Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino, Linda Barrett, Thorr Bjorn, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Wendy Bucci, Steven D’Hondt, Rachel DiCioccio, John Kirby, Lindsey McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ellen Reynolds, Joelle Rollo-Koster, Naomi Thompson & Kim Washor

Members Absent: Sharon Bell, Lori Ciccomascalo, Tom Dougan, Ken Kermes, Amanda Rode, Gerry Sonnenfeld, & Ann Morrissey

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at: http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc.html

1. Announcements
   - Brief overview of two topics for discussion today
   - IT Governance Committee will meet first week of December; some of their work will interact with us; how will priorities from that committee come to SBPC?
   - Strategic Investment Proposals: process has worked reasonably well; did not have time for reflecting at the end of last year. As a new Academic Plan and goals emerge, to what extent should they, along with benefits, be included in our process?

2. Approval of October 23, 2015 minutes
   - Approved as presented

3. IT Governance Council
   - Membership was emailed to Council members
   - Draft Charge – similar to SBPC but focused on IT matters; at the current time, if IT needs to make major purchases, the request is submitted to the Provost; the IT Council will establish priorities, many of which need to be funded – how should this be done?
   - One idea was for the Provost to present it with his priorities
   - Another idea was that the Provost make two presentations; one as Provost (IT) and one as Vice President of Academic Affairs
   - IT will determine priorities in accordance with the IT Strategic Plan and the Academic Plan
   - Different from our usual model; not fair for all IT to come forward from one division
   - How do IT priorities get considered by us? Should come through the Vice Presidents? We would be starting a bad precedent to take requests from committees/councils
   - The IT Strategic Committee will submit information to the IT Governance committee
   - IT reports to the Provost, not Academic Affairs
   - Restated – should not have committees coming to Council
   - Concerned by the fact that quorum is problematic in the draft charge
   - SBPC’s review would be based on the criteria of that council regarding new requests
Reallocation – is that a potential in the case of IT requests?
Requests go to the Strategic Committee of IT, then to IT Governance Committee, then where does it go?
Good to see the total picture of technology; e.g. if a request crosses divisions?
The requests from IT Governance must correlate to the SBPC calendar when divisional requests are considered
Maybe IT Governance would benefit from a calendar that dovetails with the SBPC calendar
Could divisional IT items go to the division heads and ones that are university wide go to the Provost?
What about the day to day needs of the university? IT policy and strategy should come out of the IT Governance; how IT spends it’s time and it is not towards the Academic mission, then we need to ask what are the implications of shifting your mission
For example, incident occurred, not really a breach, some off campus person got a list of our female students addresses; we have a default password on our websites that say use your birthdate – that was the real problem. Look thru everything and found 7 vulnerabilities – being fixed. Should not have resulted from Provost stumbling on these issues. Someone needs to be paying attention and their needs to be constant review of servers, etc.
If any division will be making a IT related request, they will need to get approval from IT Governance
Two separate presentations by Provost, one for IT as the Provost and one for Academic Affairs.
To extent something is IT investment; ITS needs to bring something to the table through reallocation/co-share.
Discussion: Process for New Funding Request Proposals for Strategic Initiatives

4. Divisional Requests for Strategic Investments
Discussion: New Academic Strategic Plan and benefits rubric as guideposts for strategic evaluation of new funding proposals.
Process has worked well; must ensure that steps are in place to ensure investments we are recommending individually and collectively are moving us forward strategically in the institution.
Coming to beginning of new Academic Plan, more broader, general endorsement
Distributed draft goals of new Academic Plan and what we previously used as benefit measurement
Review of last year’s process- when we are at the review phase, have we, in our discussion ensured that the request is in accordance with the academic plan and the benefits?
Were we measuring what we valued?
Have we swung too far in the other direction? Not looking to quantify it.
For example, the new Academic Plan has a broader definition of student success
Could ask for comments in a section; many items do not fit into the box
Could add how it supports the Academic Plan and how it benefits (could add to guidance/template)
Some items less strategic but necessary, the division should first look to reallocation or building in sustainable models
Should build sustainable models for some items
Must allow surpluses in some accounts for future purchases/replacements
Proposer makes the case; reviewers also comment
➢ Policy made by this committee, included requirement of annual operations of new buildings, etc.
➢ Formalized replacement schedules needed;
➢ Review groups need to include comments on whether or not the division head’s proposal reflected how their proposal related to the academic plan and the benefits
➢ Reallocation should be the first funding option
➢ In the directions for the written proposals, possibility of bring draft back next meeting
➢ Also next meeting, after agreement will communicate with IT Governance committee

Meeting adjourned at 3.20pm

Next meeting December 18, 2015 at 2:00 pm. 
Minutes by Linda Barrett and Lisa Fiorio 
Budget & Financial Planning Office