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1. **The President, the Provost and each VP will submit a written proposal and budget.** The written proposal should clearly identify (a) what is being requested, (b) rationale for the request, (c) associated costs, and (d) possibility of alternative (partial) funding source(s). The Proposal should also identify (e) how the request relates to the academic plan and (f) benefits URI (but with no requirement to address each point in the Academic Plan and Benefits individually). The VP may provide data (including benchmark data) to help justify their request.

2. **IT Governance Council:** It is expected that the IT Governance Council will prioritize and have requests for new funding for strategic initiatives. Requests that the IT Governance Council deem critical will be sent to the division head if it specifically relates to a division; that division head may present all/some/none of the items as part of their divisional request. If it relates to the entire University, the funding request will be sent to the Provost. After careful consideration, the Provost may present all/some/none of the items as a University request.

3. **Presentations are made to the SBPC according to the following schedule:**
   a. 15 minutes allotted for the President, Provost and VP’s to present. The Budget Office will develop a standard PowerPoint slide, to be included with the VP’s presentation, displaying, by priority, **each** strategic new funding request (which may include several items within it) with the amount requested, including display of co-share if applicable.
   b. 15 minutes allotted for a minimum two person team (drawn randomly from SBPC members who are not VPs whose role is to provide an objective analysis of the request and specifically addresses the following:
      i. Benchmark data
      ii. Concerns and/or outstanding questions
      iii. Alternative suggestions for funding strategies
      iv. Suggestions for creating cross-divisional efficiencies
   c. 30 minutes for questions and discussion.

4. In order to reduce the number of proposals for detailed, final consideration, **each SBPC member will be asked to identify (in non-ranked order) their top 30% of proposals** (or top 10 proposals).

5. **A frequency distribution for all selected proposals will be created** in order to provide data for selection of proposals for further consideration. The subcommittee recommends that approximately the **top 25% (or top 8) of all proposals based on frequency of endorsement at step 3** be selected incorporating flexibility to take advantage of clear breaks in frequencies.

6. **The selected proposals will be discussed** by SBPC members.

7. **SBPC members will rate the final proposals on a 5-point Likert scale.** Raters will be required to distribute their ratings across the 5 response alternatives of the Likert scale. Raters should be guided by the elements of the academic plan and benefits in making their ratings. We reserve the option of creating quartiles for rating such that there would be a requirement to rank two proposals for each quartile.
8. There will be a meeting to review proposal ratings and decide which proposals to recommend to the President. At this meeting, the SBPC will also discuss whether to forward to the President any of the suggestions for cross-divisional efficiencies or for revenue generation that arose during the evaluation process. Finally, the meeting will end with a critique of the evaluation process, focusing on improvements for the next year.