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Overview

The purpose of this summary report is to provide a consolidated report of the recommendations derived from the work of each subcommittee.

Mission Statement

The overall goal of the Administration and Management Review Committee (AMRC) is to identify opportunities and mechanisms by which we can reduce the costs and improve the performance of our administration, management, and business practices, and add value to the academic and co-curricular experiences of our students.

The AMRC sought as part of its mission to seek opportunities and make recommendations supportive of the strategic goals set forth by President Dooley’s Transformational Goals for the 21st Century and the Provost’s Academic Plan 2010-2015. Using these guiding documents, the AMRC prioritized recommendations that provided:

- Effective technology supportive of a competitive, technology-driven teaching, learning, research, and business environment in the 21st century.
- Efficient business process for faculty, staff, students, and alumni that support their goals and relieves burdens from outdated business practices.
  - Note: External groups such as federal, state, and local governments control many business processes at URI, as does federal and state law. The AMRC and URI have limited to no ability to change these processes. However, where possible, recommendations have been made in these areas.
- Support learning, research, and creativity at URI.
- Create engaging globalized campus environments, not just in the physical classroom or research lab, but online, in the community, and across the globe.
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AMRC Framework

The AMRC devised a standard framework for the methods and process which all members and subcommittees followed toward determining recommendations for the University.

The framework is detailed below.

AMRC Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2012</th>
<th>Committee appointed by President Dooley.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Committee work began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>Engaged consulting group. Subcommittees created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – June 2013</td>
<td>AMRC &amp; Subcommittees work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – September 2013</td>
<td>Final Subcommittee reports created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>Final AMRC Report presented to President Dooley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approach

The AMRC approached its charge as assigned by President Dooley (see: http://web.uri.edu/amrc/president-dooleys-charge/) as follows:

- Identify areas of focus and form subcommittees as needed. The subcommittee Chairs will be members of the main AMR Committee but the subcommittees will include additional members of the campus community not serving on the AMRC.
- Research and engage external sources when possible to assist in identifying approaches, areas of focus, and project methodology.
- Engage as many URI community members as possible through the following methods:
  - Maintain an online presence (http://web.uri.edu/amrc/) posting information, news, and updates accessible to anyone on the Internet.
Open web-page idea submissions on the AMRC site as well as each of the individual subcommittee websites.
- Utilize online surveys to solicit feedback from campus members.
- Conduct open “town hall” meetings at critical turning points in the process.
- Using the URI Communications and Marketing email listserv, send email notices as needed.

During the data-gathering phase, the committee will include as much data as possible by:

- Conducting personal interviews with URI leadership representing all four campuses.
- Benchmarking URI data against peer and peer-aspirant institutions
- Collecting data from online surveys, online suggestion forms, and “Town Hall” open meetings.

The AMRC will develop its recommendations based on evidence developed during the data-gathering phase.

The AMRC has excluded the following from its review:

- The URI Foundation (except for University Revenue subcommittee review)
- Capital Projects

The AMRC encountered limitations imposed by time and resource constraints. For that reason, the Committee prioritized its review of items in order to develop measurable recommendations. As noted later in this report, additional work must be done on some of the recommendations as well as developing further recommendations.

Goals

The AMRC set the following goals for the outcome of its work:

- Must add value, helping to create an academic and co-curricular experience for URI students and faculty.
- Improve the performance of Administration, management, and business practices at URI.
- Reduce costs where possible.
- Improve services.
- Create new opportunities for future growth and excellence for the University.

Process

The AMRC followed a process to cover as many areas of research as possible within a tight time frame. These processes included:
• External Sources – similar projects at other institutions
  o The AMRC and its subcommittees researched similar projects at other institutions. Reports and data made available to the public were consulted, studied, and referenced to provide guidance, facts, figures, and examples of our effort by other higher education institutions.
    ▪ At the end of the committee’s work, more than 25 peer and peer-aspirant school reports were reviewed, including Berkeley, Brown, University of North Carolina, University of Connecticut, and the University of New Hampshire.
• External Sources - industry sources
  o Research data, open studies, books, and articles were reviewed. These included a variety of higher education and technology industry periodicals, books, and research groups such as Educause, Gartner, and government sources.
• URI Sources
  o URI specific data was analyzed by the committee, which included data on Financial Services, Human Resources, Enrollment Management, Student Services and Athletics.
  o “Town Hall” campus meetings were conducted, providing open sessions to faculty and staff of both the Kingston and Providence campuses.
  o Various subcommittees and the AMRC individually interviewed university leadership and key stakeholders.
  o The AMRC provided a website posting service for the public to post suggestions, comments, and feedback. This feedback was reviewed by the committee and posted on the AMRC website.
  o Online surveys of University staff were also posted on specific topics such as distribution of information technology support, and research computing, as examples. These surveys were distributed to targeted groups of faculty and staff.

Criteria for Recommendations

The AMRC created criteria for determining if a recommendation should be brought to the President. Based on these criteria, a recommendation must:

• Be measurable.
• Be consistent with the President’s charge to the AMRC.
• Be consistent with the President’s Transformational Goals and the URI Academic Plan.
• Improve performance, effectiveness, and efficiency of URI.
• Fill an unmet need or offer a new opportunity.
Overview of Findings

As a result of its process, the AMRC found common themes through each of the subcommittee findings, and broke them down into basic categories of “Good,” “Bad,” and the overall feeling of the University’s “Outlook.”

The Good

• URI has a consistent commitment to excellence. This commitment—rooted, cultivated, and propagated by faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the global community of URI—has stood in the face of steep declining state investment, poor economic conditions, and increasingly strong competition. This commitment binds and motivates these groups of individuals who are critical to the University’s past, present, and future successes.

• URI is characterized as a “sleeping giant,” “scappy,” or a “hidden gem.” Each term represents the particular strengths and potential for the future of the University. As each term suggests, the internal perceptions of URI is of a successful university, yet one that can be even greater.

• The community of URI is ready for change. By shedding archaic organization structures, burdened pedagogy, and outdated paper-driven business processes, the URI community is embracing change for a better university.

The Bad

• The multiple sources of URI’s controlled environment are another barrier. Many business practices are outdated, rooted in a policy from generations ago or a practice that many think is required but is in fact folklore, based in decades-old reactionary management decisions. Layers of statutory and procedural requirements—written before the age of the Internet, desktop computers, or even jet planes—drive some controls and procedures. Some are required, some are not, but most need to be updated and streamlined for efficiency in the 21st century.

• Leadership is not consistently engaged with priorities, projects, or day-to-day efforts of their Divisions or departments. In most cases, Division heads rarely communicate priorities to or work with other key University leadership outside of their Division. For example, some Division heads reported virtually no engagement with IT leadership over a period of years. In many cases, services or efforts are duplicated across units and departments, rather than via a centralized system.

• Without fail, the steep decline in financial and human resources is cited as not just a negative for the University but the single major barrier to any future successes. Cited problems included nonfunctional elevators, outdated technology, insufficient funding for academic resources, and staff workload doubled (or even tripled) due to staffing reductions. The University cannot move forward without resources in the right places.
Fiscal Year 2014 State Funding Levels for RI Higher Education Institutions:

- URI – 8.6%
- RIC – 23.3%
- CCRI – 28.9%

- These “bad” factors frequently lead to a fatalistic attitude that is difficult to overcome. Faculty, staff, researchers, and students all experience it, setting hope and expectations lower because of these factors that sometimes result in an unflattering opinion of URI and the State of Rhode Island. Inevitably, this also results in a perception that URI is behind peer institutions.

The Outlook

- Those that are able to see a path for URI to succeed unfailingly see change as the path to success. Areas in need of changes range from funding models to pedagogy to management approaches to business processes to technology.
- All approaches for a bright outlook require teamwork, commitment, and cooperation. More importantly, success requires a belief in the mission, service, and community of the University of Rhode Island.
A key to the success of the University is *Leadership*.

- Leadership is required to drive the cultural change needed for success.
- Leadership is needed to allocate resources within the University to drive change, to provide prioritization of services, and to say “no” or “yes” where it is needed in a timely, effective manner.
- Leadership is needed to make organizational changes for academic, University policy, and/or procedural changes to clear the path to success. This must happen at all organizational levels and in all areas of the University: not in just one Division or department, but everywhere.
- Leadership must provide visible and tangible rewards to groups and individuals participating and driving positive change. More importantly, Leadership must celebrate successes with the URI community as a whole, which will provide examples and create the environment necessary for driving teamwork.
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Overview

The Administrative and Management Review Committee (AMRC) has been tasked with examining the organization, structure, and management of University functions. Among the largest administrative entities on campus are the colleges, the basic structure of which has been in place for decades. In the summer of 2012, the Provost, Deans, and Academic Affairs staff met at the annual Dean’s Retreat to discuss opportunities to review the structure and relationships among the academic units and disciplines within the existing college structures, and to consider whether realignments could lead to increased opportunities, stronger programs, and overall operational effectiveness. Among the possible organizational themes discussed at the retreat to various degrees were:

- Organization of health-related academic programs to highlight the interdisciplinary nature of modern health care education, reflecting the ongoing changes in 21st-century health care delivery.
- Integration of the physical sciences and engineering to enhance opportunities for interdisciplinary research and teaching, which may also create the opportunity for a college focused on the arts, humanities, and social sciences.
- Increased integration of GSO and CELS to further highlight our special strengths in marine and environmental science programs.
- Increased integration of education and continuing education programs.

These areas were identified as meriting further discussion. Only the potential for possible reorganization in the general area of Health and Wellness, however, had been discussed in some detail prior to the formation of the AMRC. Conversations with respect to the other areas had been limited to date. The Provost, in conversations with the Deans, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and others, developed a concept paper, including a draft charge for a faculty
committee to study the future organization of health-related education, research, and outreach programs and activities at URI.

After the formation of the AMRC by the President, it was decided that the review of the organization of academic programs was to be folded into the work of the AMRC. The AMRC subsequently formed five subcommittees, one of which was the Academic Subcommittee, which was charged to further explore possible academic reorganization options. The AMRC hired consultants from Academic Strategy Partners, LLC, who suggested that the review of academic program structure proceed independently from the administrative restructuring and streamlining work of the larger committee (AMRC). Based on the report provided by the Academic Strategy Partners and further discussions, the AMRC concluded that the Academic Subcommittee would continue its work in parallel with the larger AMRC and provide regular progress reports to the AMRC. The subcommittee will likely continue its work beyond the culmination of the AMRC’s work.

**Process**

The Academic Subcommittee developed proposal guidelines and elicited input from the campus community through the AMRC website. A variety of recommendations for academic restructurings were submitted to the website. The subcommittee used the following criteria to determine if a recommendation merited further study:

- Does the recommendation provide evidence of a specific opportunity or problem?
- Does the recommendation provide evidence of the effectiveness of the solution?
- Is the outcome of the recommendation measurable?
- Is the recommendation consistent with the President’s charge to the AMRC?
- Is the recommendation consistent with the President’s *Transformational Goals* and the URI *Academic Plan*?
- Does the recommendation enhance synergies and/or add value to teaching, research, and/or outreach programs?
- Does the recommendation reduce costs or increase efficiency?
- Does the recommendation fill an unmet need or offer a new opportunity?

If the subcommittee believed the recommended redesign met the above criteria, then an exploratory committee composed of representatives of relevant stakeholder groups was established and a “neutral” chair (i.e., someone who had little or no stake in the redesign of the unit or function) was selected to guide the work of the committee. For each exploratory committee, a member of the Academic Subcommittee served as a liaison to the larger AMRC.
Findings and Recommendations

A summary follows of the academic restructuring proposals and ideas submitted to the subcommittee to date. In addition to establishing a committee to explore the reorganization of health programs (listed below), two additional ideas were sufficiently developed for the committee to recommend formation of additional exploratory committees (also listed below). Included below is a fourth proposal that was recently submitted to the subcommittee for consideration. Based on evaluation criteria established by the committee, the committee determined that the remaining ideas submitted and listed below (a) require further development, or (b) could be subsumed under one of the established exploratory committees.

Health Exploration Committee

Recommendation: Organize all health-related disciplines, resources, and activities under a new College/Division of Health.

Benefit to the University: Coordinated curriculum, synergistic interaction among faculty members.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

This committee examined potential opportunities to align our human, physical, and financial resources associated with "health" into a single sub-division, school, college, or other entity. In so doing, the committee carefully and objectively considered the potential advantages and disadvantages of creating a new comprehensive overarching academic structure for some or all health programs at URI and examined models in place at other peer institutions. Ruby Dholakia, Professor of Marketing in the College of Business Administration chaired this committee, which was composed of faculty from a variety of health disciplines across multiple colleges. Prof. Deborah Riebe was the liaison between this exploratory group and the Academic Subcommittee.

The Health Exploration Committee examined the following issues:

1. Potential new academic structures that could be created to unite some or all of the health-related fields at URI and more efficiently and effectively address current overlap,
gaps, duplication, and new options for coordinated curriculum, collaborative research, and inter-professional care delivery;
2. Optimal proximity arrangements of health programs on campus and whether close physical proximity would have advantages;
3. Advancement of innovative and interdisciplinary teaching and research opportunities and potential synergistic interactions among faculty via an organizational alignment that consolidates health-related faculty expertise;
4. Determination of how this realignment would affect other programs, departments, and/or colleges and propose possible resolutions that might be explored to their benefit.

In conducting this work, the committee sought constructive input and ideas from key interested stakeholders, including Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty and students in health-related fields at URI. In addition, external stakeholders were also contacted to offer their perspective on the health-related needs in education, research, and outreach of the future. The group began its work in late February and submitted its final report in July 2013 (see attached report). The report has been shared with the Provost’s Office, the Council of Deans, the AMRC, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and will be posted on the Provost’s Office website for others to review. Any proposed changes will be appropriately subjected to University shared governance review and approval processes.

Exploring Education and Lifelong Learning

**Recommendation:** Form a committee to explore potential opportunities to align resources associated with education and lifelong learning into a single subdivision, school, college, or other entity.

**Benefit to the University:** Greater utilization of human, physical, and financial resources associated with education and lifelong learning.

- Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

Given the central revitalizing and regenerative role education has in many aspects of the function of a university, this exploratory committee will examine potential opportunities to align our human, physical, and financial resources associated with education and lifelong learning into a single subdivision, school, college, or other entity. In so doing, the committee will carefully and objectively consider the potential advantages and disadvantages of creating a new, less distributed, comprehensive, overarching academic structure for some or all education programs (over 15 programs at undergraduate and graduate levels, totaling 1,000 students) and services,
professional development, and continuing education at URI, and examine models in place at other peer institutions.

In conducting this work, the committee is seeking constructive input and ideas from key interested stakeholders, including Deans, Directors, Department Chairs, faculty, and students in education-related fields at URI, and in the public schools and other public educational entities. Professor Michael Honhart from the History Department is chairing this exploratory committee and Professor David Byrd is serving as liaison between the committee and the Academic Subcommittee. The committee began meeting in July 2013 and is expected to complete its work in Fall 2013.
Exploring Enhanced Academic Opportunities for Students

Recommendation: Form a committee to explore enhanced academic opportunities for academically advanced students.

Benefit to the University:
- Enhanced opportunities for academically advanced students.
  - Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

At present, URI offers academically ambitious students a range and depth of enhancement opportunities within and beyond the classroom, but those opportunities are diffusely managed, inconsistently communicated, and unconnected to each other except through informal liaisons and associations. Because URI is seeing increasing numbers of academically advanced students entering its freshman class each year—20% of this year’s first year class, for example, had a first semester GPA of 3.5 or better—the University should consider how it structures, manages, and communicates academic opportunities to such students, as well as to potential applicants and their families.

Units whose missions would fall under any exploration regarding increased cooperation are involved in the following forms of academic opportunity and enhancement:

- Undergraduate research
- Preparation for graduate and professional careers
- Competitive internships
- Competitive scholarships and fellowships
- Study abroad or off campus
- Leadership and management development
- Equitable access for an increasingly diverse population of students

The purpose of this study would be to explore pathways for increased collaboration among relevant units such that academic opportunities for students would be made more visible and, if not centrally structured, then at least consistently communicated to the campus community and the pool of potential applicants to URI. Laura Beauvais will serve as the liaison between this exploratory committee and the Academic Subcommittee. We are in the process of developing the membership of this committee and selecting a chair, with input from the Provost.
**Exploring the Creation of a School of Sciences and Mathematics**

**Recommendation:** Review the proposal to create a School of Sciences and Mathematics.

**Benefit to the University:** Centralized administration. Enhanced course offerings and increased collaboration among faculty.

