Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino, Linda Barrett, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Wendy Bucci, Thor Bjorn, Lori Ciccomascolo, Steven D’Hondt, Mary Jo Gonzales, John Kirby, Ken Kermes, Lindsey McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Ellen Reynolds, Amanda Rode, Joelle Rollo-Koster, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Naomi Thompson, Kim Washor

Members Absent: Cody Anderson, Sharon Bell, Rachel DiCioccio

Guests: J. Vernon Wyman, Ryan Carrillo, Jayne Pelletier

1. Announcements
   - House Finance budget hearings, April 6, 2016, there was mention of the $5.7M currently in RICAP per the Governor’s recommendation and not in the State Appropriation where it was requested for permanent expenses
   - Performance funding model meetings continue; URI has a rational approach and continues to make our case
   - New record for applications at ~22,000; while demographics indicate a decline in high school graduates in RI and the Northeast

2. Approval of March 10, 2016 Minutes
   - Minutes approved

3. Follow-up discussion on proposed CIP Process
   - Subgroup of SBPC worked with Ryan
   - Last two years rated high, medium and low
   - Have a handful of high projects not yet moved; will continue to move them
   - Make the process more strategic and in line with budget process at the University
   - Lack of strategic focus; not in concert with the operating budget process; timing of our process; leads to lack of enough time
   - Current process: letters to Vice Presidents, Deans/Directors, and requests projects; supposed to percolate up thru division heads then to Capital Planning and the Senior Team; many requests are for small items, not necessarily strategic; they bring disgruntled attitude to division heads; distracts from the big picture; new process is more strategic
   - How to better unify the capital and budget process: start with SBPC September’s meeting and have the division heads lay out the thematic goals for their division and how they relate to the bigger picture; in October’s meeting discuss divisional goals and how Council sees these; RFP only to the divisional leaders and request they work within their division for proposed capital request; Ryan is available throughout the process;
   - Allow a longer period; looking for proposals in late January/early February; divisional leaders also looking towards their divisional operational requests, which may relate to some or all of their capital projects; criteria we use is different depending upon the project; compare the project to the goals/standards of the division
   - Proposals back; three categories; auxiliary, general fund and the infrastructure (not program driven)
After proposals are submitted to the Council; smaller groups in Council review and report back to Council; March and April Council: review and submit final recommendation to senior leadership; senior team decisions in June; could have a report card once they have history;

Propose next year, wipe the slate clean; if not submitted, do not put on the CIP; only go forward with truly strategic projects;

How to integrate the operational and capital budget? How to evaluate?

How to better integrate the requests on the smaller side? A new position to address this was approved in a prior year SBPC recommendation to the President.

Limit on the number of proposals from the division head? There are no limits currently. Must build in to avoid a wish list; much more onus on divisional leaders to facilitate the priorities of their division and perhaps limit the number

What about small projects? They might require prioritization.

We are being strategic, e.g. in Academic Affairs for only one-two years out; tactical vs. strategic

CIP is major projects; infrastructure; usually two-ten years out

Strength of this is not in year one; probably in year five; start at a high level

Deans may want to talk about this in August with the Provost

Could add a category to talk about the one-two year down the road

Existing, approved and underway would continue

Still not in concert with the operational budget process

Will also be general criteria, e.g. sustainability

There should be university goals; institutional plan drives the goals; divisional goals show how tie back; historically we have not done this so well

Money piece is always a concern; e.g. probability of receiving a level of RICAP funding

Need better strategy for how to advance

Regarding funding, ask for dollars from voters; good track record; feedback every year; e.g. Fine Arts is recommended for FY2018; this group could look at what is happening at the state level; could inform us strategically how to approach

General building and infrastructure driven by age, functionality, efficiency, and not necessarily tied to a goal/mission

Another monitoring tool, over a decade investing in Sightlines to assess how we are doing on balance of the capital program, our investment, allows us to compare to peers

Need to speak with state on submitting both budgets at the same time; pursue with state

Write up as a proposal and SBPC take action on at next meeting

Is there a third split? e.g. infrastructure is a third category; could be part of RFP as a separate category; all in context of how serve institutional building

Many projects require A & E; good to have some or all of this portion come from the requesting area; one at the master planning phase and then at the funding of the larger project

Whatever budget is allocated is spent; so make strategic decisions and explain how this will work? Still not convinced it should not be a requirement. I am going to find dollars to make this work; this should be a criteria.

Joint investments with 10-15% built in for operational allowance; four years ago we addressed the issue that John raised; need to plan for ongoing costs; divisions should look internally; reallocation before requesting new funds; could expand that to cover this case

Could make a decision not to fill a position, e.g. could pay for A & E

About the multiplicity of budget lines; how do we define how different divisions can contribute and at what phase

Unclear how priorities are more than one; should we all have one priority? SBPC reviews divisional priorities and makes recommendations

Historically in trouble because we never had the priority and investment principle.
Skin in game concept has to be a conscious decision; often Capital Planning gets a call late in the year to use one time only funds; must be well thought out; cannot be spur of the moment;

- Proposed process is before the fact instead of after; carryover process should be reviewed
- Expectation of skin in game; one time only funds must be identified; what is your proposed funding model and how will you contribute?
- Like to add a category of “are there other important factors to consider”.
- To extent GO bond is the funding model; state government political landscape; higher education political landscape

4. Other

- Comprehensive multi-year history, fundraising strategies will be presented at the next meeting by URI Foundation. The last update from URI Foundation to the SBPC was in 2013. The URI Foundation will provide a status update at the next meeting, and once new URIF President Lil O'Rourke (started April 2016) is onboard, she will be invited to a future SBPC meeting to share her observations and goals.

Reminder: FY2018 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) Divisional Requests

- New Funding Request Proposals
- Due to Budget & Financial Planning Office March 25, 2016
- Related link to four documents: [http://web.uri.edu/sbpc/supporting-documents/](http://web.uri.edu/sbpc/supporting-documents/)

Meeting adjourned at 10:25pm

Next meeting May 5, 9:00 – 11:00 am, Ballentine Hall, Thomson Boardroom
Minutes by Linda Barrett and Lisa Fiorio
Budget & Financial Planning Office