The University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
March 24, 2010
9:00am - 11:00am
Thomson Board Room - Ballentine Hall

Members/Staff in Attendance:

Members Absent:
Robert Weygand, Peter Alfonso, Robert Beagle, David Bedard, Thorr Bjorn,

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

Meeting Minutes:

1) Meeting called to order at 9:06 am by Council Chair Don DeHayes.
2) Chair DeHayes called for any additions or corrections to the Minutes from the March 8, 2010 SBPC meeting.
   a) Winnie Brownell requested that on page 3, #5, h, ii, be changed to read, "35-40% of the football team are students of color."
   b) A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the amended minutes.
3) Review of Budget Principles - Continuation from March 8th meeting
   Note: Specific revisions discussed will be reflected in Draft 3 of the budget principles.
   a) Chair DeHayes reminded the Council that in order for the group to make decisions as an institution, it is necessary to be guided by a set of foundation principles that reflects how the Council approaches strategic budgeting and planning. He mentioned that Academic Affairs has a process in place whereby a set of criteria guides the process.
   b) Discussion ensued about the Budget Principles
      Note: specific wording changes to the Budget Principles will be reflected in Draft 3 of the budget principles. The following minutes reflect general topics discussed. (Note – when referencing Divisions, it is understood that Athletics is also included).
      i) Language will be added that states the Academic Affairs plan, along with the Divisional plans which are linked to Academic Affairs plan, should guide our priorities and the overall process.
      ii) Faye Boudreaux-Bartels reminded the group that the agreed upon format at the March 8th meeting should be used.
      iii) Discussion ensued about resource re-allocation as a principle not only within the Division level but also across Divisions. Also discussed was the reallocation of resources as a separate principle. (Note at the March 8th meeting, it was discussed that this might be included in the first principle. It was a separate principle in the first draft.)
Chair DeHayes reported that he would like this stated as a principle. The University Community needs to be clear about the rules the Council utilizes to make decisions.

Chair DeHayes mentioned that budgeting for stability is fine; but, it assumes the current unit base budget is what that unit needs – no more, no less, which may not necessarily be the case.

Discussion ensued about the Council’s level of involvement in decision making regarding reallocating existing resources in order to reflect the correct intent in the budget principles.

Chair DeHayes reported that the group would be making strategic allocation decisions on what proportion of requests would be going to each division. This may include decisions on reallocating existing resources to allow for review and possibly a reallocation of resources across divisions.

Council staff member Linda Barrett mentioned that the Budget Request is to be submitted approximately one year in advance; thus, at that time, retirements and resignations would not be known.

Discussion ensued about how to include the matter of workload in this principle.

Chair DeHayes mentioned that when discussing workload, productivity should be included.

Discussion ensued about each department planning prospectively. These plans flow up to the division heads. Then, the division head presents his budget priorities to this Council in April/May and those requests will have been vetted internally.

Chair DeHayes mentioned that the Vice Presidents will discuss a method/process that will be useful and consistent for the Council.

The Council will make University-wide recommendations by June 30, 2010 after hearing the budget requests presented by the Division heads in April/May.

Chair DeHayes reminded the Council that recommendations will be considered for the fiscal year 2012 Budget Request that will be submitted to the Office of Higher Education, the Board of Governors and the Governor (State Budget Office). The Council will be working with projections. He also reminded the Council that when the University approaches the fiscal year 2012 Allocation in the spring of calendar 2011, projected resources could be very different.

At the time of the FY 2012 Allocation (spring calendar 2011), senior management will reference the priority list of strategic recommendations that the Council presented to the President in June 2010 and the ones that the President elected to include in the FY 2012 Budget Request. The prioritization as approved by the President may be used to determine what priorities remain in the Allocation.

Chair DeHayes reminded everyone that the Council members are here to represent the University; they are not here to represent a college or unit.

4) Budget Planning Chronology by Council staff member Linda Barrett – FY 2012 Timeline handout

See **http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpcdocs.html** FY 2012 Timeline
The Council should be aware that the State Budget Office may establish technical requirements that will be unknown at the time the group is making recommendations to the President at the end of June.

b) It is possible for the University to receive revised budget guidelines from the Office of Higher Education as late as September that will require adjustments to the budget at that time.

c) Discussion ensued about how the Council should be planning for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 while arriving at recommendations for fiscal year 2012. This Council should encourage divisions to present plans that include 2012, 2013, and 2014.

d) Council Staff Member Linda Barrett encouraged the Council to concentrate on establishing the strategic budget priorities rather than allocating resources to the exact dollar because the group will be dealing with projections that will be refined prior to the submission of the Request.

e) Discussion ensued about the Council's responsibility to the safety & health of the University specifically to fire safety.

f) Chair DeHayes reported that fire safety issues are a part of the Capital Budget process (Restricted Budget) and that at this time, the Council is focusing on the Unrestricted Budget.

g) Discussion ensued about the number of Divisions at the University.

i) There are currently six divisions and Athletics. (President, Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Student Affairs, Research and Economic Development, University Advancement). The division of Athletics reports directly to President with dotted line to the Vice President of Student Affairs, Tom Dougan.

h) Discussion ensued about the Divisional Planning Statements

i) Chair DeHayes advised the Council to be mindful of the tasks that need to be accomplished in the next few months and to think of what types of data the group needs in order to make recommendations.