- **Efficiency Gain; Service Improvement**

This proposal suggests exploring the creation of a School of Sciences and Mathematics that would house the departments of Mathematics, Physics, Computer Science, Statistics, and Chemistry. Strong leadership is needed to attract students to STEM disciplines and help them to succeed. This would benefit faculty and students in many ways. Introductory courses in all of the disciplines within the school could be orchestrated for the benefit of students. Gateway courses that prepare students for programs in STEM disciplines could be handled in a cohesive manner. A Center for Excellence could be created to foster interdisciplinary learning among faculty members who teach 100- and 200-level courses. The Center would facilitate the dissemination of proven advanced teaching methods, as well as create an environment that promotes experimentation with innovative methods. A community of faculty could be convened within the school to pay special attention to general education courses that are meaningful to students from all disciplines and conform to the standards set by our upcoming new general education program. In particular, critical thinking, computational thinking, and analytical thinking are important competencies that are addressed by courses in sciences and mathematics, along with quantitative reasoning, and mathematical and natural science literacy. New interdisciplinary general education courses could be developed that face our grand challenges, convey the relevance of mathematics and sciences to students, and support our Honors Program.

A calculation of current costs would have to be made and compared to a potential new structure that would have a centralized administration. Not only should the number of majors be considered, but also the number of students taking service courses from these departments. Grant and fundraising efforts could be supported at the school level, along with internship programs. The School of Education could serve as a good model. Many structures could be established and opportunities given for program directors to work together and share commonalities and concerns. Internships, scholarships, and fundraising efforts could be coordinated. Other activities could be organized at the school level, as well, such as colloquia of various types. Interdisciplinary projects would be the norm, as they are in the world outside of higher education, such as new courses, pathways, research for undergraduate students and graduate students. The proximity of professors from different areas needs to be considered. It is
possible that a certain amount of intermingling of offices among faculty from the various departments can be arranged in order to facilitate more interactivity.

Integrated courses in sciences and mathematics could be created and counted as credit for programs in STEM disciplines.

The Academic Subcommittee currently is reviewing a revised proposal on this re-organization idea to determine if a committee should be developed to explore it further.

Additional Ideas Submitted to the Committee

The following ideas were submitted to the website for consideration for further study. These ideas were either not fully developed, could be integrated with the charge of one or more of the above exploratory committees, or did not meet the criteria established by the Academic Subcommittee. We have included these suggestions in our report so that others are made aware of the issues of concern to some members of the URI community.

1. Biological and physical sciences should be placed in one college.

2. URI should be more flexible regarding chair decision making on workload and class scheduling.

3. URI should develop undergraduate degrees for three-year period.

4. URI should re-evaluate URI 101 (2 people made this suggestion).

5. There needs to be consistency in course releases across departments.

6. An alumnus suggested that URI develop a sports management degree. This idea has been examined by the College of Business Administration in the past. It has been forwarded to the business school for re-consideration.

7. The University is poised to increase its position in Providence through its expansion into the “Knowledge District.” The current Providence campus should be seen not as a building or a space to be utilized, but as a vibrant, complex academic unit which can expand and transform, and which already is an important multifaceted aspect of the University of Rhode Island as a whole. There are several issues that need to be addressed to enhance the current Providence campus’ position as the “face of the University” in downtown Providence.

   • Review the space utilization by non-URI and non-academic entities and research programs to enhance balance.
   • Recognize the intercampus “flow” of students and the urban mission the academic programs are working to fulfill. How can we better integrate/encourage this flow both of students and programs between Kingston and Providence?
Part-time faculty needs to be better integrated into the life of the university community (e.g., follow the lead of HSS and hold a faculty meeting which includes per-course faculty, promote better communication, etc.).

Improve the academic support for the Providence campus. In particular, increase the number of full-time faculty in Providence in those departments that offer majors there, and articulate the role of the chairs of departments offering a major in Providence.

The subcommittee recommended that these ideas be integrated with the lifelong learning proposal above.

8. The Joint Committee on Academic Planning recommended that Education and Lifelong Learning be explored. Also, ideas regarding development of a health consortium were forwarded to the Health Explorations Committee via Deborah Riebe and considered in its work.

9. It was suggested that URI make the Health Studies Program a department. This input was forwarded to the Health Explorations Committee via Deborah Riebe.

10. One submission suggested a number of re-organization ideas. One idea that may be promising is exploring the organization of graduate education administration. Other submitted ideas include integrating Engineering and the physical sciences; integrating marine, environment, and life sciences; development of a college of liberal arts; integration of Textiles, Merchandising, and Fashion Design with the College of Business Administration; and the creation of a College of Mathematics and Sciences, uniting the CELS pure science departments: Biology; Cell and Molecular Biology; and Geosciences with the A&S departments: Mathematics; Physics; Computer Science and Statistics; and Chemistry (these suggestions will be integrated with the School of Sciences and Mathematics proposal above).

**Academic Programs - Conclusion**

The Academic Subcommittee will ensure that recommendations made upon completion of the work by the exploratory committees will be shared with the URI community and that any proposed changes will be appropriately subjected to University shared governance review and approval processes.
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Overview

The Administrative Processes subcommittee was charged with reviewing administrative procedures at the University “with a focus on promoting appropriate synergies across related units and minimizing any administrative redundancies that may exist.” The subcommittee accomplished this by interviewing both stakeholders and functional department representatives, seeking recommendations for improvements. We also reviewed internal metrics and, where appropriate, benchmarked with peer institutions to support the recommended changes.

Process

The subcommittee met with representatives from administrative departments (i.e., Human Resources, Controller, Budget, Purchasing, Facilities and Business Services) to learn about the existing processes and procedures to determine their origin and the level of internal control at the University over process restructure and design. Each department was asked to identify the governance structure for their policies and procedures whether it be statute (federal or state), Board of Education policy, state policy, University policy, departmental policy or in some cases, folklore. Departments were asked to provide data on the specific business processes performed by their department (i.e., how many personnel transactions were transmitted to the Department of Administration last year or how many Foundation-related transactions were processed by the Controller’s Office over the preceding year). Functional department heads were also asked how current administrative processes could be improved in their functional area and what internal or external constraints would have to be modified in order for that to be achieved. Lastly, we met with stakeholders (and customers) from across the campuses and asked what improvements they would like to achieve in the current procedures.
Findings and Recommendations

After the initial interviews and data gathering were completed, it became apparent that the two major obstacles to improving administrative procedures at the University were the required interface/reporting to the state and the failure to implement fully all of the necessary PeopleSoft modules.

Creation of a Single Employment Classification

Highest Priority Recommendation Within Administrative Processes

Recommendation: Create a single employment classification system at URI so that all employees are included in the non-classified service.

Benefit to the University: Removes requirements of processing HR and Payroll data within the State of RI systems, allowing URI to have one system, one business process within URI rather than through outside Agency.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

There are approximately 2,600 “regular” bi-weekly faculty and staff at the University. In addition, we have approximately 650 graduate assistants, 500 part-time faculty and several hundred seasonal employees. The vast majority of our faculty and staff are non-classified or Board of Education (BOE) employees. The BOE controls the conditions of employment for these individuals through the promulgation of personnel policies and procedures, and the negotiation of seven collective bargaining agreements. Approximately 900 of our employees are civil service or classified employees, and the conditions of employment for these individuals are governed by the state, not the Board or the University.

The employment of classified employees requires us to use the state payroll system and to follow often antiquated and inefficient state procedures and systems. For instance, the state HR and payroll systems are not fully automated. When the University processes an appointment for a new hire (regardless of service since we use the state payroll for all “regular” bi-weekly faculty and staff) there is an internal approval procedure at the University that starts with the hiring department and requires approvals from the dean or department head, the vice president, the budget office, affirmative action, and human resources. Although the current internal approval process requires paper documents, we will soon have an electronic approval process for all HR forms in place. Once the approved form reaches human resources the appointment information
must be “transferred” to a state payroll form using typewriter and multi-carbon form. All personnel transactions (ranging from a change in address to a promotion) are then placed in an envelope and transmitted via a courier to the Department of Administration in Providence. Once received and approved, the form is then manually entered separately into the Human Resource and Payroll systems and an approved copy is returned via courier. Last year the University processed approximately 3,863 personnel transactions to the state.

The subcommittee recommends that the University/Board of Education submit legislation to amend Rhode Island General Law 16-59-22 to provide that all employees of the Board of Education become non-classified employees.

The potential benefits/cost savings are multi-dimensional. Short-term benefits would include the obvious streamlining of the hiring and appointment procedures due to the fact that the University would no longer be subject to antiquated and cumbersome civil service hiring procedures. Equity in employment would be achieved by including all employees under the same policies and procedures, all new employees would participate in the 403 b. retirement and disability plans, and new job descriptions and pay scales could be created to accurately reflect the duties and responsibilities of all University employees.

Long-term benefits/cost savings could include the redesign of the current internal payroll system to include all employees or the potential outsourcing of the payroll system to minimize risk and improve efficiency. The elimination of redundancy would improve the accuracy the database (no more opportunities for multiple data-entry errors) and expedite the payment process. Currently, employees may wait several weeks before they actually receive a payroll check. The efficiencies gained from eliminating the state payroll process would also allow the human resource staff to redeploy time and effort to critical needs, such as employee-benefit administration, the recruitment process, and onboarding.

Although this would be a very challenging process, the long-term benefits and efficiencies gained, not to mention the ability to manage the entire workforce, would be immeasurable.
Create Business Centers In Academic Affairs

**Recommendation:** Reorganize all fiscal and business support staff in the colleges into “Business Centers” for Academic Affairs.

**Benefit to the University:** Provides a more consistent pool of skill and resources for all colleges and departments within Academic Affairs, streamlining processes and improving efficiency, accuracy, and morale.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

The subcommittee recommends that Academic Affairs reorganize the current fiscal/business support staff in the colleges into business centers serving one large or multiple smaller colleges. During our interviews, it became apparent that there is a significant discrepancy in both size of staff and level of expertise in business functions amongst the colleges. While some colleges have robust business operations that include many areas of functional expertise, others have very limited staff. Due to the lack of technical expertise required to perform multiple business functions, some colleges are unable to process and complete critical business-related functions in a timely and efficient manner. The business centers should have a direct reporting line to the Dean or Vice Provost, with a dotted-line reporting relationship with the functional department to ensure that they are part of the design and implementation of new processes and systems being developed in the functional area.
**URI Purchasing**

**Recommendation:** Automation of URI Purchasing procedures by completing the installation of the PeopleSoft Purchasing modules and tools. Include re-engineering of business processes and procedures to improve efficiencies along with new IT systems. In addition, seek additional delegated Purchasing authority from the State to allow more Purchases to be processed entirely within URI.

**Benefit to the University:** Reduces time and effort to complete purchases, streamlines processes without duplication of effort at State level, allows URI to create consistent procurement regulations regardless of funding source.

- **Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings, Service Improvement**

The subcommittee recommends that the University complete the implementation of the remaining PeopleSoft modules focusing initially on the E-Procurement module. Multiple stakeholders identified obstacles in the procurement procedures across campus.

In order to process purchase orders and payments more effectively and efficiently; the University should implement E-Procurement within the purchasing module. Master Price Agreements (MPAs) and other agreements could be preloaded to ensure that departments are using the correct pre-awarded purchasing agreements. The online receiving feature would also expedite the payment process. The University already owns this module, and associated costs would only involve implementation-related expenses.

Additional purchasing autonomy would allow more bids to be processed locally. Currently, purchasing regulations vary according to funding source. This causes confusion at the department level. Consistent procurement regulations, regardless of funding source, would save time and effort and expedite the ability to purchase and receive goods and services on campus.

In accordance with RIGL 37-2-7(16) (see Appendix E), the Board of Education has Public Agency status for purchases funded by restricted, sponsored, or auxiliary monies. As a result of this law, representatives of the institutions’ Purchasing Departments and the Office of Higher Education met with representatives at the State Division of Purchases and expanded upon the delegation to include specific commodities regardless of source of funds. These commodities (see attachment 2) were chosen on the basis that the majority of purchases would be on restricted, sponsored, or auxiliary funds. There are no dollar limitations on these commodities, and they are not restricted to any particular fund. Additionally, there are specific commodities that have been delegated with a dollar limitation (see Figure 3).
In accordance with RIGL 37-2-18.2 (see Appendix E), the three public institutions of higher education shall be exempt from the competitive bidding provisions of this chapter for research or research related activity funded with federal funds or other third-party funds subject to the rules and regulations promulgated by the Board of Governors for Higher Education. As a result of this law, the University Administration developed Research Purchasing. The Research Purchasing Procedures have been forwarded to the Office of Higher Education for inclusion in the Board of Governors for Higher Education Procurement Regulations; however, the regulations have not been updated to include these procedures.

All vehicle purchases and/or vehicle lease purchases must go through the State (State Fleet Operations and State Purchasing).

In summary, the delegated Purchasing Authority is as follows:

- **Restricted, Sponsored or Auxiliary funds** – Full, delegated authority (with the exception of vehicles). Purchases are made in accordance with the Board of Governors for Higher Education Procurement Regulations and Section 5.12 of the URI Purchasing Manual as it relates to Research purchases.

- **State Appropriated Funds** – Delegated authority up to $5,000 plus commodities (Figure 2) with no dollar limitation and commodities (Figure 3) with/without dollar limitations as described.

The University Purchasing Department has delegated the authority to departments to make purchases up to $5,000 on a Limited Value Purchase Order (LVPO). Competitive quotes are not required for purchases up to $5,000 on Research funds; however, competitive quotes are required when using Non-Research funds.

The University Purchasing Department has delegated to URI Dining Services the authority to make purchases in excess of $5,000 specifically for fresh meat, poultry, and fish. These purchases are made in accordance with the Board Regulations, including posting public bids on the Rhode Island Vendor Information Program website with State Purchasing.
**Administrative Processes – Figure 1**

*Fiscal Year 2012-2013, State Purchase Orders (includes advice of changes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Order Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Standard</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$902,692.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Blanket</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>$13,575,743.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Contract</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$18,463,439.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State Purchase Orders (including Advice of Changes)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>$32,941,874.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Processes – Figure 2**

*Fiscal Year 2012-2013, URI Purchase Orders (includes advice of changes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>$20,880,146.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Funds</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>$7,459,852.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Funds</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>$18,804,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Funds</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$10,382,265.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total URI Purchase Orders (including Advice of Changes)</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>$48,182,527.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Administrative Processes – Figure 3**

*URI Department-issued Limited Value Purchase Orders (LVPOs), Internal Vendor Purchase Orders (IVPOs), and Department Purchase Orders (DPOs) issued by URI Dining Services only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LVPOs</th>
<th>IVPOs</th>
<th>DPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$9,863,110</td>
<td>$2,866,778</td>
<td>$1,016,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,345</td>
<td>$13,745,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bids - URI Purchasing solicited 136 bids in Fiscal Year 2012-2013**

1. Subcontract purchase orders are processed through the Research Office. Therefore, those purchase order counts are not included in the above.

2. Not all Foundation purchases are processed through Purchasing.

3. There are few purchase orders for the Memorial Union processed through Purchasing as they are processed through the Purchasing Office in the Memorial Union and/or through the URI Bookstore/Ram Computers.

Currently, the Board of Education has a Memorandum of Agreement with the Department of Administration whereby the three institutions and the Office of Higher Education each contribute $45,000 to support two buyer positions at the State Purchasing department. The University has not realized any significant improvements in either the processing or approval of purchasing transactions, and it is recommended that this Memorandum be revisited and possibly eliminated, allowing the funds to be allocated elsewhere on the University priority list.
**URI Budget System**

**Recommendation:** Implement an interactive, online URI Budget management and reporting system, integrated with the University’s administrative systems.

**Benefit to the University:** Provides timely, accurate financial and budget management for all departments without shadow systems or different management approaches.

- **Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings, Service Improvement**

The subcommittee recommends that the University implement a state-of-the-art online and interactive Budget System that is fully integrated the University’s central Financial Administration systems. An online and interactive budgeting system will reduce the amount of manual effort required for allocations and budget-cycle processing both in the Budget Office and throughout the University. In addition, the subcommittee recommends that process re-engineering takes place to increase budget autonomy and accountability with the responsible administrative unit, utilizing the new online system to maintain effective controls.

