The University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
June 18, 2015  
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
Multicultural Center, Room 203

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino (Vice Chair), Linda Barrett, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Sharon Bell, Wendy Bucci, Lori Ciccomascalo, Steven D’Hondt, Tom Dougan, John Kirby, Lindsay McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Bahram Nassersharif, Ellen Reynolds, Gerald Sonnenfeld, Naomi Thompson, Kim Washor, Ken Kermes, Thorr Bjorn

Members Absent: Rachel DiCioccio, Joseph Maynard

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

1. Announcements
   a) Chair mentioned the importance of the Streamlining subcommittee update and that it may be included in the Academic Plan

2. FY2017 Proposals
   ➢ Review and discuss the initial results based on frequency distribution and determine next steps to arrive at the recommendation to the President
     • Responses to questions concerning: TD Advisors: appeared to be reasonable reasons; why the retention went down from the previous years? No sense of why this occurred; two years ago 89% then 85% and most recent data 77%; decrease coincided with the RELAAY Grant which provided additional guidance; Content Strategists: Web Council may want to make this their first agenda item; subcommittees that provide input to the Web Council may also want to review this item; history of the Web Council came about because of implementation without input; in 2013 came to Faculty Senate; don't have a fixed dollar amount;
     • Council is charged with recommending the most strategic items without restriction of funding amount; the recommendation can include specific sources of funding for various items;
     • Challenging because can't help but think of dollars and the spread; justification for the three positions; had questions on number of FTE's; would not recommend at full level requested; could recommend to the President at a lower level; this would be a commentary; caution is in most other years there have been 30 proposals; with eleven, this may not be the best approach;
     • Next step after discussion would be a Likert Scale; need to decide how many of these proposals we will vote on; could decide to vote on all eleven or vote on the top x number;
     • At what point could some small items go through another process? First priority is reallocation within divisions; this process involves seeking new funds for strategic items; items requested previously sometimes created via reallocation; how do we define strategic? Proposal would indicate strategic nature of the request; collectively the Council members determine the strategic nature of requests
• The proposals all appear good; every unit indicated their proposals are strategic; research and benchmarking was increasingly done each year; may be an easier discussion this year; the Council agreed to use a rubric;
• Proposal: vote on top 10 using the Likert Scale;
• Motion made that we vote on 10; could take the ones that had at least half the members voting for a proposal; don’t see a lot of difference between a 7 and a 9; strong break at 12;
• As we get better; more transformative higher priced projects may be proposed
  ➢ Likert Scale Voting

Gerald Sonnenfeld left the meeting at this time, prior to the voting
Ellen Reynold left the meeting at this time, prior to the voting; she returned later

➢ Likert Scale Results – discussion
• Top four proposals with unanimous recommendation in score order are:
  Professional Advisors; Content Strategists; Security Maintenance; TD Advisors
• Ten Professional Advisors was identified as the top priority within the top 4 as it received the highest recommendations
• Each division brought forth their most strategic needs
• Comments could include the centralization issues regarding the Web positions
• Would not recommend a second tier; as there is a significant separation between the four that came out on top; smaller number allows for only very top proposals to be considered
• There is a benefit to a shorter list

Ellen Reynolds returned to the meeting

3. Discussion whether to forward to President any of suggestions for cross-divisional efficiencies, revenue generation that arose during evaluation process
• None suggested

4. Critique of evaluation process, improvements for next year
• At step 1 of the process, add a comment column e.g. I voted for this; but, think it should be one position instead of 2.
• At time of request would need to determine a cutoff and send back to requestor
• Perhaps should be looked at relative to the strategic nature; change how we do business; are we making an investment vs routine business
• Commentary for lower ratings
• Add a column of concerns and suggestions
• Process affected by the number received
• Once we see number of proposals could make a recommendation for the process to be used
• CIP Process: council does not get the level of positive or negative discussions; very different arguments from very different people; idea being discussed is a SBPC subcommittee that worked with the CIP cycle; having 2-3 council members responsible and presenting them as a Team like the divisional proposals for new initiatives; could it come forward sooner to SBPC; listing of funding sources on the rating sheet; CLV will take it back to Vern, Kipp and Ryan and come back with a recommendation; not convinced more time with Vern etc it is getting it earlier; projects generated from VP’s; speak to prioritization; not sure all VP’s bring forth projects with same consideration; back and forth watchdog role of this committee; key role this council should play; worry about adding more square footage as opposed to renovating spaces; projects that are soundly rejected by the Council are revisited year after year; clv will reconstruct their process and timeline and look at an earlier schedule; process has improved each year; could build the process into
the college budget process; good model would require several sources of funds; e.g., perhaps a portion of the A&E is contributed by the college

