The University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
June 3, 2015
9:00 am – 12:30 am
Thomson Board Room, Ballentine Hall

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino (Vice Chair), Linda Barrett, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Sharon Bell, Wendy Bucci, Lori Cicmacenaco, Steven D'Hondt, Tom Dougan, John Kirby, Lindsay McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Bahram Nasserlyarif, Ellen Reynolds, Gerry 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.html

1. Announcements
   a) Chair reminded Council about not taking a position when they make their presentations
   b) Template we will be using for ranking was developed and approved by the Council

2. FY2017 Divisional Request (9:00 am) – Athletics presented by Thorr Bjorn, Director
   a) Vision, mission, strategic goals, athlete welfare
   b) Fundraising growth displayed; FY10 $700K; FY15 goal $1.4M
   c) National Athletic Trainers Association – recommendation based on their recommendations
   d) Request consists of (included lawsuit year also); add 2.77 Athletic Trainer and 2 strength and conditioning positions ~$310K; $117K would be reallocated from IPR and Alumni; total is $192K and will get us closer to where we need to be; provide better service
   e) Operating Needs - $145K for team travel and recruiting; uniforms and equipment; advertising and promotional; need to train and compete at the highest level;
   f) Conclusion – student athlete welfare; enhancement of athletics; to move closer to national association guidelines; net amount requested $338K

3. FY2017 Divisional Request - Athletics critique presented by Trish Morokoff and Ellen Reynolds
   a) Trainers - maintain health and physical wellness of Athletes
   b) Strength & Conditioning Coach will help athletes perform to their maximum potential; maintain physical health and wellness of student athletes
   c) Difficult to keep quality personnel in current situation; internal payroll, etc.
   d) Will address no coverage during the off season for some sports
   e) Request is 3.5% of personnel budget
   f) Limitations – increased annual personnel budget; could potential savings be achieved from other aspects of the budget and be reallocated; does not appear to be the case
   g) Second request is for operating budget needs – $50,000 team travel; $50,000 recruiting; $30,000 uniforms and equipment; $15,000 advertising and promotion; total requested amount is $145,000, no co-share
   h) Increased travel distances due to conference participation; need to take more flights; of the components, the travel is the most important
i) Strengths – fewer missed class days; better quality uniforms and equipment protects students and promotes performance and brand

j) Limitations – travel request seems better justified than advertising and promotion; as compared to FTE requests, this portion would benefit fewer students; could any of these be covered from other funding sources?

4. FY2017 Divisional Request - Athletics Council Discussion
   a) Alumni fund clarification - $400,000 is unrestricted; remainder restricted; teams are required to generate funds; compete within conference play and in certain regional;
   b) Apparel cookie cutter deal with Adidas is pricing; we spend a certain amount per year in apparel; when reach that mark we get ability to get additional apparel up to a specific amount.
   c) Travel for charter for MBB and WBB not same as this; this relates to other sports
   d) From a strategic standpoint, a request for operating should be from reallocation; what is the strategic part of the operating request? Funds could be allocated one time only for uniforms, equipment and then not really needed for a few years and by then perhaps revenue will be generated to cover these expenses in the future.
   e) Is it this Council’s role to determine if Athletics is underfunded in operating?
   f) Council created a principle in its first year that reallocation is the first source to look too for funding.
   g) If we ask for anything new, would be asked for here first
   h) Team travel $1.4M; $250K from non-fund 100
   i) Have sent teams by bus because cannot afford to fly; our competitors fly
   j) Total athletic budget including fringe and scholarships is ~$18M
   k) Fundraising monies have been applied to ongoing operating needs versus new items
   l) If additional revenue funds are generated may need to make another presentation for Athletics to retain those funds
   m) Success costs a lot more
   n) Don’t think can count on fundraising; could be a shift towards capital needs
   o) Priorities need to be vetted on the fundraising side also
   p) Larger question is what should the subsidy be for URI Athletics from Fund 100; we were high on the list recently released (79%); this request would raise the subsidy; what should the subsidy be? At what point do we say the subsidy is as high as it should be; some schools phasing in to a target subsidy
   q) Caution that comparisons are not always true comparisons relative to Athletic subsidies
   r) If we make a small investment, the goodwill generated by the programs is important; URI values academics for the Athletes

5. FY2017 Divisional Request (10:15am) - Student Affairs presented by Tom Dougan, Vice President
   a) Full time position for student veteran coordinator; $65,000;
   b) Have one at CCE; he spends 25% of time coordinating issues relating to veterans; 75% as an advisor
   c) 39 veterans in Providence; 337 veterans on Kingston campus
   d) All other NE Land Grant have full time veteran coordinators
   e) Hardled by committee in Kingston
   f) Space is in Adams Hall; veterans center a resource; VA promised to fund student help; may have to find bridge funding for a year
   g) Second request is for four advisors for TD; total request is $230,000; operating budget is $870,000;
   h) These four individuals are currently funded from RELAAY Grant; AEC partnered with TD to provide access to ~100 students; work with them and other TD students;
i) 114:1 current ratio; if eliminate ratio would be 171:1
j) Benchmark data? None available
k) Institution has made a huge commitment to the Talent Development (TD) Program
l) TRIO requires 40:1 ratio
m) First generation college students; academically underprepared; little family support; jobs; average income family $37,565; average income for college educated parents $99,000; many students support their family; many of DCYF at 18 have no home and are part of the TD program
n) Grant ends October 2015; could be extended through October 2016

