Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Abigail Rider (Vice Chair), Samuel Adams, Linda Barrett, David Bergeron, Thor Bjorn, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Kathy Collins, Mark Conley, Kathryn Jervis, Oleg Kazakov, John Kirby, Jeffrey Konin, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Ellen Reynolds, Peter Snyder, Kim Stack, Adriana Wilding, Barbara Wolfe

Members Absent: Adam Quinlan, Naomi Thompson,

Guests: Gabriele Fariello, Paul Kassabian, Michael Khalfayan, Hillary Leonard, and Michael Motta

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
   - Originally estimated $5 million shortfall for FY2019; House Finance Committee added $2 million; Fine Arts – FY2019 $6.4 million, FY2020 $4.6 million over two years
   - New Chief Information Officer hired and announcement will be sent to URI community tomorrow

2. Approval of April 24, 2018 Minutes
   - Approved with amendments as follows: (1) List David Dooley under "Guests (2) Under section "5. CIP Process", in first bullet, change "President will share to "President Dooley presented"

3. FY2020 Presentation: Provost/Information Technology (1:00 pm) presented by Donald DeHayes, Provost
   - Creating a university-wide information technology structure; first phase funded in FY2019; aligns with goals 2 and 4 of the university’s strategic plan; $301,000 one time only (OTO) funds and $135,000 base funds are requested
   - Compelling reasons for proposal – URI must be in compliance with Rhode Island Identity Theft Act; URI receives about 400,000 hacking attacks per hour from Russia, China and Asia; about one million per day; could result in loss of computer facilities; fines and URI’s reputation are at stake; will companion to a single sign on
   - Development of a risk based information security program; is a university-wide need and asset
   - IT Governance Committee listing displayed; this representation is across the university including students
   - CIO indicated if it is something we need to report, could be a risk; first task is a vulnerability assessment program for all servers and desktops to where they are in relation to patches released; flaws in it get patched; email, file servers that have not been patched; vulnerability management program to identity, categorize, and
compartmentalize different sections of the university to identify the vulnerability; Second is patch management to deploy patches in a consistent manner; cannot organize a fully automated version; single biggest problem is the people; ID systems are at risk and we must let folks know; without being completely blind as to what is happening on our networks

- Reasonable to expect with $150,000 of additional budget should be well positioned; sign up to a service that tracks and pushes the information to URI for their knowledge and action; there could be an additional infrastructure not aware of now; this will get us to an acceptable place, needs re-evaluation

4. FY2020 Presentation: Provost/Information Technology (1:15 pm) critique presented by Faye Boudreaux-Bartels and Samuel Adams

- Last year two presentations; phase 1, $330,000 for FY2019 one time only (OTO); Microsoft licensing obligations
- Priority 2 was to implement IT Security Infrastructure for the FY2020 request
- OTO cost of $301,000 mainly for a university wide technology infrastructure, software; 16.3% increase from last year; is it the same items; base of $135,000 FY2020 or FY2021?
- Pros reflect the IT plan; protects, responds; protect against sanctions and harm to URI’s reputation
- Cons – the proposal is somewhat confusing; perpetual and yearly licenses in OTO; is the start date in FY2020 or FY2021; in budget slide it is presented in FY2021; proposal had many abbreviations; a lot of tech speak; no explanation of what software did; only initials and names; there was a reference to $84,000 in two different places; listed as a savings and in another place as an annual cost; annual cost is not clear
- Given importance, should it be funded sooner? Now vs. later, can fund balance be used for FY2019?
- Seems like an organizational necessity

5. FY2020 Presentation: Provost/Information Technology: Council Discussion 30 minutes

- Independent from last year’s request; does not have to be done in sequence; one shores up the other; single sign on is not the same as threat assessment; bit of an overlap but can do separately; synergy in having them done together; slightly higher cost when doing separately; the more delay, the higher the cost because we are amassing more systems and doing more things; maintenance cost starts in FY2021; $135,000 starts in FY2021; $135,000 is the annual amount going forward
- This is not the absolute best approach; but with small security staff and other competing requests, it is what we thought was best for URI and would get us to acceptable; could implement and our risk profile should be better; get us comfortable within our constraints; if not constraints would need to expand the security staff; single greatest risk is the people in the organization
- If something happens, what is the next step? They provide patches; we take it from there; maintenance should not increase
- Do you have a technology capital plan? How can we be proactive and not reactive?
- No capital plan; have strategic IT Plan with first time holistic view on a university level; have an idea of projects and plans up ahead; but IT is fluid; this is a capital expenditure to take us where we need to be; ongoing budget items deal with infrastructure; part of the IT Plan includes items that will mitigate our risks; these projects are underway
Next year Council should not see just a bigger version of this; should see progress; what have we done and what is the differential ask the next year

