University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
Tuesday, June 13, 1:00pm-4:00pm  
Ballentine Hall, Thomson Boardroom

Members in Attendance:  
Don DeHayes (Chair), Abigail Rider, Samuel Adams, David Bergeron, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Kathy Collins, Barbara Costello, John Kirby, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Adam Quinlan, Ellen Reynolds, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Kim Stack, W. Michael Sullivan, Barbara Wolfe

Members Absent:  
Ryan Buck, Kathryn Jervis, Lindsay McLennan, Naomi Thompson, Thorr Bjorn

Guests:  
Dean Karim Boughida, Ryan Carrillo, Mark Conley, Mike Iavarone, Michael Katz, Mike Khalfayan, Rich Kubica, Karen Markin, Mike Motta, Jayne Pelletier, Vern Wyman

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
   - Four proposals submitted this year; a low number
   - Probably due to the budget expectations
   - Governor’s proposal for RI Promise may not pass

2. Approval of May 25, 2017 Minutes (copy attached)
   - Approved as presented

3. FY2019 Global Request (1:15pm) – Information Technology presented by Donald DeHayes, Provost
   - Quick consensus that IT should be the “institutional proposal”
   - Particularly focused on IT Security; clearly an area for which we need to invest
   - First proposal submitted collectively from senior leaders
   - First set of action items from new IT Strategic Plan
   - First strategic prioritization of IT needs
   - First action taken by IT Governance Council, chaired by Dean Boughida
   - Funding Requests: two inter-related items; directory service and security infrastructure; second requires the first; 68% of institutions have put forward rigorous security plans, we have not
   - Combination of one time only and permanent base funding requests
   - Directory Service relates to managing user access to the university
   - It is an authoritative data base; access and who can log in
   - Currently have a dozen different directories on campus managed by multiple individuals (nine are done manually)
   - Cost savings; could move to a single log on
   - Provides core for security
   - Improve integration of services, including cloud services
- Reduction of risk; less opportunities for breaches
- HIPAA data must be protected
- Directory Service – three phases; not properly licensed for Microsoft products at the current time
- Phase II and III relate to how rolled out to the URI community; this could be in $200-$300K range
- This has been a priority; AMRC reviewed this issue; Berry Dunn Consultants did an assessment and a university IT plan was developed
- Coincides with the academic plan; touches on all the goals
- The risks of not implementing are significant; biggest risk is to URI’s reputation
- Not compliant with current RI law
- $258K one time only; $87K permanent funding in FY2020
- URI is lowest funded per student in benchmark presented

4. FY2019 Global Request (1:30pm) – Information Technology critique presented by Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Adam Quinlan, and Ryan Buck (not available)
- First priority is directory service; second is security infrastructure
- Directory service: single authentication; optimize cost/efficiency
- Second part is $170K annual cost to be in compliance with Microsoft Office
- Benefit - compliant with licensing; consultant part would help with future benefits; enhanced security; efficiencies; faster and better integration of IT services
- Three phase project over five years; this is phase I only; benefits do not come until later phases;
- Budget pays for consultant recommendations and does not fund implementation
- Phase II is directory roll out; phase III is one log in and other portal services
- Concerns - is this the only request to SBPC or continuous requests; if make a commitment to phase I does this commit to phase II and III; could impact the decisions in the next few years
- If fund phase I and not II and III or delay, the benefits and risk management are decreased and could disappear. Are we willing to commit to multiple years?
- Overall potential cost not known; phase I $760K and phase II could be $200-$300K; new material for Hartford Healthcare had 18 active directories and that was a $2.4M cost; University Las Vegas is at $1M and the process is not complete
- Large amount over several years
- Berry Dunn: over 40% of IT not in IT at URI; when benchmark is done, may not be a good benchmark with other schools central IT funding
- Single sign on is listed as a justification; however, would not appear until the very end and would be additional expenditures; proposing one password and not a single sign on
• Should we invest in new URI employees vs. a consultant? Difficult to locate someone who would work for our salary structure
• Reasons that there are IT not in central IT
• Security Infrastructure: risk management assessment; improve vulnerability assessments and remediation that follows
• Specific breakout of $258K
• Ongoing cost is $87K
• Benefits - protection from cyber threats; protect reputation
• Concerns - many technical issues; more info needed that we would not have at this point
• Need clarification of budget information; not entirely clear what net benefits or ROI is at this point
• Delaying could incur significant security risks; damage to data/infrastructure and fines