It is also recommended that the University move to a model that improves budget stability for all departments. The current “use it or lose it” funding approach leads to numerous inefficiencies and severely constrains ability to effectively plan investments, purchases, and projections.
The Office of the General Counsel

Recommendation: Increase the staff in the Office of the General Counsel.
Benefit to the University: Reduces timelines for legal review and allows the University to be able to react faster to issues, purchases, contracts, and compliance issues that require URI Legal resources.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

The subcommittee recommends allocating additional human resources to the Office of the General Counsel. Without exception, in every focus group or large discussion the issue of constrained legal resources became a topic of discussion. Currently, the Office of the General Counsel has one attorney and one support staff. In comparison, peer institutions across New England have significantly higher staffing levels. For instance, below is a comparison of the five other flagship institutions in New England:

**Administrative Processes – Figure 4**

**Staffing of Legal Counsels at Peer Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Staffing Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>12 Attorneys for 5 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>7 Attorneys, including 2 Assistant Attorney Generals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>3 Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>4 Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4 Attorneys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that we engage outside counsel for litigation, our current staffing level puts the University at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to timely contract review and approval, not to mention potential liability in the areas of compliance and risk management.
Consolidation of Custodial and Security Functions Under the Division of Administration and Finance

Recommendation: Move all custodial and security functions to the Division of Administration and Finance.

Benefit to the University: Centralized services under one management area, removing duplication of effort.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings, Service Improvement

The subcommittee recommends the consolidation of custodial services under Facilities Services. Facilities Services currently employs 72 housekeepers responsible for cleaning all of the academic and administrative buildings on the Kingston Campus. Housing and Residential Life employs an additional 52 housekeepers responsible for cleaning the residence halls. In addition, there are housekeepers employed throughout the University in various colleges and departments, such as the Graduate School of Oceanography, the Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Continuing Education, W. Alton Jones, Health Services, Dining Services, and the Memorial Union.

The initial recommendation is the consolidation of Housing and Residential Life custodial services under Facilities and Operations. About a decade ago all Housing and Residential maintenance operations were consolidated within Facilities and Operations to increase efficiencies in maintenance and repair. The proposed next step was the consolidation of custodial services, but it was never effectuated. The consolidation will promote management efficiencies, improve cleaning standards across campus, create purchasing efficiencies, allow for a more efficient distribution of the current staff and a more efficient method of distributing overtime, and increase the capacity for consistent in-service training for all housekeeping staff.

A future recommendation would be to review the other custodial functions at the University to determine whether efficiencies would be gained by consolidating those employees under Facilities Services, or whether the duties and responsibilities for those positions are so integrated into the functions of the departments (i.e. Dining Services) that consolidation would not be viable.

The subcommittee also recommends the consolidation of all security functions under the Department of Police and Security. Currently we have separate security functions at the Bay Campus and ASF/CCE. The hiring, management, training and deployment of all security personnel should be centralized.
Complete Online Automation of Business Processes

**Recommendation:** Complete the online automation of business processes at URI by implementing outstanding PeopleSoft modules and supporting systems, such as Expenses (for Travel and Expenses), Billing, Accounts Receivable, Asset Management, and Benefit Administration.

**Benefit to the University:** Further efficiency gains, cost savings, and service improvement.

- **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

The implementation of several outstanding PeopleSoft modules will bring current paper processes online and streamline business processing throughout the University. For example, the Travel and Expense module would allow for a more efficient and effective travel approval and reimbursement process. The current process is a manual paper process, and travelers, especially faculty/researchers, need quick approvals so that they can book the cheapest available flights. Three or four levels of approval are required before the travel can commence.

During FY 2013 the General Accounting Office processed more than 3,200 travel authorization requests, totaling $4.4 million dollars in expenses. Online approval and processing of travel will both expedite the approval process and lower travel costs. After travel is completed, the traveler can use the online system to upload receipts and submit them for approval. This would significantly expedite the reimbursement and posting of travel expenses.

The savings for this project are undetermined at this time, but the University owns the module, so the only cost would be the internal implementation costs. The current implementation estimate is $300,000, and includes two functional and one technical resource. The reduction in time spent preparing travel-related paperwork would result in a significant time savings across the institution.
Human Resources

**Recommendation:** Develop a strategic staffing plan that identifies the skills and competencies needed for current and future employees.

**Benefit to the University:** Accurate assessment of potential employees’ skills, talents, and suitability for job description. Hiring of employees whose skills meet or exceed the demands of their job, resulting in a workforce with skills and competencies to meet the demands of the future in a changing environment.

✓ Efficiency Gain

URI needs to develop a strategic staffing plan that identifies the skills and competencies needed for current and future employees. Each department needs to identify the critical skills that employees are expected to have, and work with HR to establish the best positions to fulfill departments needs.

Conduct Further Evaluation and Streamline Analysis of Administrative Departments

**Recommendation:** Engage the services of Professor Doug Hales to advise and supervise graduate students working with administrative departments to evaluate and streamline current procedures.

**Benefit to the University:** Further efficiency gains, cost savings, and service improvement.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

Professor Hales was one of the internal resources we relied upon when we embarked on our current journey through the web of University processes and procedures. We met with Professor Hales, and he shared his experiences with other employers (including some state agencies) in achieving administrative efficiencies. Professor Hales has proposed a project and a budget for utilizing graduate students to assist in data gathering and analysis for improving administrative processes at the University. Human Resources and the Controller’s offices have volunteered to pilot the process if the project is approved.
The genesis of this proposal is that we allow employees within administrative departments to reengineer their own processes and procedures to make their own jobs more productive and efficient. The graduate assistants will assist in collecting and analyzing the data since the employees will be continuing to perform their current functions while the re-engineering is in process.

The projected cost of this initiative would vary from $50,000 to $150,000 in the first year, dependent upon whether the project was staffed by graduate assistants or graduate students paid on an hourly rate.

Based upon prior results presented by Professor Hales, this investment could significantly improve the efficiency of current business processes, and also provide some experiential learning opportunities for our graduate students.
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Terminology Used Within the Information Technology Report

Because of the de-centralized and pervasive organizational structure of groups and individuals delivering information technology services at URI the following terms will be used to identify these groups:

- “IT” refers to the industry of Information Technology.
- “IT Services” refers to the URI department “Information Technology Services.”
- “information technology” (lower case) refers to the overall activity both within IT Services department and information technology across other departments.
Overview

Today, Information Technology is central to most of our daily services at the University of Rhode Island. The quality, availability, and accuracy of technology are critical contributors to the services provided by the University. In the 21st century, there is no service, no employee, and no student at URI not using or interacting with Information Technology on a daily basis. Nearly all services depend on information technology to ensure its delivery, maintenance and integrity. Supplying these services in any environment is challenging in an industry whose hallmark is rapid change.

The goal of the IT Subcommittee for the Administration and Management Review Committee is to focus on Information Technology services and practices at the University within the President’s charge to identify opportunities to:

- Increase efficiencies
- Improve services
- Reduce costs

Like other service areas of URI, Information Technology is subjected to many demands, both internally and externally. As described in the June 2013 Educause article “Top-Ten IT Issues, 2013: Welcome to the Connected Age” by Susan Grajek, four strategic priorities are identified for IT that are deemed critical to success for higher education institutions:

1. “Contain and reduce costs...” Efficiencies are sought, and business best practices are often viewed as the best path to achieving efficiencies.
2. Achieve demonstrable improvements in student outcomes. The window of opportunity for colleges and universities ...is shrinking.
3. Keep pace with innovations in e-learning, and use e-learning as a competitive advantage... presidents, chancellors, and provosts are eager to use technology to help inform and transform postsecondary education.
4. Meet students’ and faculty members’ expectations of contemporary consumer technologies and communications. Students and faculty... expect that their institutions' services will work as elegantly and effectively as commercial services.”
Process

The IT Subcommittee consulted with an array of both external and internal sources that included published industry materials, URI reports, personal interviews of external and internal sources, and data from peer and peer-aspirant institutions.

External Sources

- Projects conducted at other schools and organizations included reports and data from more than 25 peer and peer-aspirant institutions, including UC Berkeley, Brown University, University of North Carolina, University of Connecticut, and University of New Hampshire.
- Research articles and industry data regarding providing information technology services throughout the higher education industry, as well as IT in general. Sources included Educause, Gartner, and various published industry articles. See Source listing for more details.
- Government sources, such as IPEDS.
- Individuals from external sources were also interviewed. These included:
  - Susan Grajek, Director of Research for Educause, a non-profit organization focused on advancing information technology services in higher education.
  - Thom Guertin, State of Rhode Island Chief Digital Officer, Office of Digital Excellence; and Allison Rogers, Director of Policy, Department of Administration in the State of Rhode Island. Thom and Allison are both focusing on finding ways to improve digital services within the State of Rhode Island, including finding new ways to deliver both existing and future services to organizations and individuals.

Internal Sources

- URI financial, human resources, and student enrollment data were consulted and analyzed to develop empirical data, resulting in some of the recommendations. Data sources consulted included: University enrollment, alumni, IPEDS, comparison of IPEDS data within URI and to other schools, URI purchases for information technology products and services, staffing for information technology services throughout the University (both within and out of IT Services), budget information, software and hardware contract information, and other related data.
- The pervasive nature of IT at the University required that a vast array of individuals be interviewed. See Appendix D – Interviews Conducted by the AMRC Information Technology Subcommittee.
  - The President, Provost, College Deans, Vice Presidents, representatives from Athletics, the Foundation, Purchasing, Budget, HR, Controller’s Office, University Library, Enrollment Services, Admissions, Research, and Faculty representatives were all interviewed.
  - IT Services staff as a whole was interviewed in two ways:
    - Leadership of IT Services – interviewed individually by the committee as a whole.
IT Services staff – interviewed in an open session specifically for ITS staff.
- AMRC open sessions – Individual IT Subcommittee members were present at AMRC campus sessions to address the questions and topics of the URI community as a whole.
- Online surveys – sent out to University staff to gather information not available through other sources:
  - Computer server hardware within and out of IT Services
  - Human Resources who are assigned responsibility of delivering information technology services (not necessarily denoted through a job title)
  - Status and number of research-related computer hardware maintained outside of IT Services
- IT Subcommittee website – used to solicit feedback from the campus community. Topics of suggestion and concern covered:
  - Email services
  - IT Services communication, instructions, and documentation
  - Organizational issues
- Members of the IT Subcommittee were also contacted directly by faculty, staff, and students: in person, by email, and by phone.

**Approach**

Recommendations were developed based on empirical data gathered through the process identified above. Each recommendation had to conform to the five criteria set forth by the AMRC:

1) Measurable
2) Consistent with the President’s charge to the AMRC
3) Consistent with the President’s *Transformation Goals* and the URI *Academic Plan*
4) Improve the performance, effectiveness, and efficiency of URI
5) Fill an unmet need or offer a new opportunity
Findings

The IT Subcommittee identified a framework of findings described by the graphic below. This graphic describes the pieces of IT management (petals) as part of the overall organizational service requirements (environment around petals).

Responsible and balanced management of each piece, held together by strategic leadership, leads to quality service to stakeholders and support for University functions.

Information Technology Subcommittee Report – Figure 1

Framework of Findings

Many individuals interviewed were quick to cite areas where they felt IT Services had made significant progress despite resource restrictions. Areas cited were:

- Network and Wireless services
- Help Desk Services
- E-Campus
- Sakai
The findings also revealed a very common feeling that information technology and IT Services are underfunded, both through human resources and finances, for products and services. Some of the frustrations expressed in terms of services available were most commonly in the areas of:

- Email
- IT Services communications
- Lack of automation and integration of business processes and data
- Lack of single sign-on or portal

The Subcommittee encountered a defeatist attitude about technology services. IT Services is sometimes characterized as being behind the times in some key areas and as holding URI back. An apparent lack of leadership trust across the University (and within IT Services) with IT Services was also frequently encountered.

The findings listed below are a result of the data gathered in the process described earlier. The IT Subcommittee recognizes that all readers will not agree with all findings; however, every effort has been made to be fair to the process, its contributors, and the results.

**Strategic Partnership**

Information Technology is rarely recognized as a strategic partner at URI. Organizationally, IT Services does not have a direct line to the President. Personal interviews of the President and Provost revealed a clear understanding of issues and goals for information technology and IT Services, but other stakeholders did not. In particular, interviews with Vice Presidents and some key stakeholders revealed virtually no regular communications with IT Services leadership, no regular planning of Division or department priorities with IT Services, and some lack of understanding of services available from IT Services. Engagement of IT Services leadership with University leadership lacks consistency, accuracy, and enough information to be productive, symptomatic of a lack of partnership.

Data collected also revealed that decentralized information technology has created numerous areas of duplicated services, positions and expenditures, while at the same time there is no direction or leadership for a consistent strategy. This includes everything from data security, communications, IT process management, project management, and IT service levels. In many cases, individuals both in and out of IT Services were unclear as to who is responsible for providing and maintaining a service.

- Several examples of inefficiencies and extra expenditures were revealed due to the lack of a well-defined strategic plan and central IT that is enforced across all Divisions and departments. Examples include duplicated hardware, software, and information technology positions in the areas of email, website delivery, authentication, and IT.
Operations in colleges and departments. By allowing expenditures on the same or similar products and services across Divisions, colleges and departments, the University is not making strategic decisions to focus its technology resources on University priorities.

No clear method exists for making University-wide IT strategic leadership decisions or engaging senior management in information technology planning across Divisions.

- This suggests that the lack of strategy is not a process that has been overlooked as a result of declining resources, but is a process that is not in place at all.
- Major information technology investments, like PeopleSoft, Sakai, and Network services, require ongoing, consistent attention by staff, including maintenance, upgrades, and application customizations throughout the lifecycle of those products and services. Because of reduced funding and resources, a number of key and potentially useful applications or services have been purchased but never implemented at the University. In addition, none are addressed in any strategic plan or prioritization.

There are neither IT Services nor process methodology in place at the University to structure project/services inception, funding, communications, staffing, implementation, and management of projects.

- Process methodology is key to structuring engagement of appropriate stakeholders and resources. Process methodology may also mitigate other issues revealed in the Findings section of this report, such as not implementing major software or services purchased by the University, staff skills, resource allocation, and strategic planning.

**IT Governance**

IT Services does not consistently function in a current industry service model.

- Organizations are, for the most part, grouped around technology platforms rather than services, creating barriers as well as a lack of consistent service levels and accountability. Surprisingly, there is a common lack of understanding across the University about the need to plan for the full lifecycle implementation of a major information technology project. This includes getting agreement to proceed and a commitment of resources from stakeholders, budgeting, and purchasing.
- University stakeholders are not engaged in planning, purchasing, or project management in a systematic and consistent manner. Most notable is the lack of coordination in planning or prioritizing projects and services.
- Purchases are made without a specific plan for implementation that is developed with stakeholders and contains a clear commitment of resources both in and out of IT Services. This is due in part because the “use it or lose it” funding model is driving last-minute fiscal-year purchases in order to use funds that cannot be carried over for future strategic use.
• Decisions made for information technology across URI and IT Services do not consistently involve stakeholders, in some cases resulting in millions of dollars spent on IT products and services that are not implemented, such as PeopleSoft modules, and many miscellaneous software contracts or services both in and out of IT Services.

Many of these issues are rooted in the lack of a governance body at URI for information technology with University stakeholders to engage in ongoing information technology strategic planning, prioritization, and project oversight.

• Models such as this have been used in specific cases at URI, such as the steering committee formed for the initial PeopleSoft implementation, which led to a successful on-time launch. However, that committee was not continued past the initial release in 2003, which may have led to an incomplete implementation.

• Creating such organizational structures, sufficiently empowered and representative of involved stakeholders, has been a successful model of governance across the IT industry in public and private sectors.

**Structure of IT at URI**

URI has a decentralized organization of information technology. This means there is not one department or body responsible for delivering or coordinating all information technology services at the University. Frequently, decentralized information technology means the mission, products, and services of IT Services are undermined. In addition, contracts and major purchases are made independent of a coordinated plan or leveraging technologies and skills already in place at the University. Consistent, accurate communications in a decentralized environment is nearly impossible. Unlike academic delivery at the University, this organizational structure is akin to having multiple departments or groups providing the same Mathematics, Nursing, or Business courses.

Consequently, URI is spending nearly as much on decentralized departmental technology expenditures and staffing as on the total IT Services department budget (see Appendix A – *Information Technology Subcommittee Report: True University-Wide Cost Analysis*). Beyond the financial numbers, duplication of services and resources were revealed in the campus survey responses revealing an inefficient structure and delivery of information technology. This includes services and support provided by research grants and contracts, including overhead funding. Symptomatic of decentralization, there is little attention to centralized planning and deployment of information technology support that could free up resources to strengthen education and research. In some cases, decentralized means no one is assigned to handle the issue. Resources and delivery of services is not efficient, consistent, or as effective for the University as it needs to be for future success. Some resources are overloaded; others are not available for balancing of work and priorities to meet the University’s strategic goals.
Decentralization also creates inefficiencies and extra expense in the procurement process. For example, there is no standardized desktop or laptop configuration for faculty and staff; departments purchase software and servers without consulting IT Services. In addition, the lack of adequate legal counsel to review information technology contracts and RFPs slows down the procurement process. At times, this has prevented services from going ahead for the department of Media and Technology Services and Security.

