The University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
June 22, 2010
1:00pm – 4:00pm
Galanti Lounge – Library

Members/Staff in Attendance:

Don DeHayes, Robert Weygand (arrived 1:45pm), Abu Bakr, Robert Beagle, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Winnie Brownell, Trish Casey, Steven D'Hondt, Tom Dougan, Cheryl Foster, Ron Jordan, Ken Kermes, Patricia Morokoff, Stephen Swallow, Raymond Wright, Ann Morrissey, Jeff Johnson, and Peter Alfonso

Members Absent:

Thorr Bjorn, David Coates, Glen Kerkian, Jack Szczepanski, and Linda Barrett

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:

a) Meeting called to order at 1:12pm by Council Chair Don DeHayes.

b) Chair DeHayes introduced discussion on how the Council will move forward. A rubric to organize the priorities of the Council was introduced. Chair DeHayes urged all Council members to consider if using this rubric is a viable way to proceed into the future. He requested questions and comments regarding the rubric from the Council. Chair DeHayes emphasized that this rubric would be a starting point and not a bottom line. Chair DeHayes reminded the Council that they are to think at a high level as to what benefits the overall institution.

c) Discussion on Rubric

a) It is consensus that a rubric is a good way to proceed. There was debate on whether it is best to prioritize by divisional requests or by each individual request.

b) An excel spreadsheet with the FY 2012 requests from all divisions, including President’s, was distributed. A second spreadsheet to be distributed later reflects the FY 2012 requests. The recommendation to the President will include both FY 2012 and FY 2013 consistent with the Budget Request submission.

c) A point was raised regarding whether or not the President's "White Paper" should be taken into consideration by the Council.

d) Chair DeHayes points out that the focus of the "White Paper" is on fundraising.

e) Chair DeHayes explained to the Council that if the rubrics could be filled out by the end of the current meeting then the results could be gathered and summarized very quickly.

f) A point was raised about the Likert scale on the rubric. The rubric is slanted too strongly towards the positive in regards to III. Benefits. It is suggested that the scale range from: "Highly
Negative Impact” to "Highly Positive Impact" with "No Impact" being placed in the middle of the five options.

i) Chair DeHayes asked the Council to approve this change and it is approved. The scale will be changed on all rubrics before the assessment takes place.

g) Chair DeHayes assured the Council that no final recommendations will be made during this session.

d) Discussion on Student Aid Request

a) Chair DeHayes gave a brief overview of the $10M Student Aid request: $7M will be used to attract and yield incoming freshmen in Fall 2011; $3M will be for retaining the Fall 2011 sophomore class.

b) Dean Libutti was introduced to answer questions about the Student Aid request.

c) If the $10M was granted, the student aid budget would be $80M.

d) Private funds can make a difference; giving student aid to help student retention is in concert with the President's "White Paper". Discretionary (flex) money can be provided by private donors to give enrollment the flexibility to make decisions. It should be an institutional priority to build up unrestricted dollars for scholarships as student retention is a continuing problem.

e) Dean Libutti was asked how diversity is considered with this potential funding.

i) Dean Libutti explains that the 2011 freshman class has 21% diversity, up from 14% the year before. He explained that this is by design and that it takes more than money to raise the percentage. Another strategy being used by the University to increase diversity is major code consideration.

f) Dean Libutti estimated that if the 80% retention loss is cut in half by the $3M student aid increase, a one year savings of $800K to $1M could be attained. The size of the school could dramatically shrink if student retention percentages are not increased.

e) Discussion on Faculty Positions

f) A point was raised about the plausibility of increasing student-to-faculty ratio from 15.5 to 16.5 while just replacing those who retire.

a) Chair DeHayes addressed this by saying the University has already raised it from 14.5 to 15.5 in the last year. He explained that the Council will soon receive tenure track data. He explained how the hope is that departments will cash in some per course dollars and leverage that money into full-time faculty. He explained the perils of simply waiting around for people to retire and not being proactive in the meantime. Chair DeHayes continued on this point by explaining that a goal of the University should be to have full-time faculty in front of first year students. He said that the Council needs to ask itself, "Is there some things we can stop doing here?"