With infrastructure to Cloud, we will be much better off; will manage all on a dashboard; not just our virtual cloud server; the single biggest risk is the social; have to know internal workings of the system to know if compromising the system;

Staff in Administration and Finance are mandated to take IT security training

One of biggest vulnerabilities are people; ensure all desktops are patched;

Should this amount be part of base budget? Yes, $135,000

Could actually implement in three phases; what is current state of directories; information was from university survey; priced it based on that

Council recommended last year to implement all phases; with exception of the Council being kept informed

Reference to Council indicating in a prior meeting of March 2018, that IT does not need to return to SBPC for phase 2 and 3; phase 1 is beginning; resources are in the IT budget and to address the $330,000 in FY2019

6. FY2020 Presentation: President’s Division (2:00 pm) presented by Thorr Bjorn

- New position in NCAA Compliance Office; this office reports directly to the President; there are new NCAA mandates for reporting, evaluations, investigations
- National Association of Collegiate Officers; 1:125 students is the recommended ratio; we are 1:250
- The average Division 1 school is 1:156 and schools in New England are 1:168;
- NCAA has increased a large number of requirements; academic program representatives, gender equity; equity, and sports demographic; federal government also requires reports;
- We should report a minimum of five violations per year; URI has averaged 3.75; as a percentage it is significant; will look at what schools fall below certain thresholds; failure to monitor or lack of institutional control is what we never want to hear; the new position must have a good understanding of the rules/regulations/laws and ensure that we are doing the most we can; new Supreme Court ruling – what is that impact?
- Legalized gambling will allow betting on everything; e.g. someone could say to an athlete, I will give you $300 to miss the first jump ball in a basketball game
- Major public embarrassments e.g. North Carolina, Penn State, North Carolina had $20 million legal costs
- Ensure to identify problems and report as quickly as possible; also, educate and protect the University’s reputation
- Daily responsibilities would be interpretation of the law, understanding rules and regulations of NCAA; integrity laws; going through court papers and assessing the impact to our athletes; follow what national manufacturers interact with our athletes; safeguard our institution; implement education for URI offices; alumni supporters; preventing external individuals making money off of our athletes; ensure they are not exploited; ensure training of student athletes
- NCAA compliance is not just eligibility

7. FY2020 Presentation: President’s Division (2:15 pm) critique presented by Barbara Wolfe and Kimberly Stack

- Compliance Coordinator; Grade 9; includes professional development
- Individuals are at risk; displayed benchmark data; many schools are similar to us
- Separation between compliance and academics is important
- Potential benefits; prevent sanctions and fines; maintain our reputation; support continuity of the athletic program;
- Insufficient staff is not an excuse for failure to report
- Must track texting between coaches and students or recruits
- Due to risks associated with this request, there are no drawbacks

8. FY2020 Presentation: President’s Division: Council Discussion
- Qualifications? Number of individuals work as interns with NCAA; lawyers will apply;
- If violation is in one sport can it impact the others? We verify 500 athletes per semester; may affect a team that is prohibited to going to final 4 because one athlete did something; impact on morale is significant; reputation; fundraising implications
- Second position is in Compliance office; all funding is within the President’s division; why now? Increased complexity; increased responsibility of reporting; cost and exposure of violations;
- Recent Rice report – allowing agents for potential and current athletes; burden on us to monitor; major issues for colleges across the country; new lawsuits coming to closure; name and likeness of student athletes and receiving compensation for this;
- URI, although not as big as other schools, is still at risk of reputation, fundraising, etc.
- Within Division 1, we must follow the rules within this Division; best practices show you are making an honest effort to control what your school is doing or not doing
- This helps to protect the students as well as the institution

9. FY2020 Presentation: Academic Affairs (3:00 pm) presented by Donald DeHayes, Provost
- Staff for Institutional Research; small staff that handle many requests; ten years ago we needed a Director of Institutional Research, someone who has knowledge of data analytics, etc.
- Operate in a world that is heavy to data and predictive analytics and now performance funding; new skill needed
- Request is to add 2.5 positions; 1 experienced leader;
- In a mode to analyze, interpret and make predictions of data
- Academic Affairs will co-share; new FTE totals 2.0;
- Aspirational practice for Institutional Research; making data informed decisions
- Scrutiny of higher education, critical we respond with data and thoughtful analysis
- Currently 2.5 FTE in Institutional Research; in addition have 1 FTE in Institutional Research that reports to Enrollment Management
- Greater breadth and depth of data analytics and visualization
- Must have measures of progress against our strategic plan
- Student success efforts require expanded data analytics
- Recently moved paper to online for faculty teaching/course evaluation
- NEASC requests info
- A proactive appropriately staffed Institutional Research office will help in many areas: student success, etc.
- Director will be hands on and set direction; represent the University at national and regional meetings
- Part time Data Analyst will focus on IDEA
- Benchmarked Data on average number of staff in IR Offices; our peers have 9; we have 2.5 to 3.5
- Director will report to Ann Morrissey, Assistant to the Provost for Planning
10. FY2020 Presentation: Academic Affairs (3:15 pm) critique presented by Patricia Morokoff and David Bergeron