Organizationally, within the University, IT Services reports to the Provost, but financially it is managed as part of Academic Affairs. IT Services and Academic Affairs may have different needs, task/project goals, processes, and timeline requirements inherent in mission differences such as IT Services supporting all of the University (administration, research, academics).

**IT Staff Skills**

Keeping pace with changing technology requires frequent training. Training in relevant and current technology for IT Services staff is rare and no clear training program tied to strategic goals is in place. Due to decentralized information technology, training of staff outside of IT Services is left to leadership of departments and organizations without an IT mission. Training in non-technical skills such as project management and negotiation is non-existent. Inconsistent and inadequate training is inefficient and costly for URI, and results in a proliferation of bad habits and slow growth into new areas.

**IT Services Communications**

University-level communications from IT Services is dependent upon the individual to deliver. There is little to no department-level communications to University faculty, staff, students, and researchers. Policies, procedures, and best practices are not communicated or disseminated to the University clearly and consistently. A key source for information technology information at URI is the IT Service website but it is outdated, difficult to navigate, and includes some inaccurate information.

As explained earlier, in most cases University leadership is unaware of plans, priorities, and progress in IT Services. This includes access to projects and plans in place, a 5-year strategic plan, an operational plan, funding, and expenditures within IT Services. Engagement of ITS leadership with University leadership lacks consistency, accuracy, and enough information to be productive. A key factor to correcting this problem is effective communications.

**IT Risk Management**
Decentralized information technology undermines security. URI’s central security authority is not consistently supported and because information technology services are duplicated or provided by multiple departments, security for the University’s data and services is not consistently applied and enforced. Best practices for security are inconsistent within IT Services Security policies both within IT Services as well as across URI.

Data and service recovery is not defined. End users and IT Services staff are unclear how to recover lost data, or if it is possible. URI stakeholders have not been engaged in establishing policies, procedures, or plans for data storage, recovery, or continuity of services. There is no Academic or Business Continuity plan for the University in the event of major loss of systems, data, or other catastrophes.
Recommendations

Issue an RFP for an IT Organization Consultant

**Highest Priority Recommendations within Information Technology**

**Recommendation:** Given the importance, cost, and complexities of information technology at the University, issue an RFP for an outside Information Technology consultant to review our detailed report and make additional recommendations in areas of re-organization, staffing, best practices, and service levels. Evaluate information technology strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats at URI and make recommendations for improvement.

**Benefit to the University:** Comprehensive outside- and industry-approached organizational and staffing recommendations to develop additional efficiencies, service improvement, and cost savings.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

Engaging an outside consultant will allow a comprehensive review of this report and additional information requested to provide the University with a detailed review, assessment, and plan for items such as:

- Re-examine the placement of IT Services in the URI organization to make it more of a strategic partner to the University as a whole.
- Develop an assessment of current and future services, systems, staffing, policies, and practices, with recommendations for improvement.
- Look to URI strategic goals and identify the current situation of IT Services, its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and the pathways to success.
- Design a structure that moves URI towards a centralized information technology structure with appropriate service models.
- Identify potential opportunities for moving services to vendor-support and re-allocation of associated resources.
Establish an IT Governance Committee

Recommendation: Establish an IT Governance Committee to oversee strategic goals and prioritization for information technology at the University.

Benefit to the University: Ensures engagement with URI leadership in planning and implementing major technology services, resources and staffing (both technical and business resources), and coordination with University strategic goals.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

IT Governance Committee members need to be a diverse group that represents Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Research, Administration, and Student Services (Admissions, Enrollment Services, etc.), with members also holding high-level leadership positions in their department or Division. The Committee should track results through the University’s CIO and report regularly to the President and the URI community. The IT Governance Committee should focus on results with appropriate reporting mechanisms for consistency between information technology projects and purchases.
IT Strategic Plan

Recommendation: Redefine an IT Services Strategic Plan, including information technology as a whole to be both strategic and operational.

Benefit to the University: Ensures clear communication of path and priorities for IT Services and information technology as guidance for IT Governance Committee and management decisions.

- Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

The revised Strategic Plan should set specific goals with specific pathways and timeframes to achieve these goals. The IT Services strategy should connect to the President’s strategic goals for URI by identifying the current situation of IT Services, its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and the paths to success. One of the key benefits of a strategic and operational plan is it is also a business plan for the University’s Information Technology infrastructure and services.

In an ideal situation, a good IT strategic plan will be the guide for determining prioritization, resource allocation, and funding decisions on a University level as well.

In addition, a crucial factor for a successful plan is that all Divisions at the University must participate in an IT Services Strategic Plan. Information technology is not a stand-alone service, and IT Services is not a stand-alone department: it must be viewed as partner in all units of the University, which means all units must be engaged in making decisions about what can and cannot be achieved for information technology.
**IT Process Methodology**

**Recommendation:** Establish a consistent IT Process Methodology across all units for IT projects at URI. Use this as a foundation in establishing IT service methodology management within the University.

**Benefit to the University:** Ensures a focus on objectives and services for IT projects, purchases, and resource allocation in relation to services at the University to ensure quality, accurate delivery, feasibility, and cost effectiveness.

- Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

Looking forward, the business of IT is service oriented and must be focused on the quality of the services and relationships with its customers. The framework of IT Process Methodology provides specific steps, templates, and processes to follow for all aspects of every IT project, including inception, authorization, development or selection, implementation, and maintenance. Justification for IT projects, organizational decisions, and engagement of resources are documented and maintained along each step of an IT project’s lifecycle, whether it is a major software purchase, major hardware purchase, a staff organizational change, or network redesign. The continual theme for establishing a process methodology is to gain process improvement, efficiencies, and cost effective service improvement.

Several options exist in the IT industry, but a popular methodology for higher education is ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library). Established in the U.K. in the 1980s, it is popular throughout Europe and the Americas, and across industries. The specifics of the process can be customized for an organization’s need, but key factors necessary for URI are:

- Engagement of all stakeholders through each step of an IT project
- Standardized documentation and record-keeping
- Transparency and justifications for decisions and actions
- Results driven with accountability in place for all stakeholders
- Major projects must be vetted with key stakeholders and senior management.
  - Options for projects must be researched and evaluated.
  - Before any major project is scheduled, resources need to be identified, timelines established, and a Return on Investment defined with alternative solutions.

To ensure the effectiveness of information technology as well as solidify a service management culture, University senior leaders must also engage in a semi-annual update and planning session with IT Services leadership and the IT Governance Committee.
**IT Services and Information Technology Staff Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation:</strong></th>
<th>Institute annual training, annual performance reviews, and salary reviews every 5 years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit to the University:</strong></td>
<td>Aids in hiring, retaining, and development of qualified information technology personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiring, retaining, and developing qualified information technology resources must be a priority for the University. Having clear strategic and operational plans with a consistent process methodology will not be effective without also having a consistent program to build and reward talent for the right reasons.

An annual minimal required training for all information technology staff is required to ensure that all staff receives current and relevant training. This includes technical and non-technical skills (such as project management) and should include industry and product related trends to provide better evaluation of options for the University. Utilizing online training sites, URI faculty and staff, conference attendance, as well as external vendors, will assist in making this cost effective.

An annual performance review should be conducted for all information technology staff. The industry of IT changes rapidly, and in most cases several years go by with no formal performance evaluation. Employees, management, and University leadership lack a method of regularly providing feedback to and from the individuals responsible for delivery of IT services at URI. Without regular performance evaluations, staff has no formal venue for a dialogue to express concerns, needs, or to address job description and skill gaps.

As part of the rapidly changing industry and workforce of IT, URI Human Resources should conduct a salary review immediately and every 5 years afterward. This will allow URI management and staff to determine, through empirical data gathering, the status of current competitive salaries and will help resolve salary discrepancies among the staff.
**Desktop/Laptop Purchases**

**Recommendation:** Use URI Ram Computers for all desktop and laptop purchases; supply URI faculty and staff with a standard set of configuration choices.

**Benefit to the University:** Simplifies and standardizes procurement process of the most common IT purchases and allows the University to better leverage its volume buying power with vendors.

- **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

By following this policy and standard configuration choices for faculty and staff, the procurement process will be streamlined and simplified for some of the most common IT purchases at the University. The University will be better able to better leverage its buying power with vendors because a centralized process creates cost-savings via volume and consistency. URI Ram Computers also earns rebates from Apple at 8% of the purchase price and Dell at 4%, all of which goes back to the University. Ram Computers staff can set up computers for departments, which will provide additional efficiencies (process and cost to be determined). Ram Computers is also an authorized warranty provider.

**IT Services Approval of IT Purchases**

**Recommendation:** By using features of e-Campus Purchasing module in the Financials system (Items), URI should develop a simple process to require IT Services approval for IT purchases outside of URI Ram Computers.

**Benefit to the University:** Reduces chances of duplication of services, purchases, hardware, and software. Allows coordination of University strategic goals.

- **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

By setting up “items” in e-Campus Financials, a simple approval process can be set up that will allow specific IT purchases to be reviewed and approved by IT Services. This process will reduce the chances of duplication of services and purchases of software or hardware that conflict with University goals. Duplication of purchases and services is common at URI in technology. For example, many departments have purchased and installed their own servers for everything from email services to file sharing, even though these services are provided centrally at the University. Enterprise-level software is also duplicated. For example, the University owns more than one room-scheduling software package: Enrollment Services has one that is in use for all classroom scheduling and space optimization, while Memorial Union and College of Pharmacy have their own version of a different package that provides the same fundamental service.

Necessary controls must be in place to ensure efficiency, reduce waste, and improve services by focusing both financial and human resources into unified services for the University as a whole. If a department or a college needs an IT service, others at the University may also need it and
should benefit from the implementation. Other controls include security, which is not consistently implemented across the University as purchases and implementations are made without consultation of the University’s technology resources.

**Coordination with the State of RI and Board of Education**

**Recommendation:** Work with the State of Rhode Island and the Board of Education to obtain State-wide enterprise licenses. Engage State and College IT leadership at multiple levels in regular communications and planning. Conduct annual retreats to share plans, initiatives, resource availability in face-to-face format.

**Benefit to the University:** Leveraging the combined buying and negotiating power of the University, State, and BOE will reduce costs for commonly used software, simplifies procurement, and may make some software or services available that would otherwise be out of reach.

- **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

Utilize State Purchasing for MPA computer-related expenditures, software, hardware, and consultants. One example is the State of RI in the process of issuing an MPA for an email system for all state agencies.

Opportunities exist by partnering with State of RI, Rhode Island College, Community College of RI, and other schools locally and nationally. Lack of a service plan or strategic plan that can be communicated to other institutions inhibits developing these relationships and translating them into products and services for URI.
**IT Budgeting, Financial Management, and Procurement**

**Recommendation:** Work to improve the financial management and budgeting process for information technology to allow URI to function competitively within the IT industry and follow best practices.

**Benefit to the University:** Increases negotiating leverage with IT vendors and contractors, and allows URI to operate within IT industry norms, such as taking advantage of payment plans for large-scale purchases.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings

URI negotiation and purchasing procedures are not conducive to IT industry negotiation and procurement procedures. Often one-time money is used with no additional funds or staff to support purchase or to implement services rather than allowing funds to be brought forward to another fiscal year to combine for a strategic purchase. Purchases of major software and hardware are frequently done quickly when money is available without clear plans or prioritization to implement.

- Stop the practice of purchases without a business plan or supportive business engagement (see IT Process Methodology recommendation). Reconfigure budgeting process to allow for needs that cross fiscal years. Allow IT to carry over funds to next fiscal year.
- IT purchasing is both central and de-central, with no clear prioritization or way to know that resources are committed in all areas. Establish a position in ITS to coordinate all non-research-related IT purchases.
- Work with the IT Governance Committee to ensure communications on purchases.
- Explore exemption to State purchasing under specific conditions because State purchasing rules can delay, duplicate, and make purchasing more expensive.
- Hire additional legal staff because lack of adequate IT legal to review contracts and RFP slows down process and at times has prevented services from going ahead. Create templates for contracts below a specific level to avoid the need for extensive legal review.
**ITS Support Services**

**Recommendation:** Establish clear service agreements for faculty, staff, and students, identifying exact software and hardware supported.

**Benefit to the University:** Consistent skilled support with less frustration.

Currently there are no clear guidelines on what ITS or IT staff can and will support. Establishing a clear service agreement for faculty, staff, and students while also identifying specific software and hardware supported, will allow the University to cultivate focused resources that can become more proficient in their support area, rather than attempting to “be all and handle all.” This will also set expectations correctly and enable coordination of standardized configurations (see URI Ram Computers recommendation). Also, the University should ensure that IT staff has adequate skills to deliver identified support (see Training recommendation).

**Data Analytics**

**Recommendation:** Invest and implement a Data Analytics system to deliver broad-based and “drill-down” data across systems and departments, as well as at the University level. Use this tool to fuel a culture of decision making via data and evidence.

**Benefit to the University:** Accurate, timely data-driven decisions, forecasting, and planning. Reduced time and effort to develop accurate information with increased consistency across the University.

✓ **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

“Implementing analytics and applying it to make data-driven decisions is a major differentiator between high performing and low performing organizations.” (Big Data: The Next Frontier for Innovations, Competition and Productivity). McKinsey Global Institute, 2013.

URI is badly lacking sufficient current-day reporting and analytical tools for University leadership at all levels. Currently, there is no central reporting and analytics system. The University is dependent upon independently generated report data that’s often inconsistent, as well as traditional paper reports. Data-driven decision making is not practiced consistently throughout the organization due to the lack of tools. Reporting inaccuracies must be flushed out by the recipient, whereas institutional reporting system management ensures data integrity before a report is pulled. This is an inherent risk for the University in drawing conclusions and making decisions based on inaccurate data.
URI cannot move forward with a patchwork of analytics. There must be a central, validated, and consistent reporting platform/process/procedure for all organizations within URI. This should include clearly defined metrics consistent with the President’s goals, as well as with Divisions and departments. Dashboard-style reporting should be utilized to report high-level metrics and allow the URI community to track performance.

**In-House Versus Vendor Services for URI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Establish framework to determine costs, feasibility, and benefits of moving services to vendors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the University:</td>
<td>Maximize services while keeping costs down. Will allow current staff levels to focus on core services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URI should work to explore more supported services to maximize services while not increasing staff. Establish a framework to determine costs, feasibility, and benefits of moving services to vendors. Establish clear goals. Look to recommendations from Educause and other groups as well as conducting a thorough cost-benefit analysis of email, Sakai, server administration, ITS Operations, and system architecture. This will allow University staff to be re-purposed to a service position, thereby moving the organization to an IT Service Management model.
**IT Risk Management**

**Recommendation:** Enhance the role of IT Services Security to have information technology audit responsibilities to ensure best practices across the University.

**Benefit to the University:** Secure University data, including research data. Enforce consistent approaches, procedures, and protocols.

✔ Efficiency Gain

The University’s security authority in IT Services does not have the authority, responsibility or ability to audit security on software and hardware throughout the University. With recent data breaches, this is critical to ensure compliance with University policies and procedures. This includes within and outside of IT Services to include personal computing devices and outside vendor service data security.

**Recommendation:** Establish a Business Continuity and Data Recovery Plan for the University.

**Benefit to the University:** Ensures the University is able to conduct all aspects of its business including teaching, learning, billing, payments, payrolls, and research, in the event of any level of incident. An incident can range from a water leak damaging technology equipment to malicious actions to weather catastrophe.

✔ Service Improvement

URI lacks a Business Continuity Plan. Data and service recovery are not defined, and URI stakeholders have not been engaged in establishing policies, procedures, or plans for data storage, recovery, and continuity. Best practices are not in place. In the event of an incident, the cost to URI will be greater if the University does not have a Business Continuity or Disaster Recovery Plan in place.

As part of IT Process Methodology and an IT Governance Committee, establish a team to review IT Services and University policies, procedures, and plans for business continuity in the face of incidents. Empower team to assign tasks, set goals, and establish policies as needed.
IT for Research

Recommendation: Establish resources to coordinate IT services and core facilities for Researchers with the Division of Research as well as Academic Affairs.

Benefit to the University: Allow researchers to focus on research and obtain proper support in coordinating and procuring necessary IT services.

- Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings

There are no dedicated resources or core facilities at URI for IT needs of Research across the University. The President’s plan calls for increased Research, but essential support services are missing for information technology.

- A position should be established in IT Services to coordinate information technology services for Research, including creating partnerships with external vendors and sources of IT services for Research.

