Members/Staff in Attendance:


Members Absent:

David Coates, Jack Szczepanski, and Robert Beagle.

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 9:12am by Council Chair DeHayes. Chair DeHayes acknowledged President Dooley.

b) Chair DeHayes provided President Dooley with a brief summary of the Council’s proceedings since it last met with the President.

c) Chair DeHayes explained that the Council greatly appreciates and welcomes their attendance; however, discussion will be limited to Council members.

Budget Presentations

d) President’s Division – Presented by President David M. Dooley. The presentation will be made available on the SBPC website.

a) His presentation included the following:

i) The University outsources many tasks which should be handled by Affirmative Action, Legal Counsel, and NCAA Compliance.

ii) The President's personal goal for year one is to learn the University: who everyone is and how they work together. Only then can he best help and assist all involved in the community.

iii) President Dooley is actively looking for feedback to reformulate the University's vision. The goal is not necessarily to divorce this new vision from those of old, but rather to reframe it appropriately for the 21st Century.

iv) President Dooley will be taking a long, hard look at the University curricula and how it is taught. All good universities are constantly doing just this.
v) President Dooley's goal is to make the University more inclusive, reflexive, and transparent and to also have it become an international leader in working with partners.

vi) President Dooley believes the University can assume a position of national leadership in advancing the values of diversity and community as intrinsic to a stellar education in the 21st Century. There is a vacuum in Higher Education which the University can fill.

vii) Working to establish diversity as a core value of the institution should not be done out of a misguided sense of requirement but rather because if it is not done the institution will be failing its students going forward.

viii) The idea of community and diversity is not how we can all live together as we do other important work-- it is doing our important work together. A student's success will be limited, regardless of their talents, unless they can work cooperatively with others different from themselves.

ix) President Dooley offered his FY12 budget request of the Council: Creating the position of the Chief Diversity Officer.

(1) The Chief Diversity Officer would work with the Provost's Office, the various Deans, faculty, the Affirmative Action Office, University Advancement, Athletics, and Student Affairs to promote diversity both internally and externally.

b) President Dooley would like Legal Counsel staffed to the point where they can be proactive rather than reactive with issues on campus.

c) The new Chief Diversity Officer would represent the President while working across the campus to advance the goal of promoting diversity as a core belief of the University.

d) President Dooley was asked by the Council to elaborate on how the Chief Diversity Officer would wield power if this position was indeed created.

i) President Dooley explained that he would like enforcement not to be the main objective of the Chief Diversity Officer. Rather, his vision is for the Chief Diversity Officer to help foster a mentality on campus where things are being done on campus to promote diversity not by force but by an organic belief that this is in the best interest of the University and its students.

ii) The President would like diversity to be the defining characteristic of the University of Rhode Island.

iii) It is important to the President that the scope of this position not be too broad.

e) President Dooley was asked by the Council why he thought it best to create this position instead of a new division dedicated solely to diversity.

i) The President cautioned the council that whenever a new division is created, pieces of pre-existing divisions are cut out and reassigned. The President feared that natural working connections and relations would be disturbed by the creation of a new division.

f) The Council urges the President to come back at a later date with FY13 & FY14 requests which will be useful in aiding the Chief Diversity Officer in achieving the goals set forth by the President.

g) The Council asks the President how the new Associate VP would go about balancing the promotion of diversity at the community, state, and international levels.
i) The President asserts that this promotion process starts with the URI community first. The energy present on the URI campus provides a great base for the Chief Diversity Officer. There is already positive momentum building up. This person will work with those who are already working hard to foster diversity within the community. Reaching out to alumni will be a critical role of the new Chief Diversity Officer.

h) The President is asked to give a profile of his ideal candidate for the new position.

i) This person's number one passion will need to be diversity; will need a background in curricula discussion; will need to be comfortable talking to faculty; will need to understand the skill sets students need to learn alongside people very different from themselves; and will need to be a very strong communicator.

i) The council expresses its desire for a structural method to evaluate the achievement of diversity goals.

e) Discussion on Rubric

a) There were various points raised regarding the rubric.

b) Chair DeHayes proposed that if the council decides the rubric approach is a viable way to move forward that the rubric be fine tuned and honed over the next year by multiple council members.

c) At 10:45am Chair DeHayes introduced Eugen Trandafir from the Budget and Financial Planning Office to give a summary presentation on the rankings of the requested items he compiled based on the rubrics submitted by the council.

d) It was noted that the rubrics were submitted before the President’s presentation on the Chief Diversity Officer.

e) Next year the weighting of the categories will be given more time and attention.

f) Discussion on Individual Line Item Requests

a) Chair DeHayes asked the council to go line item by line item to discuss each request.

b) Cheryl Foster reminded the council that the initial rubric submission by the council members was a first run through. She pointed out that many council members filled the rubric out quickly and the results of this process are to be used simply as a guide.

i) Chair DeHayes concurred with her assessment of the process.

c) At 11:02am the results of the funding options section of the rubric was presented to the council.

d) The council members explained that they voted on funding sources by listing potential funding sources and not how they believed the funding should be proportioned.

