soft money = $120,000

A new model for designating support to students, faculty, and external constituents that incorporates a single electronic portal and digital data hub for all clients, development of learning outcomes and faculty support for credit-bearing internships, uniform awarding of academic credit, liability release, funding for project based courses, learning goals and outcomes, and connection to Rhody-net and Career Services. This proposal will specifically support experiential learning liaisons between the Office and academic units and build strong connections to external community (e.g., business, non-profit, and agency) partners.

**Recommended Funding from Council:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GR</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>Grants/Fed $</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg % = 81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SBPC Comments:**

- critical to support students and faculty for internships
- Providing “expanded opportunities for experiential learning” is the first statement in President Dooley’s Transformational Goals. From the faculty viewpoint, this idea, although intriguing, can be daunting. How do we change how we teach? How will assessment work when we are sending students out to do field work? What are the rules and regulations? Working one-on-one with students can be much more time consuming than lecturing. The Office of Experiential Learning and Community Engagement will provide all of the support we need. In fact, I believe that the existence of this office will allow faculty to experiment and innovate in this area of instruction. The other important function of this office is to provide businesses a portal to communicate with URI about their needs and be connected to the right people.
- Private fundraising should occur here. Corporations and other relevant organizations should be solicited to provide financial support for student scholarhips (for experiential learning purposes) and for support of the administration of a program that has the potential to benefit the Rhode Island business community.
- This position seems to enhance the current office of experiential learning. It is clearly related to the academic plan, but again it is an administrative position that should involve reallocation of resources.
- I support this position strongly in principle but, as with the Global director position LAST year, the experiential position THIS year is not sufficiently worked out in detail. The concept is still in formation - internships and externships, relations with partners/companies, relation to existing internships via the office in UC and in departments - and needs another year to be persuasively put forward to the council. I would also add, I do not think the politics of campus administration should enter into HOW an office such as this is overseen and administered. When asked if this would be
taken out of UC it was implied that “turf issues” were too entrenched to do so - this is a very bad justification for failing to work through a better way of administering co-curricular programs an opportunities. Needs more time and specificity prior to investment. Also a plan is needed to set up some income for this through partners who will benefit from cheap labor.

We look forward to our upcoming August meeting with you to learn about your final budget allocations. We appreciate the opportunity to play an integral role in the University’s strategic budgeting process.