Several dozen researchers and staff have servers, data stores, High Performance Computing (HPC), analytics, and people resources. Scattered resources and external support for these services has not provided sufficient and sustainable support.

- URI should create a centralized facility that is collaborative with Brown and other national sites to more efficiently serve Research computing needs. Weave together resources such as operating, grants, and contracts to meet Researchers’ needs, and set a goal to provide human expertise to assist scholars.
**Classroom and Online/Distance Technology**

**Recommendation:** The Joint Classroom Steering Committee, The Joint Committee on Online and Distance Education, and the CIO should review services now and on an annual basis to determine if modifications are needed.

**Benefit to the University:** Providing consistent and efficient support to learning in classrooms and online.
- Service Improvement

The Joint Classroom Steering Committee, The Joint Committee on Online and Distance Education, and the CIO should establish an annual review of the budget for classroom and lab maintenance and solicit funds from other offices to fund major upgrades in technology and media. This committee should also develop a strategic plan for future upgrades and replacements.

The Joint Classroom Steering Committee, The Joint Committee on Online and Distance Education, or Provost Office should review where Classroom Media Assistance staff should report: IT Services, Provost, or Academic Affairs.

The Joint Classroom Steering Committee and The Joint Committee on Online and Distance Education should review staffing levels.

- Is second shift staffing adequate?
- Is an Audio Visual Integrator needed?
Virtual Desktops and Servers

**Recommendation:** Develop a plan for implementing virtual desktop and servers across the organization: classrooms, labs, and staff computing devices.

**Benefit to the University:** Reduces acquisition costs of hardware and software as well as human resource costs in maintenance. Improves service and security with consistent services delivered to multiple individuals from a central location.

✓ **Service Improvement**

Virtual desktop interface (VDI) should be deployed to all computer classrooms and labs. IT Services should develop a strategic plan to convert labs to virtual desktops as well as converting classrooms and staff to VDI. The strategic plan for VDI must include resources, cost, timeframe and return on investment.

Additional maintenance cost would be offset by reduction in cost of computer purchases.
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Overview

Published research in its broadest context is a required component of every tenure-track faculty member’s career. Research can range from unfunded scholarship, through small-scale funding for faculty release time or student help, to a multimillion-dollar enterprise in the sciences or engineering. In some departments, funded research is an essential part of a successful career; in others it is valued but not required.

Our subcommittee has focused primarily on management of funded research. We did not focus on administrative aspects of unfunded research. However, we feel that the Vice President for Research should engage all faculty members in the pursuit of scholarly activity.

Process

In early 2013, we posted on the AMRC website a standing request for input from the entire URI community.

In spring 2013, we sent an information request to Vice President Alfonso and Vice President Weygand. The request was designed to get a better idea of how the funding for research on the URI campus is utilized, specifically the Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA) funding. VP Weygand responded with detailed information. VP Alfonso also responded.

Subcommittee members met individually with faculty and staff researchers throughout this entire process and collectively with Provost Donald DeHayes, Vice President Robert Weygand, Linda Barrett and other URI senior staff in spring and summer of 2013. We thank Sharon Bell, Vern Wyman, Anne Marie Coleman, and Robert Weygand for their insight, particularly with respect to the recommendations below.
Findings and Recommendations

Pooled Fringe Rates

Highest Priority Recommendations Within Administrative Processes

Recommendation: Develop Pool Fringe rates for all URI employees.
Benefit to the University: Improved budget management and easier proposal writing.
✓ Efficiency Gain

A key difficulty for URI researchers is the inability to apply a common set of fringe benefit rates to employees supported on grants. This lack of “pooled” fringe rates for budget calculation confuses reviewers of URI proposals, unnecessarily extends budget development times, and complicates personnel justifications to agencies. Therefore, we recommend the development of Pooled Fringe Rates for all URI employees. This may require multiple categories of pools, based on an employee’s contractual status. However, the benefits of such pooling will improve URI research practices in the following ways: First, it will allow principal investigators to more easily and consistently write proposal budgets and budget funds from grants and contracts. Second, it will remove any incentive to base research hiring decisions on potential fringe costs of individual candidates. Third, if properly implemented, Pooled Fringe Rates will allow carry-over of health care funds and funds for other fringe benefits from year to year and thereby provide a hedge against mid-year changes in fringe rates.
Graduate Tuition

Recommendation: Charge full graduate tuition only until students have taken their required coursework and passed their comprehensive examinations.

Benefit to the University: Projected savings from reduced costs of graduate students to research grants and contracts. Improved competitiveness of URI research proposals, larger number of graduate students supported by research grants and contracts.

✓ Service Improvement

The cost of graduate tuition for students not participating in recognized classroom activities or coursework is onerous, both for students whose tuition is paid by grants and for students who finance their own graduate education. We believe that these costs have reduced the number of students in graduate programs throughout the University. We recommend that full graduate tuition only be charged until students have taken their required coursework and passed their comprehensive examinations. These requirements will typically be met at the end of the second year for Masters candidates and the end of the third year for Ph.D. candidates.

Implementation of this recommendation will (i) provide a strong positive incentive for all students to move expeditiously through the formal coursework stage of their graduate career, and (ii) significantly reduce costs of graduate students to research grants and contracts. In combination with the existing in-state tuition program for graduate students on research grants and contracts, implementation of this recommendation will also (iii) greatly improve the competitiveness of URI research proposals (relative to proposals from competing institutions), (iv) allow larger numbers of graduate students to be supported by research grants and contracts, and (v) greatly improve clarity in the proposal writing process by removing the present widespread confusion regarding limits on years of eligibility for the tuition differential between in-state and out-of-state charges. Implementation will require the development of a differential tuition model for students who are making appropriate progress toward completion of their degree while not taking academic coursework; we recommend a 9-credit dissertation or thesis credit package for $250/semester.
### Postdoctoral Scholar Employment Designation

**Recommendation:** Formally recognize postdoctoral scholars as trainees; fringe charges should be reduced to benefits trainees actually receive.

**Benefit to the University:**
- Projected savings from reduced fringe charges.
- Lower postdoctoral costs and formal organization will increase competitiveness of the University’s postdoctoral programs.
- ✓ Service Improvement, Cost Savings

Attracting and hiring postdoctoral students is extremely expensive at URI and the University does not provide a recognized program for appropriate postdoctoral training. We recommend that postdoctoral scholars be formally recognized as trainees, rather than regular University employees, and that fringe charges on postdocs be reduced accordingly to only cover benefits that postdoctoral trainees actually receive (e.g., health care). URI presently charges much higher post-doctoral costs than our major competitors. In consequence, the number of postdoctoral scholars at URI is much lower than at competing institutions and many URI research groups lack the educational and research mentorship advantages of postdoctoral interactions with students and investigators. URI also lacks a formal structure for appropriately recognizing and meeting the educational and training needs of post-doctoral scholars. Implementation of this recommendation will (i) significantly reduce the cost of postdoctoral scholars to funded research projects, (ii) significantly improve the competitiveness of URI proposals to fund postdoctoral scholars, (iii) allow larger numbers of postdocs to be supported by research grants and contracts, and (iv) provide a solid basis for inaugurating a formal URI structure for educational/training aspects of postdoctoral scholars. Such a formal structure will improve the readiness of URI postdocs for the next steps in their careers. It may also help the many different URI postdoctoral programs to articulate their specific goals. Finally, this change may provide URI researchers with a distinct edge in postdoctoral recruitment by attracting candidates who value the opportunity to participate in the program.
**Principal Investigator Mentorship Program**

**Recommendation:** Create a strong and effective program for mentoring potential principal investigators in grant writing and submission.

**Benefit to the University:** Principal investigators will be more adept at winning grants.

✔ **Service Improvement**

Many faculty members come to URI as their first professional experience following graduate school, a postdoctoral fellowship or adjunct faculty appointment(s). Consequently, many have not developed the complete set of skills needed to competitively secure extramural funding. To help overcome this problem, we recommend that URI create a strong and effective program for mentoring of potential principal investigators in grant writing and submission (i.e., teaching them “how to fish”). The objective of this recommendation is not to enable writing of proposals, but to enable writing of successful proposals. This program should be viewed as part of a broader program to stimulate highly successful scholarly activity across all disciplines. This broader program should include focused effort to improve scholarly activity in areas without significant potential for external funding, as well as areas with significant potential for external funding.

**National Council of University Research Administrators Peer Review**

**Recommendation:** Invest in an onsite National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) Peer Review.

**Benefit to the University:** Higher quality, lower risk sponsored program services.

Identify and improve areas of weakness.

✔ **Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement, Cost Savings**

To better assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Sponsored Programs Administration with the Division of Research, we recommend that the University invest in an onsite National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) Peer Review. The NCURA Peer Review Program is a powerful tool for enhancing sponsored program operations. This review is available to all NCURA members. The confidential peer review would be conducted by a team of nationally recognized research administrators who would thoroughly review URI’s externally sponsored research programs. The review uses National Standards that represent the core and vital functions of sponsored programs, regardless of size and type of institution. At completion of the review, URI would receive a detailed confidential report that provides valuable feedback addressing program strengths and areas for improvement. This feedback would assist the sponsored programs office in providing quality services, minimizing risk, and promoting a positive culture for research administration.
**Administrative Support**

**Recommendation:** Create a position to specifically aid faculty members with administrative activities related to research.

**Benefit to the University:** Improved budget development and projection of research-project expenses.
- **Efficiency Gain**

There is currently little consistency in administrative support for research activities across the colleges. In our present configuration, some colleges provide extensive and highly functional support units for research support, but others provide little to no support. This inequity can be seen in the absolute disparities in (i) funding of such support by the colleges and (ii) the support of other (unfunded) research and scholarly activities. There should be staff in each college whose job descriptions include assisting faculty members with administrative duties related to research, including budget development and projection of research-project expenses. These positions would be assigned to specific faculty members and would be a contact for the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) when project-related questions arise. While these positions would report to the college they reside in, the Division of Research and Economic Development (RED) should provide training for these administrative positions.
General Counsel Support

**Recommendation:** Hire additional legal counsel assigned to Research and compliance issues for the General Counsel. Develop contractual agreements for legal services from skilled outside counsel to support the research enterprise.

**Benefit to the University:** Improved ability to approve research contracts, memoranda, and cooperative agreement in a timely manner.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

The amount of time necessary to develop and approve research contracts, memoranda and cooperative agreements negatively impacts the research and scholarly activities of faculty, staff, and students. These delays can lead to loss of funding, lack of participation in key projects, and inability to initiate fundable research activities across the campus. The General Counsel has an exceedingly challenging job; additional staff and, in some cases, contractual counsel are needed to accomplish the many complex and highly diverse projects. We recommend that the University look into additional support for the General Counsel’s Office (beyond the recent hire) and develop contractual agreements for legal services from skilled outside Counsel to support the research enterprise.
University Revenue Subcommittee Report

Members of the University Revenue Subcommittee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Whitney</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>URI Bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bergen</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Casey</td>
<td>Associate Controller</td>
<td>Controller’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Higgins</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview

There are real pressures on the overall funding of Higher Education. Across the country numerous states have decreased their appropriation to public institutions, which has had a direct effect on overall tuition cost to families and students. As such, the “Net Tuition” as a percent of Public Higher Education total revenue by State has risen. (See the www.sheeo.org Report: FY 2012 State Higher Education finance by State Higher Education Executive Officers or SHEEO). In 2012, URI is in the top ten [#9] in net tuition revenue. This budget model is not sustainable.

To close the gap in funding, URI has taken a number of actions over the years: Increased enrollment, increased tuition and fees, left vacant faculty and staff positions unfilled, and reallocated funds to financial aid. Yet the annual budget shortfall continues.

Numerous colleges and universities have initiated reviews of their entire operations. The purpose of this self-analysis is to ascertain what is being done right, as well as what can be improved to find additional resources to meet the primary mission of the institution. A review of the URI budgets for Fiscal Years 2013, 2014 and 2015 documents a number of issues that affect the URI community. These issues need to be vetted with the University community because the success of URI is our shared responsibility.

This review process and our recommendations for change will not be successful without cohesive leadership from the senior level administration. A bureaucracy cannot change itself. The culture of the institution is not something that affects us from the outside; it is created and sustained by us on the inside.

In the book A Force For Change: How Leadership Differs from Management, John P. Kotter writes the following:

“This means, first and foremost, providing a vision of the kind of culture that is needed. It also means being a visible role model of what is expected from others. It means helping people to understand what leadership is, why it is
important, how it is different from management, and how it can be created. It means giving people the opportunity to lead and manage. It means supporting efforts with resources and enthusiasm that are consistent with the desired culture. It means recognizing and rewarding successes. In short, it means providing leadership on the issue of culture.

Leadership and culture are subjects that are closely related as management and structure [for systems]. It takes strong leadership to create a useful culture... In a sense, institutionalizing a leadership-centered culture is the ultimate act of leadership.”

Financial Background

During the process we assumed the following financial information for Fiscal Year 2014: estimated tuition and fees would be $261,700,000, enrollment would be approximately 14,400 (FFTE), annual tuition and mandatory fee rates for in-state and out-of-state students would remain level with FY 2013 as directed by the Office of Higher Education.

Process

As a subcommittee of the Administrative Review Committee, our charge was to examine the revenue-generating and cost centers at the institution, generally referred to as the auxiliaries. In reviewing these entities we tried to follow the same process for each of them. Before meeting with the individuals representing the entities, we asked for background material and provided these individuals with a list of questions we would ask during our meeting. The material requested and the questions we posed are set forth below.

Background Material

- Mission and purpose of the department
- Total personnel costs and organizational chart of positions
- Fiscal year budgets including actual results in previous fiscal years
- Cash fund balance and use thereof [if applicable]

Initial Questions Posed to Individuals:
1. What URI operational hurdles do you want to see changes in that would enable you to operate more efficiently? (Purchasing, Human Resources, Financial [Controller/Budget], ITS, other).
2. Do you have a Reserve fund? If requested, what amount of current cash fund could you turn back over to the University without hurting your operation over the next 2-3 years?
3. If asked, how much in personnel costs could you reduce over the next three years? How would you manage the reductions?
4. Could we reorganize parts of our operations into a central accounting office for all of Student Affairs?
5. Privatization data? Please identify comparative data to lease operations in your area.
6. What changes would you like to see the State of Rhode Island make in their overall procedures or mandates over URI or auxiliaries in general?
7. What other contributions does your department make or pay back to URI already?
8. What other services do you offer the campus community?

The entities we examined or plan to examine are set forth in Table 1. In examining these entities we have done so consistently with the President’s overall goal “to identify opportunities and mechanisms by which URI can reduce the costs and improve the performance of its administration, management, and business practices, and add value to the academic and co-curricular experiences of our students.” Subsequent to the meetings, additional questions or clarification took place through emails or phone conversations. Finally, we also had numerous individual conversations with staff throughout the campus, and interviews with both the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Vice President of Administration and Finance.
### University Revenue - TABLE 1

#### Status of Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Alton Jones Campus</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Office</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Office</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Programming and Events</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Union</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Life</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Services</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Center/Boss Arena /Management RFP</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI Foundation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI Licensing program</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI Bookstore</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Services</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Programs</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Stores</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Office</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/Communication and Marketing</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings and Recommendations

Indirect Cost Allocation and Contributions to General Fund

**Recommendation:** Treat indirect costs as a single contribution to University overhead from auxiliaries and enterprise units.

**Benefit to the University:**
- Projected reallocation: $1,500,000 to $4,000,000.
- Enhanced operational management.
- Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings

The indirect cost allocation equation should be reviewed and clearly defined and applied on a consistent basis from year to year. The current equation utilized to determine indirect cost is complicated and needs to be simplified. URI should consider using this line-item expense as a single contribution to the University overhead from auxiliaries and enterprise units. This would serve as the primary reallocation of funds from auxiliary and enterprise units to the University. This redefinition of indirect cost will enable the directors of each auxiliary or enterprise fund to manage their operations better.

**NOTE:** Total indirect cost contributions to URI by the auxiliary units were $4,250,000 in FY 2012. (Dining, HRL, Health Services, Memorial Union, Bookstore). URI also needs to charge an indirect cost rate to all units deemed as an enterprise, for example, Parking Services.

Overall actual financial assessment of a department is hindered by the long-term practice of either charging outside expenses to an auxiliary or not charging expenses to an enterprise. For example, Residential Life contributed not only an indirect cost of $2,250,000 to the General Fund in FY13, but the students also paid for an additional $3,600,000 in outside salaries, projects, or other donations that may not be direct operational expenses. Residential Life total contribution in FY13 is $5,850,000.