- Data is critical; stunned to learn URI does not have an IR Director
- Proposed structure is to report through Academic Planning
- Association of Institutional Research has completed a study and the numbers are vastly different; most offices have 1-2 staff because most are not research university; benchmarking data displayed was from Hanover; important point is that institutions invariably have a Director
- Typical services per Hanover Report – many are mandated some by federal government; National Center for Education Statistics releases the data, if wrong, paints negative picture of the university; important that data be accurate and timely; campus community should be used by the campus community;
- Needs of various entities, IDEA, predictive analytics; performance funding
- Pros – improve quality of data, provide resources to leadership; allow for timely response; institutions that do not report accurately to the federal government are fined; most important – having a good strong Institutional Research Office allows for ability to tell the good stories; grounded in data that is why the press reported on it; aspirations practices from IR document should have us consider who should do institutional research; one of key decision makers in higher education are students
- Should it be a direct report to the Provost? In some institutions IR reports to the President; how do you attract the best Director to URI; it will be important to them to report to the Provost; key is to get the strongest Director you can for the institution and build out the role/department;
- Will benefit all aspects of the University

11. FY2020 Presentation: Academic Affairs: Council Discussion

- Technology has impacted Institutional Research; careful about not adding bodies without adding systems; what is the balance?
- Director could help us balance the people with the systems
- We have a “warehouse” in DataSpark; they have the capacity to maintain the data and do the analysis
- Missing the new technologies, new system and data visualization
- Better to build our own expertise
- IR Office asked us not to ask for any new software
- Gap on campus in training; aspirational items spoke to this; how to move from interesting to action step; Institutional Research Director could spend times with various cohorts and they could pass it to others
- What are our goals? Sophisticated interpretation of data
- Usually the IR staff will work with a faculty or staff member who knows the data
- DataSpark has a massive amount of data
- Believe this also has a risk; absent predictive analytics to drive decisions puts us at risk
- Number of programs in health care that have required reports; how can we best look at our Admissions process? Increase retention?
- Heard IDEA was doing to be Automated and now we need an extra person – why? Individuals in Enrollment Services who used to do the paper? Savings were put towards the software; needed someone with a technology background; became very clear needed a person;
- Is there a cost savings? Probably cost neutral; certainly a timeliness
- Probably putting more into co-share than actuals
- Can go back and look at the analysis and report back
- If have the right Director, you get better data; IDEA results in office; if built correctly could do quantitative assessment in the office;
- IR undergone a sea change in last decade; Director should think about what questions will I get asked in two years
- Wish we could balance with a Chief Creativity Officer; brand new idea won’t come from what exists; there are other kinds of knowledge that cannot be done this way
- Rare that data solves problems; but can cause us to bring in innovative thinkers

Note: Per SBPC principles, reallocation should be considered first for all proposals

SBPC Presentation Process:
- 15 minutes allotted for division head
- Standard PowerPoint slide (created by BFPO) summarizing budget info
- 15 minutes allotted for team (drawn randomly from SBPC members (excluding VP’s)
- Team provides an objective analysis of the request and specifically addresses the following:
  - Benchmark Data
  - Concerns and/or outstanding questions
  - Alternative Suggestions for funding strategies
  - Suggestions for creating cross-divisional efficiencies
- 30 Minutes for questions and discussion

The randomly selected teams for the FY2020 Strategic Initiative Requests:
- a. Provost/Information Technology – Faye Boudreaux-Bartels and Samuel Adams
- b. President’s Division – Barbara Wolfe and Kimberly Stack
- c. Academic Affairs – Patricia Morokoff and David Bergeron
- d. Student Affairs – Mark Conley and Adam Quinlan
- e. Research & Economic Development - Kathy Jervis, Oleg Kazakov, and John Kirby
- f. Administration & Finance - Adriana Wilding, Jeffrey Konin, Ellen Reynolds

UPCOMING MEETINGS:
June 13, 2018, 2:00pm-5:00pm, Memorial Union, Atrium 2 (Divisional Presentations)
June 19, 2018, 1:00pm-4:00pm, Ballentine Hall, Thomson Boardroom (Identification of top proposals and final recommendations completed)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:50pm
Minutes Submitted by: Lisa Fiorio and Linda Barrett, Budget & Financial Planning