The University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
January 24, 2012  
10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Thompson Board Room, Ballentine Hall  

Members in Attendance:  
Chair Don DeHayes, Vice Chair Bob Weygand, Peter Alfonso, Abu Bakr, Trish Casey, Tom Dougan, Nancy Eaton, Cheryl Foster, Jeff Johnson, Ron Jordan, Ken Kermes, Patricia Morokoff, Linda Barrett, Ann Morrissey  

Members Absent:  
Bob Beagle, Thorr Bjorn, Faye Boudreaux Bartels, Winnie Brownell, David Coates, Steve D’Hondt, Scott Martin, Michael Smith, Ray Wright  

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc/Membership%2011.pdf  

Presentation:  
FY 2012 and FY 2013 Budget Update by Linda Barrett  

Meeting Minutes  
1. Meeting was called to order at 10:10 am.  

Announcements:  
1. Chairman DeHayes thanked the Council for their flexibility when scheduling SBPC Meetings. As a reminder, the President had previously instructed there would be no substitutes for those members unable to attend. Dates for future meetings distributed.  
2. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) solicitation proposals went out last week to Deans/Directors/Divisions Heads.  
3. Provost office to focus on global initiatives, which was high on list of priorities. A temporary position has been established to address global strategy and strategic institutional international partnerships, policies and process to advance the recruiting of international students, working to support the ACE (Associate Cultural Exchange) at URI, and other related activities.  
4. Reminder about the timeline for divisional presentations, which are due to Budget and Financial Planning Office by March 15th. Also, reminder that the process will be different this year, in accordance with the approved recommendations of the Rubric Subcommittee. Assigned teams (randomly drawn) will be responsible for reviewing and presenting the divisional requests to the SBPC. Reference the attachment materials with specifics about the timeline, process, and template.  
5. No action has been taken yet by the Board of Governors on the URIP. Board has asked that URIP information be shared with the Executive and Legislature.
6. The Speaker of the House appointed a Commission on Access and Affordability chaired by Frank Ferri of Warwick. URI answered a variety of questions posed by the Commission last summer and the President presented the information at a hearing. They followed up by asking URI to make presentations in a variety of topics in Academic Affairs and Research. The Commission is now taking public testimony (this evening at the Alumni Center at 6:30pm) from community members who may wish to speak to them on access and affordability. Some members of our community will likely be on hand to provide testimony.

7. The Academic Summit last Friday was an example of the dedication of faculty – The event was at full capacity.

8. The BOG shared with the University a study on trends in higher education by McKinsey and Company. Chair DeHayes suggested the Council review and the recommendations for higher education from this objective source.

9. Vice Chair Weygand indicated that the Senate and BOG were presented with information that shows the University has grown while achieving cost efficiencies. He mentioned that the idea of abolishing OHE and BOG has been discussed within the Legislature, although the University has taken a position against it, believing that one board for education would not serve the needs of higher education.

Presentation by Linda Barrett on FY 2012-2013 Budget Update

1. Timeline will be posted on SBPC website for members.
2. Budget and the SBPC meeting timeline reviewed - (see slides for details)
3. Members were urged to make the various SBPC meetings a priority as these were difficult to schedule with the new process for divisional presentations.
4. The teams assigned to the various individuals for divisional presentations to the Council will be randomly selected within various categories (faculty, VP/Director, staff and student and alumni). Teams will need to meet in April (scheduling their own meetings of their assigned team members) to prepare their presentations for May meetings.
5. Financial Aid – if the students don’t return, the dollars do not get spent.
6. Linda reviewed the request for use of fund balance process. Per the 9/26/11 meeting at which the President asked the Council to review the request for fund balances once final numbers and the mid year projections are complete. Currently we are holding the $4.2M, which is slightly less than 1% of the overall budget. Linda also distributed the Recommendations Proposed by SBPC Subcommittee: Model for Budget Reinvestment, Contingency Fund, and Capital Expenditures. This document was revised to incorporate the feedback from the last meeting.
7. For clarity - we do not have shortfall for FY 2013 budget. It is balanced and includes personnel savings. There is a misconception that URIP would create an unbalanced budget. This is not accurate. The savings equivalent to the URIP Program are reflected in the FY 2013 Request.
8. Chair DeHayes mentioned that he has made it a priority to protect the core missions as State appropriation continues to decline.
9. Edit to timeline slide - April 15th should have been reflected as April 24th for the CIP meeting.
10. The revised version of the recommendations from the SBPC Subcommittee: Model for Budget Reinvestment, Contingency, and Capital Expenditures that incorporated suggestions from the previous SBPC meeting was distributed as the penultimate draft. It was noted that the
recommendations would be addressed at the next SBPC and, if supported, would be provided to President Dooley as recommendations from the Council.