A clear policy of determining the auxiliary’s additional contributions to the General Fund needs to be developed. A strategic plan and operational budget review of any additional contribution must be included as part of the process.
Health Services and the Counseling Office

Recommendation: Merge the Counseling Center with Health Services.

Benefit to the University: Projected savings/reallocation: $300,000 to $400,000.
Consolidated administration.
✓ Efficiency Gain

The committee felt that the counseling office should be part of a comprehensive definition of health services and that these two entities should be combined. The merger will result in administrative savings by combining these closely related services into one comprehensive entity. The Health Services fee should be reexamined based on this recommendation. The new health fee would cover the combined costs of operations as well as indirect cost allocation and projected capital expenditures. The Emergency Medical Services [EMS] group is part of Public Safety and should not be set up as an independent enterprise. Funding for the EMS group is currently part of the budget in Health Services.

Conference Office and Public Programming and Special Events

Recommendation: Consolidate the Conference Office and Public Programming and Special Events Office.

Benefit to the University: Consolidated and centralized administration.
Coordinated event scheduling.
✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

URI should review a consolidation of the Conference Office and Public Programming and Special Events office. One staff position from the Memorial Union doing similar work could be considered as part of this consolidation. URI should consider including all potential venues for event management within the auspices of this new office with the exception of Ryan Center/Boss Arena. Potential savings may occur by combining the expertise and limited resources of the currently independent operations with each other. Although there is currently collaboration among the separate department staff, the combined administrative organization could potentially increase events from outside groups, organizations, and agencies utilizing University venues, which will broaden our community service role and in some cases increase event revenues. The hosting of special events on campus will increase the number of potential students, researchers, and faculty that may want to visit the University.
While each department now serves a different mission, their overall goals and objectives are often very similar. Once the combined services and structure of this new “Event” office is clearly identified, all departments, colleges, and student organizations at URI should be required to coordinate their events and services through this office. Finally, the W. Alton Jones – discussed below – might also be merged into this entity and viewed as a subsidiary. At a minimum the W. Alton Jones marketing staff should be considered in a merger of these offices and included as part of a consolidation.

Memorial Union

Recommendation: Hold the Memorial Union student fee at its current rate through FY2016. Personnel cost to revenues should be reduced over time through attrition to less than 50-55% of total revenues.

Benefit to the University: Cost Savings/reallocation projection: $700,000.

✓ Cost Savings

Recommendation: Alter the current Memorial Union construction plan to focus on aesthetics and the creation of small, informal gathering areas.

Benefit to the University: Enhanced study group resources and technologically advanced classrooms.

✓ Service Improvement

A current capital expenditure review of the Memorial Union is under consideration. Funding of this project has yet to be determined. This project should be scaled back from an expansion of the facility’s square footage to a more attainable renovation of the current facility. A focus should be made on the aesthetics of the facility and the creation of smaller informal gathering areas and study group resources. All meeting rooms should be converted to also allow for possible classroom use. The highest level of technology enhancements should be installed in each room, such as smart boards that will interact with various devices (tablets, laptops, and smart phones).

Recommendation: Renovate the Rams Den to include a private food court.
Benefit to the University: Additional dining options for students, extended dining hours, and new space for event scheduling.

✓ Service Improvement

The Rams Den should be renovated into a food court that offers a few private franchise operations with late operational hours. URI Dining office would oversee the franchise operators and contracts. The open food court seating area would be available for scheduling of special events, speakers, movies, etc.

Parking Services

Recommendation: Consolidate all Parking Services and lots into one entity.

Benefit to the University: Sustainable revenue model for parking services.

✓ Efficiency Gain

All Parking Services and lots need to be consolidated into one entity. Under the current model, the necessary revenues to run the entity are disproportionately borne by the students and thus the current model is not sustainable. Various revenues/expenses outside of the student permit fee are not directly attributable to the enterprise. The current permit fee to park on campus also subsidizes the “discounted” RIPTA bus fares that students and staff purchase at the Memorial Union. The current campus shuttle system is operated at a cost of $994,610.

Recommendation: Impose a parking fee for preferred staff lots.

Benefit to the University: Improved parking lot maintenance.

✓ Service Improvement

The subsidy for faculty/staff “parking fee” of $271,494 annually does not adequately represent the cost incurred to maintain the faculty and staff lots because all parking lots are not part of parking services. Parking Services only includes student lots and those lots which have been renovated. A fee-based system for staff parking should be considered.
**W. Alton Jones**

**Recommendation:** Clearly identify the mission of the W. Alton Jones Campus and update operational procedures.

**Benefit to the University:** Projected savings/reallocation: a minimum of $1,200,000.

- **Cost Savings**

The mission of the W. Alton Jones Campus needs to be redefined and operational procedures changed. The General Fund contribution to the WAJ operating budget needs to be clearly identified, and then the enterprise needs to operate at a breakeven level by FY 2015. Personnel costs need to be brought down to 50% of revenues overall [FY12 was 80%]. Additional staff should not be added at this time until a complete operational analysis is made and a revised business plan is developed that is sustainable.

**Dining Services**

**Recommendation:** Complete a financial analysis of catering services and review total personnel costs in all Dining operations.

**Benefit to the University:** Projected savings/reallocation: $1,200,000

- **Cost Savings**

Dining Services should complete a financial analysis of their catering services and consider alternatives to supplement delivery of those services. Dining should consider adding a number of 3rd party local companies to assist in the various catered events on all campus locations. The sanctioned outside catering businesses would be determined through a RFP bid process in Purchasing. URI Dining could establish 1, 2, or 3-year agreements with vendors, depending on the overall needs for the campus community.

Dining should consider a potential reduction in overall personnel costs to revenues by FY 2016-17. Reduction in costs might be attained through attrition, increased part-time staff to supplement full-time, and increased revenues.

**Recommendation:** Reassess the budget for and goals of the Butterfield renovation.
Benefit to the University: Additional dining options for students and extended dining hours.

✓ Cost Savings, Service Improvement

Dining Services should consider the need to invest $8,000,000 in the renovation of Butterfield dining facility and whether a more modest renovation would achieve a similar goal. For example, a renovation of the Rams Den, located in the Memorial Union, to create a food court concept might increase the opportunity for franchise locations to extend operational hours and optimum scheduling space. A new Rams Den operational model coupled with a smaller Butterfield renovation may have a longer-term positive impact.

**URI Foundation and Alumni Association**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Consolidate the URI Foundation and Alumni Association into one entity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the University:</td>
<td>Centralized administration. Clearly defined roles for both institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current consolidation of the URI Foundation and Alumni Association should move forward quickly. If possible, a single administrative office with accounting support staff should be established to meet the needs of both entities. The defined mission for each organization should to be discussed and implemented. We recommend that all fundraising events be centralized through URI Foundation, and the URI Alumni Association mission should focus directly on alumni relationships.

Recommendation: Move all processing of financial transactions that involve Foundation-only funds from URI Accounting to the URI Foundation.

Benefit to the University: With no statutory requirement for this practice, URI resources will be freed up for URI financial processing, while Foundation fund processing will be centralized within URI Foundation.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings, Service Improvement
The Administrative Processes and University Revenue subcommittee recommends that the University discontinue the practice of processing payments with Foundation funds through the University accounting office. Over the next few months, the URI Controller’s office and the URI Foundation should review the current procedures and responsibilities involved in the transaction payment process. In FY12, more than 5,000 transactions for a total of $6,860,252 were processed by the Controller’s office.

This issue was identified early on in our discussions amongst committee members and later with stakeholders throughout the University. After researching the origins of this practice, it was determined that this was actually born out of “folklore” rather than a specific University policy or procedure. There are no statutory requirements, Board policies, or University policies and procedures identified that would require this practice to continue. During fiscal year 2013, 4,400 transactions totaling $4,420,284 were processed through the General Accounting Office with Foundation funds. As a result, the General Accounting Office was required to add an additional 521 vendors to the system and issue 1099-MISC forms for reportable transactions. In addition, the accounting staff spent considerable time following up with incorrect addresses and TIN match issues. With limited exceptions, the URI Foundation is equipped and fully amenable to processing these transactions through their own accounting office. Foundation payments should not be processed through the URI General Accounting Office since these are private funds and permissibility of the expense is determined by the Foundation, not the General Accounting Office.

The estimated savings of the recommendation is $50,000-$75,000 annually.

Recommendation: The URI Foundation should determine its own policy for reimbursable expenditures.

Benefit to the University: Consolidate Foundation reimbursements under Foundation policies; improve efficiency and turnaround time of reimbursements.

✓ Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement

A discussion of a revised payment procedure should also include the “Dean’s Designated funding” reimbursement policy. As a separate 501(c)(3), the URI Foundation should determine its own policy for expenditures that are reimbursable through its accounts. In the interim, we recommend raising the required Provost Office signature authority limit of $300 dollar to $1,500.
**URI Bookstore**

**Recommendation:** Reduce personnel costs to 12% of total revenues by FY 2015.

**Benefit to the University:** Projected savings: $350,000.

✓ **Cost Savings**

The revenues for the URI bookstore have declined over the past few years due to marketplace competition and industry changes. Total personnel costs, including benefits, are 16% of total revenues in FY 2013. The bookstore needs to prepare a business plan to bring personnel costs to approximately 12-14% of total revenues by FY 2015. The projected savings from this initiative is approximately $350,000.

**Recommendation:** Consolidate all computer hardware department/staff purchases through Ram Computers.

**Benefit to the University:** Projected savings: $125,000.

✓ **Cost Savings, Efficiency Gain, Service Improvement**

The University should review and consider consolidating all computer hardware department/staff purchases through Ram Computers (a URI Bookstore operation). Ram Computers is an official higher education Reseller with Apple and Dell computers, and has certified warranty repair technicians. A commission rate of 4–8% is returned to URI Bookstore when orders are centralized through our account with Dell and Apple. More than $1.4M of laptops and desktops were purchased directly from Dell and Apple in FY 2012. URI did not receive any commission on these orders. Centralized hardware ordering could generate a potential savings/reallocation of $125,000 or more. A percentage of the net income through Ram Computers should be earmarked to support University network improvements.
**Recommendation:** Update the Memorial Union renovation project to include renovation of bookstore fixtures and expansion for office and storage space.

**Benefit to the University:** Improved aesthetics and customer service flow, potentially improving sales.

- **Service Improvement**

A renovation of the store to upgrade store fixtures and expand the square footage for office and storage space on the north side of the building should be included in the Memorial Union project. The bookstore needs to remain in the center of the campus and near the residence hall facilities. A proposal to move the store to a new “retail” area as outlined in the Master plan should be deleted from the plan.

---

**Ryan Center/Boss Arena**

**Recommendation:** Designate a technical committee to develop and review the RFP specifications for the Ryan Center.

**Benefit to the University:** Projected savings: $125,000.

- **Cost Savings**

The management services of the operation of the Ryan Center/Boss Arena require a new RFP. The RFP is currently being developed and will be processed in FY 2014. A full-time student building fee was increased in 2011 to $418 to help sustain the facilities and help cover operating costs. The student fee accounts for $5.6M in revenues of the two facilities. A new management contract for the facilities is likely to cost more than the original agreement.

URI should designate a technical committee to develop and review the RFP specifications. One of the goals of a new management agreement is to see how outside revenues can be increased and operational costs decreased.

The current student’s building fee must be reviewed. A consideration of a reduction or reallocation of a portion of the fee to Recreational Services should be made.
URI Licensing Royalty Program

Recommendation: URI Foundation and Director of Licensing should review the current agreement and develop a proposal to either implement a self-managed licensing program or create an updated RFP for administrative/marketing support with a national company.

Benefit to the University: Projected savings/reallocation: $50,000 to $75,000.

✓ Service Improvement

URI started a management program for trademark licensing in 1991. This program requires vendors that produce products and merchandise with University logos to be licensed. Royalties back to the university are approximately $100,000 annually. The URI Foundation was designated as the office to work with the Collegiate Licensing Corporation [CLC]. The current agreement runs through June 2017. The current Director of Licensing is also the URI Bookstore director.

Centralize Accounting for Auxiliaries and Enterprises

Recommendation: We propose a review of the feasibility and effectiveness of establishing a central financial accounting office to serve all auxiliaries and enterprises. The review should be completed by March 2014.

Benefit to the University: Centralized administration and operations.

✓ Efficiency Gain

We propose a review of the feasibility and effectiveness of establishing a central financial accounting office to serve all auxiliaries and enterprises. Currently, each auxiliary and enterprise maintains separate fiscal and accounting staff. The staff is essentially doing the same bookkeeping procedures as outlined by the Controller’s Office. A comprehensive review of each department’s organizational chart of positions and workload should be made to determine if a consolidation of some staff into a business support office would increase efficiency and reduce cost.


**Printing Services**

**Recommendation:** Establish a partnership or a combined printing center with URI Printing Services and URI Bookstore Campus Copy Center to meet the majority of URI printing/copying needs.

**Benefit to the University:**

- Projected savings/reallocation: $250,000.
- Efficiency Gain, Cost Savings, Service Improvement

This department has improved its operation over the past few years and currently has a fund balance of $50,000 that is utilized to upgrade the equipment. Revenues have remained approximately the same over the past three years, but some traditional operational costs such as rent or utilities do not appear to be allocated to this department.

We propose a detailed review of the current services offered through Printing Services and Campus Copy [operated by URI Bookstore] to be conducted by December 2013. One of the goals of the review would be to establish either a partnership or a combined printing center to meet the majority of the needs of the URI community. It is estimated that more than $250,000 of overall revenues currently going off-campus could be brought back into the University printing business.

Printing Services is currently a department within Business Services. It is recommended that Printing Services be established as an enterprise or auxiliary.
AMRC – Moving Forward

Implementation Phase Recommendations

Effective implementation of the AMRC recommendations is critical to the future success of URI. This cannot be understated, as each recommendation requires thoughtful, planned, and well-managed implementation in order for URI to achieve the expected benefits.

For this phase, the AMRC recommends that President Dooley appoint an Implementation Team. This team must be charged with oversight and accountability to ensure success of selected recommendations with clear, well-defined expectations and time frames. This team must work closely with the President to ensure effectiveness as well as cohesion with strategic institutional goals.

The AMRC recommends that the President identify “Champions for Change” to provide positive, interactive evolutions throughout each Division and department. Each Champion must be an invested participant in the implementation of a recommendation, and must look for new opportunities for change. This means a Champion must also have defined responsibility for an implementation. The responsibility must include maintaining close communications with the Implementation Team to act as a conduit between the URI community and implementation leadership. Feedback from the community as well as leadership from the Implementation team is critical to adjust implementation plans, which makes “Champions for Change” a critical piece to success.

Each implementation must have measurable goals and outcomes for success, with team members identifying potential cost savings, efficiency gains, or service improvement. As part of the implementation and the culture of change, these metrics must be brought into the everyday management and service environment of the University beyond the implementation period.

Last, the Implementation Team must also provide regular reports to the URI community as well as its leadership. Focusing on feedback, measures of goals achieved, accountability and plans, the reports will need to be perceived as a critical University scorecard.

Future Phases

It is the hope of the AMRC that its charge from President Dooley becomes a continual effort at the University of Rhode Island well beyond the final report. It is important to note that several recommendations require additional work or investment to implement. The hope is that beyond
that effort, the charges of the committee become systemic to the culture of the University, and will include additional phases to dig deeper and find new opportunities.

**AMRC Final Report – Conclusion**

The University of Rhode Island must change to meet the challenges of the future. Higher Education is increasingly competitive with enormous financial “war chests” in use across the globe, fighting for a shrinking population of students and research grants. Rapidly changing technology, student needs, and financial challenges require creativity and commitment to excellence.