e) Chair DeHayes stated a desire to look at the top 5-10 items on each list (strategic alignment, benefits, costs) and see if the rankings seem to make logical sense.

f) A question was raised about whether there might be a structural problem facing the rubric in regards to it being based so strongly on academic affairs.

i) Vice-Chair Weygand explained that this bias is probably explained by the strong academic plan which has been laid out by the University. There is no university strategic business plan laid out, it is absent so it makes it harder to evaluate the strategic alignment of non-academic items. It is easy to evaluate these items based on plausibility and cost-analysis because those things are well-laid out as well.
g) It was suggested that perhaps some administration positions needed to be reviewed to see if they are still useful and effective. The size of the school is shrinking yet administrators are being added, this seems counterintuitive.

h) There was an urge for the council to look at existing budgets to grant requests rather than finding new money for all new requests. Perhaps consolidation is possible in some cases.

i) Chair DeHayes pointed out that the last two points of discussion were a little outside the realm of the charge of the council. The council is not in place to manage.
   i) DeHayes offered that the council will be best served to recommend to the President that he reallocate some existing funding once it is deemed which items are worth funding.

j) Discussion of the URI Study Abroad Program. Some concerns were raised about the program with a hesitancy to invest funding. The global learning position is good in principle.

k) Vice-Chair Weygand asked the council to consider how it would like to progress toward making recommendations to the President. He explained that this is a "40,000 foot" question to answer. Should it be based on a formula?

l) It was proposed that the top 3 items on the rankings no longer be discussed as there seemed to be consensus that those three items should be a part of the recommendation to the President. Instead, the focus should be placed on items in the middle where more discussion is needed for clarification on where the committee, as a whole, stands on these items.

m) It was suggested that a ranked list of all 40 requests be submitted to the President along with a division by division look at the requests. From there the President could make allocations and reallocations.
   i) It is also added that the President should see how the council prefers requests to be funded.
   ii) Peter Alfonso stated that he believed the council was going well beyond its charge. He explained that he believes the council does not have access to existing budgets. The council should only be looking into new budgets. He said it would be best for the council to rank the items and then let the President decide how and if to fund them. Any report sent to the President should focus primarily on recommendations and not on funding.
   iii) There was disagreement. It was argued that it is important to have funding sources in any report because it sets example for the divisions that they need to look outside the box for alternative sources of funds and wean off of the general fund.
   iv) Chair DeHayes offered his opinion that the sources of funds were the most powerful thing which emerged from the rubrics.

n) Chair DeHayes once again pointed out the importance of the Student Aid request.

o) Dr. Alfonso explained that he believed the rubric to be a filter. He believes the next step is to categorize the requested items based on the results of the completed rubrics.

p) Chair DeHayes noted that the rubrics have helped to put the council in a better place than it was a year ago. Now, there are twenty people sorting these issues out together rather than in isolation.

q) There was a call to break the requested items into thirds and then, from there, re-rank the upper third portion of the items.

r) There was a call for each division head to re-prioritize their requests so as to let the council know what they believe to be vital. This will make shrinking the list much easier.
There was opposition to letting the President see the preliminary votes since the council did not know this could happen before the voting process began.

Chair DeHayes supported a future re-ranking of the top one-third portion of the requested items. He also stated his belief that possible/preferred funding sources should be attached to whatever is submitted to the President.

There was a motion for Glen Kerkian to advise the President on which items from the final list could be supported by fundraising.

There was a call for self-imposed cuts by each division so the council could spend more time on fewer items.

A member of the council said repackaging of requests would better serve the council rather than outright cuts.

Chair DeHayes explained that repacking can lessen transparency. Grouping things puts the council in danger of not knowing exactly what it is voting on.

There was agreement on this point. Requests are, and should be, broken down by function.

Another point was raised which cautioned the council on restricting divisions to a certain amount of requests. This could lead to divisions having to hold back some very important items.

Chair DeHayes suggests each council-member vote on where they believe each item should be prioritized in relation to each other. Each council-member should place each item in either the top-third, middle-third, or bottom-third of prioritization.

Chair DeHayes informed the council that each member would receive a summary of the first rubric voting and a sheet which lists all 34 requested items. Next to each item either a 1 (representing highest priority), 2 (middle priority), or 3 (lowest priority) should be listed. This sheet will be due back before the next SBPC meeting.

Note was made as to how 40 became 34. It was suggested that division re-lump individual items to condense to 34.

Anne Morrissey alerted the council of the date & time of the next meeting, June 30, 9am-12pm, being posted on the meeting wizard. She asked that each member respond promptly.

12:14pm meeting adjourned.

**Required Actions Items:**
1) Requested items to be ranked, by priority, into thirds by the council before the next meeting.
2) Discussion and recommendations

**Information Requested:**
1) None

**Next Meeting Date:**
Wednesday, June 30, 2010 3pm - 5pm in the Galanti Lounge, 3rd Floor University Library
See SBPC website for meetings and agendas
Minutes by: John Olerio, Graduate Assistant, Budget & Financial Planning 6/25/10