(1) The Council may want to communicate to the community the specific types of supporting data that is anticipated to be needed as the Council reviews the divisional budget priorities as presented by each division head or representative.

ii) Chair DeHayes reported that he and the Vice Presidents and the Athletic Director will each provide a presentation to the Council regarding divisional budget priorities and that this will be the basis for which the Council will make recommendations.

iii) Chair DeHayes noted that the divisional plans may not be extensive given the timelines. He and Vice President Weygand sent a communication to the division heads a few weeks ago. Each division head will present to the Council written materials (two to three pages), a brief presentation and there will be a question and answer period. Chair DeHayes noted that there will be a common template (i.e. how the division plan correlates to the Academic Plan).

iv) It was noted that given the current date (March 24) that the Vice Presidents should be notified that the Council will expect divisional budget statements in April/May. Chair DeHayes noted that he would bring this up at the next meeting of the Provost and Vice Presidents.
v) A question arose regarding the process if a new division was being requested. Chair DeHayes responded that once this was endorsed, it would come to the council for consideration of funding in concert with the priorities the Council would ultimately be recommending to the President.

i) Discussion ensued about the Categories of Revenue

   i) The significant segment of revenue for the University is tuition and fees which are driven by not only the number of students but also rate increases.

   ii) Revenue budget also consists of research indirect cost, auxiliary indirect cost, state appropriation, and miscellaneous revenue.

      (1) State Appropriation consists of three parts

         a) Legislative Mandated State Appropriation - relates to specific programs as directed by the Legislature
         b) General Obligation Debt Service State Appropriation - Supports debt service that the State pays for on behalf of the University
         c) General State Appropriation - Supports general operations.

   iii) Council Staff Member Linda Barrett reported that revenue projections for the fiscal year 2012 Budget Request cycle are calculated approximately one year in advance – Summer 2010 which is FY 2011 for the FY 2012 Budget Request).

   iv) These revenue projections will be refined during the Allocation budget cycle (spring of calendar 2011, which is FY 2011.)

   v) Discussion ensued about how new initiatives in attracting students and the current poor economy result in shifting enrollment trends which impact projections. Chair DeHayes also mentioned that the University’s undeclared population of students is three to four times larger than normal. This may be a result of the first year of the common application.

   vi) Discussion ensued about the kinds of enrollment data the Council will need. The division heads and Deans will need lead-time to prepare the data.

      (1) It was suggested that a break-down of estimated yield by in-state/out-of-state students by college would be a good data set.

   vii) Discussion ensued about the authorization of an initiative versus appropriation for that initiative. (i.e. request for a new major at the University would only be presented to the Council as part of a division presentation if funding is required.)

      (1) The Council will need a level of analysis that will assist in decision making (i.e. using new major example: what new markets of students will be attracted and what are the direct and indirect costs generated by the new program.)

   j) Discussion ensued about Comparative Data

   i) Chair DeHayes commented on the types of comparative data the Council would require of division heads when presenting divisional priorities (i.e. IPEDS, student/faculty ratio/square footage/peer data/etc.). The Council will need to utilize comparative data during the review of divisional priorities.
ii) Chair DeHayes handed out Tenure Track Faculty data requested at the March 8th meeting, and the handout will be posted to the SBPC website under Supporting Documentation.

iii) Council Staff Member Ann Morrissey inquired as to whether it was more valuable to look at peer data rather than University historical data since the University is a part of a competitive marketplace.

k) Discussion ensued about the Council's responsibility to not only encourage colleges/units to make the best decisions within, but also to quell misconceptions of unfairness in resource allocation. The data used by the Council to make decisions will support the recommendations and quell misconceptions. The Council will operate openly and consistently; with data to support their decisions.

l) Council Member Stephen Swallow suggested that with respect to the data shared with the Council, the raw level of data be preserved in the event further questions arise from the data provided.

5) FY 10 Budget Update & FY 11 Budget Update- due to time constraints, this item will be included in the agenda for the April 5, 2010 meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:16pm.

**Information Requested:**

1) The change of administration and staff positions by FTE (Full-time Equivalent) over the last 3 years by functioning group, if possible, as well as the change in the number of students over same time-period. (To supplement information supplied for tenure-track faculty by division)

2) Chair DeHayes commented that some data, such as part-time faculty (originally requested), is not available. Chair DeHayes stated we would gather as much data as we could and would report back what was available

3) It was suggested that a break-down of estimated yield by in-state/out-of-state students by college would be a useful data set for the Council.

**Required Action:**

1) Council members to continue review of Budget Principles for discussion at next meeting

2) Chair DeHayes will communicate the timeline to the Vice Presidents regarding divisional budget presentations to the Council.

**Next Meeting Date:**

April 5, 2010 from 9:00am to 11:00am in the Galanti Lounge, 3rd floor University Library
Next Meeting Agenda:

1) Approval of Minutes from March 24, 2010 meeting
2) Review of Budget Principles (continue)
3) FY 2010 Budget Update & FY 2011 Budget Update (postponed from the March 24, 2010 meeting)
4) Remaining agenda items to be determined.

Minutes by: Cheryl Hinkson, Associate Director, Budget & Financial Planning 3/24/10