5. FY2019 Global Request (1:45-2:15pm) – Information Technology Council Discussion
• Vice Chair – Administration & Finance believes this is the single most important investment for the university; security is critical and financial system is dependent upon it;
• Is there a plan for a match? Not at this time.
• Probably greatest threat to business continuity; can bring academics and support of academics to a halt; would like to see what the out year estimates are for this proposal
• Are we wedded to Microsoft?
• Per CIO, investigate find all directories and is design work; then bring on all distributed groups; third phase gives us the overarching functions;
• Goal is one log in and one password to all organizational units
• If we are out of compliance what is our plan? Per CIO we will have to fund the funds if new funds not allocated; this gets us a base structure; then will assess;
• Compliance with RI State law and HIPAA
• Disagree that you lose fed funds for FERPA violation; penalty is so harsh it has never been assessed; if we have security issues we need to address in a timely fashion; at some point they will make a statement with a significant fine
• IT Plan reflects substantive funds involved; very modest request compared to true needs;
• Not addressed is the hardware, uses, training, education and rather see a larger proposal so we can see a full three to five-year plan that gets us current
• It is a $2-$3M project
• Lot of work to do to give you a comprehensive proposal
• In past did not have a clear strategic list of IT priorities
• Engaged consultant
• IT Strategic Plan distributed
• If we did not get to phase II do we see any benefits
• How does the security tie to the directory?
• If we phase it; after phase I will have central directory structure in place, phase II brings in colleges and departments; start consolidating to one log-in and password; then phase III single sign-on and portal services;
• Can do phase II before phase I; in addition to the first phase, going to find security deficiencies; everyone in one domain would be easier to distribute software
• Focusing on services, not just technology;
• Critical to get started
• How can the University access funds sooner? Perhaps one time only funding can be identified; could think about borrowing for short-term
• Long term consequences are important for us to understand

6. FY2019 Divisional Request (2:15pm) – Research & Economic Development presented by Gerald Sonnenfeld, Vice President
   • Looking at new ways to generate additional funding and help our faculty and post docs be more competitive
   • ~20% of NSF grant applications are funded (9-30% for NIH); most are at 9% due to competition and budget reductions
   • With deep knowledge of one-two agencies
   • Multiple benefits of increased grant funding
   • Hit rates on awards increase
   • Spoke with peer institutions; three of the four full-time grant writers and one uses consultants and one has decided not to go that route
   • Skilled grant writer brings increased prominence and impact of research, scholarship and creative work; increased overhead funds to support additional programs and involve more students in research; improve competitive position to recruit top faculty and students and encourages alumni philanthropy; aligned with goals one and two of Strategic Academic Plan
   • $10K co-share is from Fund 110

7. FY2019 Divisional Request (2:30pm) – Research & Economic Development critique presented by Patricia Morokoff, Kimberly Stack, and Barbara Costello
   • Help support the organization of drafting the grant
   • Help with writing; mostly done by faculty
   • If multi-institutional, this person can be a liaison among institutions
   • They could assist students and junior faculty with their research
   • Not easy to learn who has grant writers among our peers
   • Some have grant writers; some do not
   • Depending upon institution, grant writer can be helpful
   • Examples of increased research funding from a grant writer being hired
   • Progressive approach
- Alternative suggestions: specialized grant writers? Appears a need to be connected to agencies; more than one grant writers would be more effective;
- CBA has someone focused on grants from foundations
- Overlap with RED positions? No specific job description for new position requested; seems a good deal of staff effort in data entry; perhaps resources could be applied differently; someone does review a finished product and suggest revisions for greater probability of success
- Gerry – regarding: overlap – we don’t have a lot of staff; compared to our peers we are the lowest in number in staff
- TIG, located in Washington, D.C., a firm engaged by the URI Research Foundation, review high profile grants and won’t help with these proposals
- Potential benefits – familiarity with funding agencies and potential to help many faculty (hundreds of proposals submitted annually)
- If increasing our success rate could increase our funding
- Drawbacks: is one grant writer sufficient?; difficult for one person to have expertise in all fields; no stated plan for evaluation of success of new position in generating more (or more successful) proposals
- Could create a permanent position and have funding remaining flat
- Not talking about huge increases in funding based on what is going on in Washington
- Cross-divisional efficiencies: writing across the University Initiative; grant writing workshops; connection to advancement of teaching and learning
- Grant writing workshops exist – to what extent?

- AMRC reviewed Research; when separated from AA, not funded appropriately; must find out how to make it more efficient;
- Most staff not funded with SPA
- What about $87K towards a grant writing boot camp? Have not looked at it; would only be one time only and we are already doing this; must understand what the agencies want;
- Depends on the boot camp
- Experience indicates that they are not successful
- They would meet with this person and get guidance; the faculty member would write and come back to the grant writer
- Review panels do a power analysis and this is where you go to get it done
- Sounds like it is more of a “coach”
- Depends on the content area; and may be specific within an agency; must be thoughtful as to what we are looking for
- There is a case where this person might be writing – several or inter-institutional investigators
- Very often creative activity pops up; but NSF, NIH is discussed; maybe the arts should be considered?
• There are principles, coupled with senior faculty could be used to mentor faculty and become more competitive
• Well trained person who understands it could be a powerful addition
• What do the new faculty think are the most important investment?
• Graduate School looking into something similar; may be doing a workshop and discussing a part-time grant writer; Lil searching for a proposal writer; some of same skill set; may be opportunity to collaborate
• Our main focus is on faculty
• Chair urged collaboration
• How would you implement?
• We would have to prioritize – junior faculty and major projects and if find out if overwhelmed, then make an argument to expand
• How do you help faculty graduate and transition from entry level to higher level scientist?
• What is rationale for a multi-institutional grant to be submitted by institution other than URI? Depends upon a PI
• Chair – if we go forward, it may be beneficial to target areas like INBRE, EPSCOR; this would impact the skill set of the grant writer
• That is a way to approach it; but, we do not want to leave out the small budgets

9. Next Steps
   • We will discuss the process at the end of the meeting tomorrow

Meeting Adjourned at 3:07 pm

Next Meeting Wednesday, June 14, 1:00pm – 4:00pm, Thomson Boardroom, Ballentine Hall (Div Presentations)

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