The most critical factor for success is Leadership:

- Strong, accessible leadership at all levels.
- Leadership must engage with their staff, working directly with them: faculty, staff, students, and alumni.
- Leadership must be engaged in the “big” and “small” issues, always and unswervingly acting as a “Champion for Excellence.”
- Leadership must focus the URI community toward common goals, making it clear that no individual need is larger than the need of the University as a whole; that an individual’s need is in fact the University’s need.
- Above all, leadership is responsible for building an enthusiastic, engaged community of honest, dedicated talent.
AMRC Appendix A – Information Technology Subcommittee Report: True University-Wide Cost Analysis

ITS at URI provides computer services, telecommunications, networks, media help desk and services to the University. In the e-Campus Financial System, the IT Services departments include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Vice Provost - Inform. Tech. Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3306</td>
<td>Networking &amp; Telecommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td>University Computing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3311</td>
<td>Media &amp; Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>ITS Computer Labs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The departments are funded by various sources listed on the following page.
### Revenue and Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>12,053,147</td>
<td>11,676,555</td>
<td>11,616,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Telecommunication, Media &amp; Networking Service Fees</td>
<td>2,921,148</td>
<td>2,656,731</td>
<td>1,602,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Media &amp; tech Services</td>
<td>297,768</td>
<td>275,739</td>
<td>272,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>UCS fees</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>43,089</td>
<td>41,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Office of Higher Education - Project Funds</td>
<td>462,035</td>
<td>423,854</td>
<td>430,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>State RI High Tech Bonds</td>
<td>747,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>16,523,692</td>
<td>15,075,968</td>
<td>13,963,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>8,462,933</td>
<td>8,768,765</td>
<td>8,830,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Hardware, Software &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>2,934,562</td>
<td>2,411,078</td>
<td>3,015,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Lease Equipment</td>
<td>1,493,624</td>
<td>760,461</td>
<td>845,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Internet</td>
<td>2,590,574</td>
<td>1,997,853</td>
<td>1,289,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Operating Expense</td>
<td>839,636</td>
<td>545,728</td>
<td>710,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>16,321,329</td>
<td>14,483,885</td>
<td>14,690,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>453,752</td>
<td>656,508</td>
<td>1,248,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund transfer</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY Surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>202,363</td>
<td>592,083</td>
<td>(726,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>656,508</td>
<td>1,248,591</td>
<td>521,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centralized Information Technology Services Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Service Positions</th>
<th>Info Tech Services</th>
<th>Networking &amp; Telecommunication</th>
<th>University Computing Systems</th>
<th>Media &amp; Technology Services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate &amp; Assistant Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assistant to VP/UCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, Lead &amp; Program Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, Lead &amp; Information Technologist</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Technicians III &amp; IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Support Technician I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Supervisor (CCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Database Support Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Customer Service Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Computer Operator</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant II</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (filled as of June 2013)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant or unfunded FTEs as of June 2013</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Equivalent</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Decentralized Information Technology Employees

URI has decentralized Information Technology positions within various departments throughout the organization who do not have a direct or may have an indirect (dotted line) reporting to URI Information Technology Services (ITS) Division. There are currently 98 filled and 14 vacant decentralized positions with ITS-related job titles. In addition, there are employees who perform IT-related functions, however their job titles do not reflect these duties. The ITS subcommittee did a community survey to identify these resources. The survey responses, although not complete, reported 11.4 equivalent FTE positions. Services performed include webpages, computer hardware, academic/research/administration software, networks, training, security, and labs. The survey results have been extrapolated to estimate the true cost of decentralized ITS-related staff.

ITS-related job titles include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Control Clerk</th>
<th>Senior Information Technologist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry Operator</td>
<td>Senior Programmer Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Aide</td>
<td>Systems Support Technician I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Svs Tech I &amp; II</td>
<td>Tech Staff Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead &amp; Information Technologist</td>
<td>Tech Support Spec I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead &amp; Programmer Analyst</td>
<td>Technical Programmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Assoc/Data Analyst II, III &amp; IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Decentralized Information Technology Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job titled</th>
<th>FTE – ITS</th>
<th>Salary &amp; Fringe Benefits</th>
<th>FTE-Non ITS related</th>
<th>Salary &amp; Fringe Benefits</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Total Salary &amp; Fringe Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>$349,607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>$349,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Enrollment Services</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$438,838</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>$166,285</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>$605,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Colleges &amp; Library</td>
<td>50.93</td>
<td>$3,575,796</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>$326,082</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>$3,901,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic--Other</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>$217,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>$217,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>$332,378</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$551,814</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>$884,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Economic Dev.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>$253,520</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$304,609</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>$558,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$130,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$130,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>$530,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>$530,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>$215,012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>$215,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Positions</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapolations Survey Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non ITS Employees</strong></td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>$6,042,769</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>$2,748,790</td>
<td>123.70</td>
<td>$8,791,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Cost of Computer Hardware & Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job titled</th>
<th>Average Cost 5 years</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$22,701</td>
<td>$9,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Enrollment Services</td>
<td>$93,501</td>
<td>$75,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-Colleges &amp; Library</td>
<td>$1,987,949</td>
<td>$2,078,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic--Other</td>
<td>$73,367</td>
<td>$74,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$137,639</td>
<td>$146,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Economic Dev.</td>
<td>$24,676</td>
<td>$15,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$52,745</td>
<td>$45,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>$39,896</td>
<td>$50,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>$162,211</td>
<td>$139,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$13,843</td>
<td>$15,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,422</td>
<td>$2,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-ITS departments</strong></td>
<td>$2,608,528</td>
<td>$2,650,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>$1,164,294</td>
<td>$2,637,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,772,822</td>
<td>$5,288,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost of Computer Hardware & Software by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>5 Year Average</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non ITS Dept</td>
<td>ITS Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>$1,275,242</td>
<td>$631,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Unrestricted Self Supporting</td>
<td>$189,669</td>
<td>$327,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1XX</td>
<td>Other Fund 100</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Unrestricted - Overhead</td>
<td>$286,701</td>
<td>$286,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Expense Allocations &amp; Clearing</td>
<td>$15,342</td>
<td>$86,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2XX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>$160,058</td>
<td>$160,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3XX</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$10,916</td>
<td>$10,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Other Restricted</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>$177,774</td>
<td>$12,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>GO - High Tech</td>
<td>$107,162</td>
<td>$107,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>$464,235</td>
<td>$464,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Agency Fund</td>
<td>$9,698</td>
<td>$9,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,608,528</td>
<td>$1,164,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESKTOP & LAPTOP COMPUTER PURCHASES**

Currently, URI purchases large volumes of computers and laptops from Dell, Apple, and Hewlett Packard, as well as from the URI Bookstore; averaging $1.8 million over the last 5 years. URI Purchasing should work with ITS and URI Ram Computers to develop computer configuration packages for employees similar to what is being done at URI Ram Computers for students. (See [https://ramcomputers.uri.edu/index.php/computers/rhodyreadypackages.](https://ramcomputers.uri.edu/index.php/computers/rhodyreadypackages.)) If there are extenuating circumstance such as Research, Computer Science, Crime Lab, etc., these departments or a PI would be able to buy more advanced computers from the approved MPA vendor. However, for the standard employee there should be a limited selection from which to
choose. This would create efficiencies for departments needing to research computer configurations and various other options from vendors.

An example of excessive spending from the past: a department executive assistant purchased a high-end Mac computer with an extremely large screen because she used PeopleSoft. The majority of her work in PeopleSoft was inquiry-only for department expenditures.

URI should develop policy that **ALL** desktop and laptop computers must be purchased through URI Ram Computers, similar to UNH. This would standardize computer purchases and URI Ram Computers earns rebates from Apple (8%) and Dell (4%). Establishing standard computer configurations would help in vendor negotiations, because URI could provide details on types of computers purchased. In addition, Ram Computers staff are certified warranty service providers for certain computers.

If departments do not have staff to set up new computers, then URI Ram Computers staff can do it for them, which would provide additional efficiencies.

**DESKTOP COMPUTER SOFTWARE & APPLE (IPAD) APPLICATIONS**

Desktop and iPad application software should be centralized to URI Ram Computers. The list of available licensed software (such as Microsoft Office and Adobe Professional) can be clearly published. This would provide efficiency by saving department research of where to purchase licenses on an MPA or other vendors. Additional savings could be generated by URI having detailed information on number of users to negotiate licenses in the future.

URI Ram Computers can purchase iPad apps through Apple Volume Voucher program. Currently, staff has to personally purchase iPad apps and then request reimbursement. A standardized process would improve efficiencies and could reduce cost by volume purchases or educational pricing.

**COMPUTER SERVERS & SOFTWARE**

URI Purchasing should set up a category code in PeopleSoft for large computer hardware purchases, such as server or software systems that will need ITS support. ITS approval should be part of the college requisition process. This would help to identify if the ITS department will need to monitor or maintain the equipment or software. In addition, it will identify potential issues for IT security purposes and for backup issues. This could eliminate departments maintaining servers outside of ITS.
Example: Campus video security systems. Campus Police have a video security system; however, some individual departments have their own and the IT staff is not involved. Who is maintaining and backing up the system? Are the files secure or encrypted, etc.? Who has access to files? What is the security risk to URI?
MAJOR COMPUTER EQUIPMENT AND SOFTWARE PURCHASES WITH YEAR-END FUNDS

Budgeting process needs to be changed for major equipment and software purchases. URI needs a Strategic Information Technology Plan to prioritize major upgrades and implementation. URI needs to establish an IT Services Governance Committee to oversee and set priorities. The committee should establish budgets to fund product purchases and cost of implementation. A formal plan with timelines and milestones needs to be established. ITS project budgets need to be able to roll fund balance forward in order to complete projects. ITS will need to make sure it has an appropriate budget for the annual maintenance.

Example: In 2005, URI Purchased PeopleSoft Modules for E-Procurement, I Procurement, E supplier, Employee Expense, and other modules because URI received a “good deal”. These are products that could help streamline administrative processes across URI. However, there was no plan for their implementation, including a timeline, functional, technical and financial needs for implementation of these modules. They were purchased and put on the shelf. URI pays an annual maintenance on these modules of $176,554.

In FY2014, Controller’s office is scheduled to begin implementation to the employee expense module. The staff has been scheduled to go to training. There will need to be a commitment from ITS to provide technical resources.

URI purchased COGNOS in 2007 and it has not been implemented. URI pays an annual maintenance of $13,125.

URI purchased various software packages from Sunguard for Advancement. Not all modules were implemented, and URI was paying annual maintenance of approx. $50,000. URI has now terminated the maintenance on these since they will not be implemented. However URI is now purchasing different software from a new company, Ellucian. The software will be purchased with a credit that URI did not know it had with the company for training not utilized. The credit is more than $100,000.
## Major Software Services Not Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PeopleSoft Modules</th>
<th>Year purchased</th>
<th>Estimated Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FY2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FY2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivable</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FY2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Benefits Admin</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Flexible Spending</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costing</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Limited functionality implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Could be traded in for Hyperion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Benefit &amp; E-Pay</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Recruitment</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Not using, replaced by vendor service PeopleAdmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Procurement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Expenses</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>FY2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeopleSoft Modules</td>
<td>Year purchased</td>
<td>Estimated Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Settlement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Supplier</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Data Hub</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Procurement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMAIL**

URI has multiple email systems currently being utilized by students and staff such as Gmail, Zimbra, Microsoft Outlook, and Outlook Exchange. The State of RI has recently issued an RFP for one email system for all State Offices. URI should contact the State Digital Officer to get the details of the vendor contract, meet with the vendor to determine if it fits URI needs, and obtain pricing. URI needs to have one email system for staff and faculty. Efficiencies would result in reducing license cost and maintaining various systems, centralized listing of valid email addresses, etc. URI is paying $24,500 in annual maintenance for Zimbra. If the email system is an offsite-hosted solution, this would reduce cost of email servers and staff resources needed to maintain systems and servers.

**CLASSROOMS AND COMPUTER LABS**

Classroom Media Assistance is responsible for the equipment in all general assignment classrooms (approx. 105), which varies by semester. Also, it is responsible for computer labs with 186 computers and 6 carts with 130 laptops. There is not an adequate budget for classroom maintenance and upgrades in technology and media. Currently, labs are supported by end-of-year money, which isn’t always available or adequate. It has been stated that ITS does not have a budget to purchase light bulbs for the high tech projectors in classrooms. This is unacceptable. Students and classrooms are our number one priority.
A successful pilot program, Virtual desktop interface (VDI), was implemented in the Talent Development Lab. According to the CIO, ITS does not have the resources to expand the VDI to all computer classrooms and labs.

The technicians who maintain the classrooms and labs do not directly report to the Help Desk. It is difficult to manage scheduling and make sure there is adequate coverage when technicians are on vacation. Currently, there is no central coordination for review of audio visual equipment plans and installations. Usually the first time Classroom Media Assistance finds out about a plan or installation is when it is called to troubleshoot problems or provide access to network.

**ACTIVE DIRECTORY INTEGRATION**

URI should implement active directory integrations so staff can log into the network without logging in through active directory. By doing that, we limit the structure established for users. ITS purchased a Portal for PeopleSoft so users could log into a portal once and access multiple IT services like email and Sakai, as well as PeopleSoft Financials, and Student and Human Resources without multiple logins.

### 100-3312 Computer Labs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Year End Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Budget Increase</th>
<th>Provost Dept 1101 / 1108</th>
<th>Dept 0000 General Program 6028/0300</th>
<th>Internal Transfer ITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>127,738</td>
<td>1,042,527</td>
<td>914,789</td>
<td>109,531</td>
<td>740,469</td>
<td>64,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>187,927</td>
<td>583,124</td>
<td>395,197</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>85,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>273,099</td>
<td>523,099</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>273,099</td>
<td>336,768</td>
<td>63,669</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,331)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source document: PeopleSoft Commitment Control module FY 2010-2013 department 3312.
**AMRC Appendix B – Information Technology Subcommittee Report: Survey Questions and Response Summary – Information Technology Resources outside of IT Services (February 2013)**

**Questionnaire**
This online survey was conducted via Survey Monkey in February 2013, with emails sent to members of the Controller’s Office listserv to target management in academic and administrative departments outside of IT Services.

Questionnaire URL: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3YPBWGZ](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3YPBWGZ)

As part of the President's Administration and Management Review Committee, the IT Sub-Committee is trying to document the extent of departmental staff that has IT responsibilities. We would very much appreciate your taking the time to respond to this short survey. The survey allows you to add up to five staff people and indicate their responsibilities. If you have more than five staff, please feel free to fill out a second survey. Thank you.

1. Please indicate your department. This question is required.
2. Please give us your name. This question is required.
3. What is your title? This question is required.

Please provide the name and information about any staff that provides IT services to your department. We will ask you about each staff member separately.

4. Please provide their name.
5. Please provide their title.

6. Please provide the following information about this person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The above person</th>
<th>Type of employee</th>
<th>Part time or Full time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Please indicate the different services this person provides and the approximate percentage of their time spent on this function.
### Administration and Management Review Committee

#### Type of Service. Maintains/Designs/Installs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Service A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Service B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify service and percentage of time))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the different services this person provides and the approximate percentage of their time spent on this function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Service A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Service B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Service E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify service and percentage of time))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of time on this function

8. If you have another staff person who provides IT services, please choose "yes," to add them. If not, choose "no" to end the survey.

If you have another staff person who provides IT services, please choose "yes," to add them. If not, choose "no" to end the survey.

Yes/ No

---

### Survey Results - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Full/Part</th>
<th>Academic Software</th>
<th>Web Pages</th>
<th>Computer Hardware</th>
<th>Research Software</th>
<th>Admin Soft</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Servers</th>
<th>Com Lab</th>
<th>Unique Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRC</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div Research and Academic Development</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored and Cost Accounting, Controller</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRC, Div Res and Academic Developm</td>
<td>Full/50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Non-URI 50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering, MCISE</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Computing</td>
<td>Grad Hourly – 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Full/Part</td>
<td>Academic Software</td>
<td>Web Pages</td>
<td>Computer Hardware</td>
<td>Research Software</td>
<td>Admin Soft</td>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Servers</td>
<td>Com Lab</td>
<td>Unique Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Science &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div of Research &amp; Economic Developm</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Undergrad – 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Undergrad – 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Services</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy, Provost</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO</td>
<td>State employee 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRC</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Computing</td>
<td>Undergraduate – 25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Services</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div Research &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored and Cost Accounting, payroll</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI Health Services</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored and Cost Accounting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 54 responses to the survey.

- 22 employees filled out the survey; 32 began the survey, but did not complete it.
- 37 people were listed as providing IT support for their department and/or other departments on campus.

IT Activities:

- In addition to the allotment of time to the IT tasks we included, many people mentioned PeopleSoft taking up time.
- Only one person was selected for video production for 10% of time, so this was removed from the table.
**Questionnaire**

Date: April 2, 2013

To: URI Faculty

From: IT Subcommittee of the President’s Administration and Management Review Committee

Short Computational Resources User Survey

Hardware/Software/Data Resource Inventory

If you consider yourself to be a heavy user of IT resources, please take a minute to answer the following questions via return e-mail to XXX@cs.uri.edu.

