Minutes
University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
Tuesday, January 8, 2019 11:00am-2:00pm
Welcome Center, Hope Room

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Abigail Rider (Vice Chair), Linda Barrett, David Bergeron, Thorr Bjorn, Faye Boudreaux-Barrels, Kathy Collins, Nick Constant, Tracey Dalton, Gitahi Gititi, Hillary Leonard, Ann Morrissey, Brian Quillian, Ellen Reynolds, Peter Snyder, Barbara Wolfe

Members Absent:  Samuel Adams, Adam Quinlan, Adriana Wilding, Jen Riley, Kim Stack

Guests:
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
   ➢ Follow-up: Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) winner of 2018 degree completion award is Wayne State University, Detroit, MI. The other finalists for the 2018 Degree Completion Award were: Arizona State University, University of Memphis, University of Nevada, Reno, and University of Rhode Island.
   ➢ The 11th annual Academic Summit will be held on January 17, 2019
   ➢ FY2020 Governor’s Budget is due out on January 24, 2019
   ➢ Multi-year tuition policy; state appropriation and tuition rates are heavily interrelated and interdependent; working with the office of the Postsecondary Commissioner
   ➢ Thanks to the new members that attended a budget orientation session

2. Approval of Minutes (copy attached)
   ➢ November 15, 2018 approved

3. Proposed Timeline
   ➢ Final Review of New Proposal Process
     ➢ Development and review of proposals reviewed by a subcommittee; concerns that proposals needed more benchmark data or better benchmark data; needed a method to select a certain cohort; multiple proposals from divisions created different workload for presentations, but, the same time is allotted; instead of most activity in last three months; frontloaded some items in the fall semester; teams would speak with division heads; in January and February, pre-proposals would identify impact if not funded and clarify cross divisional impact; Budget & Financial Planning to provide amount; in March; did not address multiple proposals by each division
     ➢ Do not want to discourage multiple divisions; could form a number of committees and proposals to get assigned arbitrarily to the teams and could be from different leaders
Could be cross divisional proposals in lieu of a divisional proposal; can teams be formed once submission is known?

Review teams spend a good deal of time with one division; may be difficult if they had to review more than one division

Could cap each proposal presentations by division head and review team, rather than all proposals in a division being given one time

What is the process of each division?

Student affairs does their proposals first and then selects one to bring forward

Not advocate of limiting proposals since some divisions have an extensive array of areas

What is purpose of having the percentage of the proposal to the divisional budget? The purpose is informational for perspective

Pre-proposals envision benchmark data and draft proposal; brief conceptual item; is budget planning process being followed? Vice President would get benefit of teams input; pre-proposals are to the teams; how much comes to the Council and when? Nothing more, just more interaction with Vice Presidents and teams;

After March, same process as prior years

Division heads and teams could meet during meetings with breakouts

Encourage multiple proposals

Will Council increase the number of recommended proposals if more proposals are submitted?

History has been to see a logical cutoff for recommendations

Pre-proposals could be compliance related while others are strategic; like to see in this stage what is compliance related; if something is regulatory/legal, it does not fall within the Strategic Budget & Planning Council

Compliance needs to be defined; subjective judgement; elasticity to compliance; separating it out could be problematic

Items that are contractual or where we would violate a law are funded

Would it be better in the fall for each division to address the following three bullets to the Council and not to just the team?
  o What is your process for determining new priorities for the division?
  o Provide an example of something you recently funded by reallocating resources.
  o How do you use/assess Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data (available in October) in decision making? Consider other comparable data from peer institutions for relevant benchmark data for your proposal.

Using benchmarks in conversation could lead to working together on benchmarking data; what would be the value added for the second or third year? New members, process changes in the division

Review of benchmark data could force the process to change over time creating a more holistic view

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is useful data to compare institutions
• Interactive value of teams working with division heads; would you get same synergy if presentation is to the Council? Could lose value of intent; how would the teams know certain...; so entire Council will be able to provide input
• Preparation for making proposals agree on benchmarks
• Report for what has been funded from the President; but, we never have division heads come back and say what they did with the funds allocated
• November item refers to the update of the impact or status of past allocations
• Creating a balance which is fair and objective and not overkill; can preproposal questions be woven into a proposal? Information that is asked is not always indicated in the final proposals
• What if the division heads who do not answer all the questions? Should we adjust the process for this or if they do not answer all the questions, perhaps they do not get funded
• How to get all to comply?
• Still does not deal with the issue that some division heads were cherry picking the data
• For each area, there could be significantly different benchmarking cohorts
• Should it be defined as step one of the proposal process?
• Interactive improvements to the same proposal?
• In January/February teams meet with division heads and are looking at a draft; however, proposals are usually completed later
• Benchmarks can differ by proposals, not be same for all proposals in a division
• Often VP’s do not have enough info to make decision in Jan/Feb
• Do we need a new set of discussions every fall?
• Could come up with a reasonably standard set in November and also be customized later in year; still need to know why different benchmarks have been chosen
• As years go by, benchmarks (and process) can change; some things could be done in January; have many meetings in the spring and not many in the fall
• Should we tighten the process before we create a new process?
• Please reject a proposal that is not submitted correctly
• Make it very clear that benchmarking data must be provided
• Must revise the templates to capture everything we talked about today
• Would like to utilize the electronic ready system; input ready system
• Research & Economic Development can give us an account; 12 accounts at one time can be created; will explore the details
• Review team will reject any incomplete/incorrect proposals
• However, this does not address seeing a draft of the proposal prior to Council
• Could be submitted to Budget & Financial Planning and the team;
• Division heads to meet with team prior to and discuss proposal
• Like preproposals; multiple perspective is beneficial; synergy;
• Formulation of proposal and consultation with membership in one stage or two
• Capture the changes we have made and review template and back to all
• Teams will be formed by division and prior to proposal deadline, the Vice President can meet with the subcommittee and have a dialogue and questions
• **Proposal is submitted and Team will use its discretion to reject**
• January/February Vice Presidents may want to meet with Teams
• Proposal due in March, if missing can be rejected
• Template will be updated
• Moving benchmarking from November to January/February
• November presentation

4. Previous Strategic Investment
   ➢ Review of financial investments to date (meeting handout)
   ➢ Strategic impact of initiatives – divisional reports and timing
   • Request that each division head report at an upcoming meeting the following: What has been the ROI/impact/outcome as a result of the new strategic initiatives in your area?

5. Random selection of Review Teams
   Provost/Information Technology – Nick Constant & Jeannette Riley
   President’s Division – Adriana Wilding & Ellen Reynolds
   Administration & Finance – Brian Quilliam & Tracey Dalton
   Student Affairs – Samuel Adams & Hillary Leonard
   Research & Economic Development – Barbara Wolfe & David Bergeron
   Athletics – Faye Boudreaux-Bartels & Kimberly Stack
   Academic Affairs – Gitahi Gititi & Adam Quinlan
   
   Subject to change due to the number of divisional submissions

1:53 pm adjourn
Minutes Submitted by: Linda Barrett & Lisa Fiorio, Budget & Financial Planning

UPCOMING MEETING SPRING SEMESTER:

In process; will be posted to:
http://web.uri.edu/sbpc/