Ann presented a recap of the McKinsey report, which was distributed to members via email. UConn is in the process of addressing the recommendations McKinsey provided particular to their system. These are very similar to this more generic version.

**Discussions**

1. The Guaranteed Admissions Program (GAP) was once better supported and may be an area for potential investment.
2. Freshmen in the Talent Development Program comprise more than 10% of the total freshmen class. With the right support and investments, these students can have improved success. URI should expand the range of services or refocus efforts on these students if they have substandard skills in certain areas (i.e., science, math).
3. Pre Med should include math in addition to writing, which is already included.
4. A continued focus needs to be maintained on retention. A task force is working on advisement.
5. Perhaps a centralization of technology staff and resources should be considered. Consolidation and centralization of services could lead to more effective staff technology support across departments. Such a staffing structure would need to be organized in such a way as to allow easy access to technology support by departments. Currently, 60 staff tech people are not housed within the IT unit. Nontechnical staff, in some departments, are assuming IT responsibilities out of necessity. There are 800 servers on campus, which IT is attempting to consolidate.
6. Concern was shared about URI’s lag in fundraising. Can coordination between alumni events and fundraising activities be improved? The University needs to be more creative and have an integrated approach. Ideas for revenue generation that would capitalize on faculty and staff expertise could be explored. These might include initiatives related to the distinct strengths of the University and the local area. Ideas might include sailing, water based activities, the arts, sciences, humanities and certificate programs. Creating more coffee/social space areas within all buildings would support collaboration and opportunities to develop community and networking between faculty and faculty and students. Chafee lobby is an example – huge, inefficient.
7. Rethink how to leverage high quality, low cost education. Liberal Arts?
8. Insourcing/outsourcing. Perhaps we should review options for outsourcing. Alumni management - needs to have a long view on alumni. Improved connections need to be made between colleges/departments and their alumni that allow for communication with future alums upon graduation. This lack of connection negatively impacts our fundraising potential.
9. We should choose one or two recommendations from this report on which to focus.
10. Chair DeHayes indicated that McKinsey stressed the idea of summer programs. Innovative summer programs could boost revenues. Universities in beautiful places can use their campus for all sorts of events. We need to think creatively to utilize the potential for campus year-
round. In the summer, we have 7,000 children on campus in various camps and activities. Are we leveraging this opportunity on behalf of the University as a whole?

11. According to McKinsey, there is often a misalignment between college courses and skill sets needed by employers. Workforce development is a key expectation of higher education as well as preparation for graduate school.

12. Each of the colleges might consider having a communication or partnership board with employers that focuses on employer and community and State workforce needs. This could serve to advise faculty and deans about potential curricula emphases to better meet those expectations as well as promote internships and future job placements for graduates. A similar topic was discussed at JCAP regarding the relevance of new program proposals to careers and potential jobs. The academic review process might be a place to capture data on post graduation activity. Professor Morokoff mentioned that she does a senior exit survey so she better understand paths taken by graduates from the psychology department.

13. An impediment for getting into graduate school is the standardized test scores. URI should focus efforts on improving achievements of our graduates on the GMAT’s and GRE’s.

14. The next step in advancing ideas from the McKinsey report may be to ask the Entrepreneurial Subcommittee to develop recommendations relative to revenue generation. Another group from SBPC and/or JCAP might consider some of the other ideas.

15. The Minutes from December’s SBPC Meeting were approved as distributed.

16. Meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm.

**Next meeting date**
February 21, 2012 10:00am -12:00pm

**Required action:**
Linda asked council to review reinvestment minutes and come prepared to next meeting to approve/discuss.

Minutes by: Caroline Natale, Business Analyst, Budget and Financial Planning 1/24/12