Do you have your own, or share with a colleague, a large server, computer cluster, large data repository and/or other computational resource (including human resources, such as IT support or systems administrator) that supports your teaching and/or research? ________________

If the answer to the question above is “Yes”, please answer the following:

Do you own or share

A cluster? _______

A large server? _______

A large data repository? _______

Other (include human resources/support)? ________________

Is your primary source of computer capabilities departmental? _______

If not, please describe the source(s):

Do you use one of the national or international super-computer sites? ________________

Do you use external cloud computing, grid computing, or data archival resources; e.g., Amazon? ________________ If yes, please briefly describe the resource(s) used:
Survey Results – List of Colleges and Departments that responded to the High Performance Computing Summary indicating current use or future need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resource Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cell &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Computer and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Eng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering &amp; Applied Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Oceanography</td>
<td>Ocean Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URI Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AMRC Appendix D – Information Technology Subcommittee Report:**

**Interviews Conducted by the AMRC Information Technology Subcommittee**

The IT Subcommittee would like to thank everyone who gave us their time and effort to share their insights and suggestions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2013</td>
<td>Brian Chmielewski, Business Manager, URI Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 2013</td>
<td>Town Hall Meeting – URI Community, AMR Committee, Academic Strategy Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2013</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island Libraries – Dave Maslyn, Andree Rathmacher, Joyce Downey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2013</td>
<td>Mike Khalyfan, Associate Director, URI Information Technology Services Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2013</td>
<td>Charles Schifinio, Director, URI Information Technology Services, University Computing Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 2013</td>
<td>Dave Porter, Director, URI Information Technology, Media and Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8, 2013</td>
<td>Garrett Bozylinsky, Chief Information Officer, URI Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2013</td>
<td>Town Hall Meeting – URI Community, AMR Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2013</td>
<td>Susan Grajek, Director of Research, Educause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2013</td>
<td>Robert Weygand, Vice President, URI Division of Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| May 15, 2013       | Peter Alfonso, Vice President, URI Division of Research and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 2013</td>
<td>Donald DeHayes, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2013</td>
<td>David Dooley, President, University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2013</td>
<td>Michael Smith, President, URI Foundation; Wendy Bucci, Operation Manager, URI Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 2013</td>
<td>Thomas Duggan, Vice President, URI Division of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2013</td>
<td>Thom Guertin, State of Rhode Island Chief Digital Officer, Office of Digital Excellence; Allison Rogers, Director of Policy, Rhode Island Department of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 2013</td>
<td>Council of Deans, University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2013</td>
<td>Elizabeth Gil, Director, URI Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 2013</td>
<td>Mark Oliver, Lead Information Technologist, URI Information Technology Services - CCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 2013</td>
<td>Anne Marie Coleman, Assistant Vice President, URI Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2013</td>
<td>Dean Libutti, Vice Provost, URI Academic Affairs; Cindy Bonn, Dean, URI Undergraduate Admissions; Carnell Jones, Director, URI Enrollment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 2013</td>
<td>Thor Bjorn, Director, URI Athletics; Mike Laprey, Associate Director URI Athletics/Media Communications; Sue Bergen, Associate Director, URI Athletics Business &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2013</td>
<td>Town Hall Meeting – URI Information Technology Services staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 2013</td>
<td>Linda Barrett, Director, URI Budget and Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 16-59-22 Applicability of merit system – Teacher certification – List of positions transferable to classified service. – (a) The appointment, promotion, salaries, tenure, and dismissal of administrative, instructional, and research employees, and secretarial employees not exceeding ten (10) in number, of the state colleges shall not be subject in any manner or degree to control by the personnel administrator or by any officer or board other than the board of governors for higher education. The certification of teachers at the University of Rhode Island is abolished, except for teachers that elect to come or remain under it.

(b) All positions that are exempt from the Merit System Law, chapter 4 of title 36, which become vacant or that are to be established, must be forwarded to the personnel administrator, who in consultation with the deputy assistant commissioner of education in charge of personnel and labor relations shall determine whether the position(s) in question shall remain in the board of governors for higher education non-classified service or be established in the classified service of the state.

(c) No position presently in the classified service of the state subject to the Merit System Law, chapter 4 of title 36, shall be changed or modified so as to establish the position in the board of governors for higher education non-classified service.

(d) Faculty positions, presidents, vice presidents, deans, assistant deans, and student employees of the higher education institutions shall not be covered by the preceding provisions and shall remain in the board of governors for higher education non-classified service.

History of Section.
(P.L. 1988, ch. 84, § 122.)
§ 37-2-7 Definitions. – The words defined in this section have the meanings set forth below whenever they appear in this chapter, unless the context in which they are used clearly requires a different meaning or a different definition is prescribed for a particular section, group of sections, or provision:

(1) "Business" means any corporation, partnership, individual, sole proprietorship, joint stock company, joint venture, or any other legal entity through which business is conducted.

(2) "Change order" means a written authorization signed by the purchasing agent directing or allowing the contractor to proceed with changes, alterations, or modifications to the terms, conditions, or scope of work on a previously awarded contract.

(3) "Chief purchasing officer" shall mean: (i) for a state agency, the director of the department of administration, and (ii) for a public agency, the executive director or the chief operational officer of the agency.

(4) "Construction" means the process of building, altering, repairing, improving, or demolishing any public structures or building, or other public improvements of any kind to any public real property. It does not include the routine maintenance or repair of existing structures, buildings, or real property performed by salaried employees of the state of Rhode Island in the usual course of their jobs.

(5) "Contract" means all types of agreements, including grants and orders, for the purchase or disposal of supplies, services, construction, or any other item. It includes awards; contracts of a fixed-price, cost, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or incentive type; contracts providing for the issuance of job or task orders; leases; letter contracts; purchase orders; and construction management contracts. It also includes supplemental agreements with respect to any of the foregoing. "Contract" does not include labor contracts with employees of state agencies.
(6) "Contract amendment" means any written alteration in the specifications, delivery point, rate of delivery, contract period, price, quantity, or other contract provisions of any existing contract, whether accomplished by unilateral action in accordance with a contract provision, or by mutual action of the parties to the contract. It includes bilateral actions, such as supplemental agreements, and unilateral actions, such as change orders, administrative changes, notices of termination, and notices of the exercise of a contract option.

(7) "Contractor" means any person having a contract with a governmental body.

(8) "Data" means recorded information, regardless of form or characteristic.

(9) "Designee" means a duly authorized representative of a person holding a superior position.

(10) "Employee" means an individual drawing a salary from a state governmental entity.

(11) "State governmental entity" means any entity created as a legislative body or a public or state agency by the general assembly or constitution of this state, except for municipal, regional, or county governmental entities.

(12) "May" means permissive.

(13) "Negotiation" means contracting by either the method set forth in § 37-2-19, 37-2-20, or 37-2-21.

(14) "Person" means any business, individual, organization, or group of individuals.

(15) "Procurement" means the purchasing, buying, renting, leasing, or otherwise obtaining of any supplies, services, or construction. It also includes all functions that pertain to the obtaining of any supply, service, or construction item, including a description of requirements, selection and solicitation of sources, preparation, and award of contract, and all phases of contract administration.

(16) "Public agency" shall mean the Rhode Island industrial recreational building authority, the Rhode Island economic development corporation, the Rhode Island industrial facilities corporation, the Rhode Island refunding bond authority, the Rhode Island housing and mortgage finance corporation, the Rhode Island resource recovery corporation, the Rhode Island public transit authority, the Rhode Island student loan authority, the Howard development corporation, the water resources board corporate, the Rhode Island health and education building corporation, the Rhode Island higher education assistance authority, the Rhode Island turnpike and bridge authority, the Blackstone Valley district commission, the Narragansett Bay water quality management district commission, the Rhode Island telecommunications authority, the convention center authority, the Channel 36 foundation, the Rhode Island lottery commission their successors and assigns, any other
body corporate and politic which has been or will be created or established within this state excepting cities and towns, and the board of governors for higher education for all purchases which are funded by restricted, sponsored, or auxiliary monies.

(17) "Purchase request" or "purchase requisition" means that document whereby a using agency requests that a contract be entered into to obtain goods and/or services for a specified need, and may include, but is not limited to, the technical description of the requested item, delivery requirements, transportation mode request, criteria for evaluation of proposals, and/or preparation of suggested sources of supply, and information supplied for the making of any written determination and finding required by § 37-2-6.

(18) "Purchasing agency" means any state governmental entity which is authorized by this chapter, its implementing regulations, or by way of delegation from the chief purchasing officer to contract on its own behalf rather than through the central contracting authority of the chief purchasing officer.

(19) "Purchasing agent" means any person authorized by a governmental entity in accordance with procedures prescribed by regulations, to enter into and administer contracts and make written determinations and findings with respect to contracts. The term also includes an authorized representative acting within the limits of authority. "Purchasing agent" also means the person appointed in accordance with § 37-2-1.

(20) "Services" means the rendering, by a contractor, of its time and effort rather than the furnishing of a specific end product, other than reports which are merely incidental to the required performance of services. "Services" does not include labor contracts with employees of state agencies.

(21) "Shall" means imperative.

(22) "State" means the state of Rhode Island and any of its departments or agencies and public agencies.

(23) "Supplemental agreement" means any contract modification which is accomplished by the mutual action of the parties.

(24) "Supplies" means all property, including, but not limited to, leases of real property, printing, and insurance, except land or permanent interest in land.

(25) "Using agency" means any state governmental entity which utilizes any supplies, services, or construction purchased under this chapter.
(26) As used in § 37-2-59, "architect" or "engineer" services means those professional services within the scope of practice of architecture, professional engineering, or registered land surveying pertaining to construction, as defined by the laws of this state. "Consultant" means any person with whom the state and/or a public agency has a contract which contract provides for the person to give direction or information as regards a particular area of knowledge in which the person is a specialist and/or has expertise.

(27) For purposes of §§ 37-2-62 – 37-2-70, "directors" means those members of a public agency appointed pursuant to a statute who comprise the governing authority of the board, commission, authority, and/or corporation.

(28) "State agency" means any department, commission, council, board, bureau, committee, institution, or other governmental entity of the executive or judicial branch of this state not otherwise established as a body corporate and politic, and includes, without limitation, the board of governors for higher education except for purchases which are funded by restricted, sponsored, or auxiliary moneys and the board of regents for elementary and secondary education.

(29) "Governmental entity" means any department, commission, council, board, bureau, committee, institution, legislative body, agency, or government corporation of the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of state, federal, and/or local governments.

(30) "Construction management at-risk" or "construction management at-risk services" or "construction management at-risk delivery method" is a construction method wherein a construction manager at-risk provides a range of preconstruction services and construction management services which may include cost estimation and consultation regarding the design of the building project, the preparation and coordination of bid packages, scheduling, cost control, and value engineering, acting as the general contractor during the construction, detailing the trade contractor scope of work, holding the trade contracts and other contracts, evaluating trade contractors and subcontractors, and providing management and construction services, all at a guaranteed maximum price, which shall represent the maximum amount to be paid by the using agency for the building project, including the cost of work, the general conditions and the fee payable to the construction management at-risk firm.

(31) "Construction manager at-risk" or "construction management at-risk firm" is a person or business experienced in construction that has the ability to evaluate and to implement drawings and specifications as they affect time, cost and quality of construction and the ability to coordinate and deliver the construction of the project within a guaranteed maximum price, which shall represent the maximum amount to be paid by the using agency for the building project, including the cost of the work, the general conditions and the fee payable to the construction management at-risk firm. The construction manager at-risk provides consultation services during the preconstruction and
construction phases of the project. The project engineer, architect or owner's program manager may not serve as the construction manager at-risk.

(32) "Owner's program manager" shall be an entity engaged to provide project management services on behalf of a state agency for the construction and supervision of the construction of a building project. The owner's program manager acts as the owner's agent in all aspects of the construction project, including, but not limited to, architectural programming, planning, design, construction, and the selection and procurement of an appropriate construction delivery method. The owner's program manager shall have at least seven (7) years experience in the construction and supervision of construction of buildings of similar size and complexity. The owner's program manager shall not have been employed during the preceding year by the design firm, the construction firm, and/or the subcontractors associated with the project.

History of Section.
**AMRC Appendix F - Post-doctoral positions and cost**

**Definition of postdoctoral positions**

Our peer institutions routinely define post-doctoral scholars as pre-professionals who are continuing their professional development under the guidance of a faculty mentor for a limited period of time. This period of time ranges from two to five years, depending on the institution. The postdoctoral period is often defined by an initial interval (two or three years) with potential renewal for another one to three years.

In our survey of 7 representative institutions (UConn, UMass-Amherst, UNH, UVM, WHOI, U. California and U. Alabama), we found no institution that considers postdoctoral scholars to be regular University employees. Some policies explicitly state that postdoctoral scholars are not University employees. Some funding agencies (e.g., NIH) expressly mandate that postdoctoral scholars funded on faculty grants must not be considered University employees.

In support of the standard definition and its intent, some universities offer formal training opportunities for all postdocs at their institution. The University of Alabama-Birmingham provides one such example: [http://www.uab.edu/postdocs/](http://www.uab.edu/postdocs/).

Postdoctoral charges and benefits

URI currently charges the following benefits on postdoctoral salaries:

1. SS FICA 6.20%
2. MED FICA 1.45%
3. State Assessed 4.25% (covers workers compensation, unemployment compensation, termination and vacation payouts)
4. Staff .65% (covers RI Employee Assistance Program, Disability Insurance & Supplemental Pension & Health Benefit, all Employee Tuition Waiver expenditures)
5. Health covers medical, dental and vision (either individual plan $7245 or family plan $20,311). The % is determined by annual salary amount and whether individual plan (IP) or family plan (FP).
6. We have been informed that after 2 years at URI, Post Docs must enter into the Retirement system, which will add an additional 9% to the benefit rate charged to the grant or contract.

This is an unusually broad range of benefit charges for a post-doctoral scholar.

In general, the other institutions surveyed provide health benefits for post-doctoral scholars. Most of these institutions charge health benefits to the sponsoring grant or contract, unless the sponsoring agency (e.g., NIH) pays directly. A few institutions require post-doctoral scholars to pay for their own health insurance (e.g., UC Berkeley). Others (e.g., UC Santa Cruz) pay the premiums from grants or university accounts, but require post-doctoral scholars to make minimal contributions (up to $60 for a family PPO plan).

The University of California attempts to reduce the cost of health benefits for postdoctoral scholars by maintaining a UC-wide benefit plan for post-docs and their dependents, separate from other UC benefit plans. This postdoc plan includes health, dental and vision insurance. The post-doctoral health insurance is administered by Garnett-Powers & Assocs (http://www.garnett-powers.com/postdoc/). To limit the cost of postdoctoral scholars to grants and contracts, we strongly encourage URI to follow this UC model of a separate health pool for post-docs and their dependents, rather than fold postdoctoral scholars into the same pool as other URI employees.

Except for the University of California, all of the surveyed institutions charge Social Security, as required by federal law; UC requires Postdocs to contribute 7.5% of their gross salary to the UC Defined Contribution Plan in lieu of Social Security.

Some institutions (e.g., University of California) provide workers compensation, short-term disability for all postdoctoral scholars. Others (e.g., UNH) provide workers compensation, disability, etc. for some, but not all categories of postdoctoral scholars. Still others (e.g., U. Alabama) explicitly provide no benefits to post-doctoral scholars beyond health benefits.

None provide termination or vacation payouts and none charge mandatory retirement benefits.
Links for postdoctoral policies at comparison institutions follow below:

UNH
http://www.usnh.edu/olpm/UNH/V.Pers/C.htm

UCONN

UMASS Amherst
http://www.umass.edu/research/system/files/Postdoc%20Policy.PDF

UVM
http://www.uvm.edu/hrs/?Page=info/benefits/plans/postdocassoc_benefits.html&SM=info/infoenu.html

University of California
http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/collective_bargaining_units/post_docs/agreement.html

Unfortunately for the purpose of this comparison, the link for the current URI postdoctoral policy is broken. See http://www.uri.edu/research/tro/offices/sponproj/revpostdocpolicy.pdf

The URI HR interpretation is at http://web.uri.edu/hr/files/POSTDOCTORAL-FELLOW-APPOINTMENTS.pdf
AMRC Additional Sources

Books


Articles, Websites, Published Research, and Papers


Similar Project Reports from Other Institutions

Brown University – Organizational Review Committee Report Executive Summary.

University of Connecticut – *Strategic Redesign Report*.  
http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=uprovo_rpts  
(September 28, 2011)

University of New Hampshire – *Information Technology Assessment*.  
http://it.unh.edu/technologyplan/pdf/UNH_IT_Assessment.pdf (March 18, 2011)

University of North Carolina – *Cost Diagnostic Final Report Summary*.  

*Institutional Organization Charts Consulted*

- Community College of Rhode Island
- Montana State University
- Purdue University
- Rhode Island College
- University of California – Berkeley
- University of Connecticut
- Connecticut State Colleges and Universities
- University of Delaware
- University of Massachusetts – Amherst
- University of Massachusetts – Dartmouth
- University of New Hampshire
- University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill
- University of Rhode Island
- University of Wisconsin – Madison