g) Revenue Generating Programs Discussion

a) A question was raised about whether or not the University has any programs it feels can generate additional revenue

i) Chair DeHayes described two different programs the University is exploring. 1) A global leadership program where students from all over the globe come for two weeks and build on our leadership program. 2) A coastal ecology summer course where students from various institutes could come to URI and take a summer course.
h) **Graduate Research Tuition Differential Program Discussion**

a) Currently $150K of overhead funds contribute to this program. The request for an additional $150K from Academic Affairs has not been matched by an additional $150K from Research and Economic Development. The FY 2011 Fund 100 budget for this program is $1.3 million and the goal is for the program to reach $2M in three years.

i) **Discussion on 3% Service Contract Increase**

a) Vice-Chair Bob Weygand explained that this increase is necessary for maintaining buildings on campus which is his division's number one priority

j) **Discussion on Process of Ranking the Requests**

a) There was a concern raised about voting all-or-nothing on items such as number of tenure track professors: should the Council be able to vote for portions of requests?
   i) Chair DeHayes cautioned the Council to hold off on breaking up requests until the Council gets to an actual funding discussion. He urged the Council to simply prioritize at this point in time.
   ii) Vice-Chair Weygand added that each Council member should be ranking the 40 divisional requests based on priority because the Council was created with the intention of it having a broad scope.
   iii) There was a suggestion that perhaps another Likert scale should be implemented.
   iv) There was also the suggestion that Council members could use the comments section of the 40 item spreadsheet to voice any concerns about the specifics of any certain request. This was not thought to be the best solution; but, no others were offered.

k) **Discussion on The Council’s Definition of Quality and how that Determines the University’s Future**

a) Chair DeHayes explained how he thinks the biggest problem facing URI is cost value equation. He said that until we are where we can compete (includes research, faculty) we will be grappling to get 40-50 more students to balance the budget.

b) Quality means attracting young faculty; a good freshman and classroom experience; the beauty of the campus and diversity.

c) The University cannot be all things to all people. It will take a lot more research before the University decides what it is going to be.

d) Vice-Chair Bob Weygand stated that quality is subjective and objective. Our students have a different definition of quality. There is an academic and business model to trying to please everyone. What do students (customers) view as value? How do we address factors forcing students to leave? Vice-Chair Weygand stated that he does not think we have a strategic idea of where we should be going. It is very ambiguous and subjective.

e) Chair DeHayes pointed out that the University has made a decision not to get bigger as we were hurting our image with selection.

l) **Discussion on Future Budget Increases and Decreases**

a) State Appropriation is not going up, there is really nothing more we can do on out-of-state tuition, and politically it is not a good time to raise in-state tuition. Are there more things to be
done? The University is putting a moratorium on building more buildings because it is costing too much to maintain them.

m) **Discussion on What the Council Should Consider While Completing the Rubrics**

a) Chair DeHayes explained that there is still great interest in the University amongst applicants. He points out the number of applications this past year and claims that if the University can raise that number even higher and be more selective about the ones it chooses to accept, the University will be in a very good place. He also pointed out that the $56M the University receives from the state is comparable to the interest which would amount from a $1B endowment.

b) Vice Chair Weygand expanded upon this by saying that with this $56M comes the bureaucracy and land grant of a public place. These things do not come from a private endowment.

(1) It was acknowledged by the Council that improving the quality of life of the people of the State of Rhode Island should always be in the Council's consideration.

c) There was a second call for the Council members to consider on-campus relationships when making their decisions. There is nothing more important to retention than faculty-student relationships. The model has been set by the Engineering Department. Other departments should be emulating them.

n) **The Rest of the Session is used to fill out the Budget Request Rubrics.**

a) It was suggested that the Council only consider FY12 at this meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

**Required Actions Items:**
1) Rubric data to be gathered and provided to the Council for preliminary discussion on their recommendations to the President.
2) Discussion and recommendations

**Information Requested:**
1) None

**Next Meeting Date:**
Friday, June 25, 2010 9am - 12pm in the Galanti Lounge, 3rd Floor University Library

**Next Meeting Agenda:**
1) Budget Presentations to the Council: President
2) Discussion and deliberation in preparation for recommendations to the President for FY 2012 and FY 2013.

See SBPC website for meetings and agendas.

Minutes by: John Olerio, Graduate Assistant, Budget & Financial Planning 6/22/10