5. Subcommittee Update – Streamlining Processes

- Used our own discussions, trending reports and looked at feedback submitted to the President; through our discussions, we shaped goal strategies as a draft; for today’s meeting we tweaked it
- One important issue is strategy, having senior leadership (President & Senior team) support; ensure looking at departments for greatest streamlining; challenge to some degree, it’s almost out of sync, other areas get more specific, not as much detail; preface to everything is strategy numbers one, two and three; struggled how to incorporate; explicit as possible
- Goal is to streamline processes; strategy one is to ensure that happens in own division; strategy two looks at Human Resource processes; strategy three gets at technology; strategy four business processes; strategy five curriculum and academic affairs; strategy two needs to be embellished
- Second issue that arose, “How do divisional plans line up?” Should we get more specific about some of these things; this is the broad view across areas; will the academic plan hold accountable specific plans? We need to raise that question with the committee
- Could be other areas of streamlining; aware of those; try to bring those forward
- As a committee we need to look at the timeline; a lot has been already done; some issues have been around for a long time; priorities because previously discovered – through previous exploratory processes
- Should honor work already done through AMRC – ensure we consider and incorporate them – context by which we develop these – what process you would like to use – question raised as to whether the Council would like a draft by June 25th
- Could we possibility bring in a consultant, independent third-party to look at whole process? Sometimes we have tunnel vision.
- Human Resource position descriptions come up regarding the state definitions; we can’t have action without working with unions or states; as an action we set out to work with unions and state
- Gain greater autonomy; get away from state classifications and redefine jobs; performance funding subgroup; spent a lot of time on long range ideas, redefining jobs look at positions and reassess needs; need to revisit those position descriptions; determine what we need for functions
- We have an action item; however, we have to create an action plan
- Try to reflect the most important essence of ideas
- State travel is through state MPA; procurement rules dictate
- Complete a study at URI; cost effective and work with the state
- Should there be actions that say work with 3rd parties?
- Vice Chair: Connection to senior leaders, student affairs, and athletics: how does it tie in?
- Previous statements of autonomy, compliance and reliance to state processes; drill down the parts URI can control
- Most of document is what we can do; can we propose greater autonomy?
- Chair: Really did a good job; is a challenging task; opening challenge framed differently; some ways there were two strategies; broad based, but, every dimension has a role
• Strategies two through six is all of two; need to embellish strategy one more; then continue with actions
• Chair: scale difference that occurs; along with renumbering; need to broaden strategies, i.e. all divisions, all units; if broader, no one takes ownership
• Impressed with work that has gone in; missing is research office, president’s office, and foundation; organizations that historically don’t seem to have same amount of cuts in lean times; surprised research and some parts of president’s office not in this review
• Faculty are unhappy with the services of the Research Office
• President’s Office, seems to be getting bigger and bigger and should be held accountable
• Chair: One of the challenges is office by office approach, which opens up the offices you have missed
• As a VP, have strategy one and then specific things addressed
• Vice Chair: There are a couple of gaps; not talking about equity
• Addition of another strategy for research office was mentioned
• Chair: You have an opportunity to email comments and suggestions to Ann; this entire council will own this; the subcommittee is recommending to meet again on this; too important to cut abruptly

Meeting adjourned at 3:18 am

Minutes submitted by:
Lisa Fiorio and Linda Barrett, Budget & Financial Planning Office