6. FY2017 Divisional Request – Student Affairs critique presented by Rachel DiCioccio, Wendy Bucci, and Eahram Nassercharif

a) Coordination with Providence? Really spending 25% for veterans; 75% for advising for all CCE students
b) Was this a peak?
c) CCE is entry point; 95% of programs are on Kingston Campus
d) Orientation is specific to campuses
e) Unmet need in Kingston; catches us up to peers; opportunity to apply for grants; helps support veterans
f) Budget needs; coordination needs to be worked out
g) Model for the numbers; could peak now and decline
h) What is the long term need?
i) Four Advisors for TD
j) Impact of losing these positions? Is it urgent?
k) Support for the neediest students
l) Goal is 100:1 ratio; are we comfortable with existing ratio when they leave?
m) Projection of TD students; are we increasing parallel support; TD numbers not increasing; have about 1,300 overall; have 300 each year
n) Retention rate of students is greater
o) Budget impact for four positions; ratio

7. FY2017 Divisional Request - Student Affairs Council Discussion

a) How does the ten advisor request from AA correlate to this request?
b) Reported 75/25 split may not be the case; there is an opportunity for CCE person to work more with Kingston (per Dean, CCE)
c) Encourage to support a veteran coordinator for one population
d) Graduated 103 this past May; appears to be an increasing population
e) Impact of new federal waivers
f) When person is split between Providence and Kingston it seems that one of the campuses always suffers
g) Need to think of ourselves as one university
h) Report from the veterans committee (established by the Dean of Students) indicated co-chairs resigned 18 months ago and not replaced; no one has been appointed; need to update committee information. There is an Acting Chair (Deb Suggs)
i) There are currently two FTE in Enrollment Services that work with Veterans
j) If numbers had stayed constant, how advised prior to grant?
k) RELAAY gave all TD students more support and retention increased; however data indicated that it was not as effective with the higher ratio
l) Don’t want to decrease the number of TD students; want to continue to provide access
m) How do you manage with the current ratio? Give more attention to first year students; some students have more need; meeting needs of students outside of
classroom is one of our responsibilities; these students have no support except from us; graduation rates are 20% above students at historically black students; 10% below other URI students

n) Each of these students also has an academic advisor; like to have the TD advisors involved with the academic advisors
o) Currently have nine staff; director; with RELAAY a total of twelve staff
p) Student peer mentoring – CELS provides help to Juniors and Seniors
q) Staff in TD have other non-advising duties
r) This program makes URI unique
s) If could focus on first generation which would be helpful since we have no such program

t) What is TD RELAAY vs non-TD RELAAY data show? In annual reports not very different when preparing reports for the grant
u) Also been funding Finish What You Started Program with RELAAY grant
v) Programs like SMILE are referring students to us
w) TD retention has gone down substantially
x) Important to look at retention data of TD students over the past years; last year the retention for in state students decreased and the data showed that it was because of a substantial retention decline of TD students; if TD students removed from data, in state retention increased; retention rate for out of state students increased also

y) Even if perfect comparison group, not able to compare
z) If we funded and federal dollars do not come thru; would need bridge funding

aa) Do we have information on causes of the decrease in retention? Can we extract information? Chair requested this information (it was subsequently provided to the Council via email)

8. FY2017 Divisional Request (11:30am) – Research & Economic Development presented by Gerry Sonnenfeld, Vice President

a) Veterinarian part time to full time
b) Situation has changed from last year
c) Every research university has a full time veterinarian; need full service across the board
d) Other standard is accreditation, ALAC
e) Farm aquatic animals and rodent facilities needed for all of these; entire rodent facility will be redone; need to get rodent facility accredited; bulk of Neuroscience faculty/staff will be here
f) Current veterinarian has no training in aquatic animal care; temps take care of them
g) Don't have continuous maintenance and advocacy
h) Changes and increased use; farm plays a major role, not only in research; but in teaching and training
i) With search and Neuroscience Center, increased interest in the vivarium
j) In process of centralizing animal care; run by various colleges
k) Several colleges recruiting faculty with research involving rodents


l) Co-share from part time veterinarian
a) Split funding Fund 100 and Fund 110
b) Why not split between other colleges?
c) Want it in one division; could do with a one-time transfer; but grants should be charged, not colleges
d) Alignment with academic plan; allow faculty to focus on research
e) Possibility of expansion to Providence
f) Quadruples the cost of animal care at URI

g) Much of the driver for full time comes from anticipation of future growth; relating only to research rodent facilities

h) Optimistic scenario, greatly increase need; future need

i) No new cost share from programs that might benefit

j) Nice to see cost share so everyone has skin in the game

10. FY2017 Divisional Request - Research & Economic Development Council Discussion

a) Future is now

b) Does not increase the cost for animal care; increases the salary for the veterinarian

c) Current situation is a veterinarian with no experience in aquatic animals; intend to ask colleges for support; cannot break even on animal care facility; prior to Gerry Sonnenfeld's arrival, no per diem charges to colleges; have implemented that; generates some revenue; no way to run such a facility without putting funding in centrally

d) Issue here that complicates is we have aquatic animals

e) Need a centralized animal facility and charge grants appropriate rates

f) Veterinarian oversees health and welfare; they do not provide the care

g) Not going to find veterinarian that has credentials to serve all the different types of animals we have

h) Concerned as not seen a plan as to what we are going to do

i) Two institutions did well with on-call veterinarians

j) Are in process of central rodent facility and that will be up for accreditation

k) Don’t have the central person because don’t have the full time veterinarian

l) Need a lab animal veterinarian; have a pet veterinarian now

m) Faculty provides animal care not veterinarian care

11. Chair: Questions or Comments

a) Several members will review and finalize process for the June 18th meeting given the small number of requested items

Meeting adjourned at 11:18 am

Next Meeting Wednesday, June 5, 9:00 am-12:30 pm

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