University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
Wednesday, June 15, 2016, 1:00pm - 4:00pm
Green Hall, President’s Conference Room

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino, Linda Barrett, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Sharon Bell, Wendy Bucci, Thorr Bjorn (via phone), Lori Ciccomascolo*, Steven D’Hondt, Rachel DiCioccio, Mary Jo Gonzales (voted via email), Ken Kermes, John Kirby*, Lindsay McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Ellen Reynolds, Joelle Rollo-Koster, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Kim Stack
*participated in voting by providing rankings prior to meeting

Members Absent: Cody Anderson, Naomi Thompson

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

1. Announcements
   Primary task of business today is to discuss which proposals we will be voting for on the Likert scale chart and how each of those proposals relate to the Academic Plan and/or the Benefits.

2. Approval of Minutes (Copies Attached)
   - June 1, 2016
   - June 3, 2016
   - June 7, 2016
   Approved subject to grammar and style cleanup

3. Identification of top proposals
   - Natural divide for six items
   - Proposal to vote on the top eight – not acted upon
   - Less than 50% of the council voted for some; should those be included?
   - The Administration & Finance division would not have any, so we should go to the number that includes each division
   - Vice Chair: there is a vested interest and I appreciate including this; unfortunate things happened and I divided my own vote; my original submission was going to be for three items; however, two other items were submitted in addition to the three due to purchasing delegation and the late reorganization approval related to the Assistant Director, Capital Planning and Design position; I might have pulled one back or made an adjustment; this created a diluting of the five proposals
   - Chair: are we digging too deep? The first round was to identify the top proposals; more than half of the council did not vote for a number of items; thus it appears
that the council did not value them; what is the reason to continue to evaluate them?

- If council leaves one of the items out; worst case is six votes; if council goes with the eight, that could change the range of voting
- Council seems to have spoken with one voice with the six that rose to the top
- Proposals I voted for that fell below the line; items in double digits equals more than 50% of the Council; there is a sizable difference between eleven and eight; dropping below that break makes me uncomfortable
- Do not see how it hurts to vote for half of them; propose to include seven items for the Likert scale voting
- The procedure includes another vote after this round to identify the ones we will be including in the Likert scale vote
- By having one or two more, it does not make it more difficult; just gives us more choices (Note: to extent there are more items, it increases the number of times each response alternative (very high, high, average, below average, lowest) can be used.
- VOTE: Council voted on a motion to include seven items for discussion; motion passed (this allowed inclusion of the Assistant Director, Capital Planning and Design position)

a. Office of Innovation and General Education

- Benefits thousands of students
- Theme #1: enhancing student success
- Has the global built in and gets at last two goals
- The integrate and apply piece could become a project
- Number five easier to advance – streamlining
- Benefits: Retention implication which relates to the revenue stream

b. Assistant Director, Veterans

- Goal #1 - Student experience
- Could relate to net enrollment
- Enhancing student success; access for veterans
- Help with diversity, goals one and four
- Streamlining process for the veterans - goal five

c. Office of Undergraduate Research & Innovation

- Benefits #1 - student success; global presence
- This is an expensive proposition which does not impact that many; this should be aligned with General Education; do not want a select few learning how to do research
- This is more about scholarship; history, political science
- Was broadly defined; added innovation which was a loud voice from our students; creating learning for the students and raising the visibility; right now what we are doing is not working; there is no mechanism to manage it
- We are a research university and we need to put it out there so that students can benefit directly; other universities are raising money for this area
- Is it currently not working? Shouldn’t this be happening out there with the faculty?
- This will put a mechanism into place; there is a pool managed by a committee that is not working
This will cost over $130,000 to administer; and currently $40,000 is allocated to a committee; will cost us more to manage than what students are getting, put more dollars in without hiring someone

It’s not just about the pool of funds; it is reaching a number of students; but, we do not know the number; there is also a fellowship aspect

On the Bay Campus, we operate in isolation; some contacts; the inner space center has many opportunities; having a point of contact to bring students to the opportunities would be beneficial

Takes us away from just the honor students being selected; this brings tools to the large majority of students

Applies to Goal #2 of the academic plan

Applies to Benefits #1 – we are a research institution and should be providing unique opportunities

It is in the thousands (# of students this will impact)

Goal of undergraduate involvement in research; it is essential for some professions; hoping we have ways of tracking; number of students, their experiences, how many students go to graduate school

We funnel resources to struggling students; we also want to funnel funding to motivated students

Real potential is to support students who do not fall into departmental outlines
d. **Veterinarian**
   - Meets Theme #2 Academic Plan; build research and bring us to the next level
   - Need this with the kind of research at URI
   - Need to ensure accreditation for the animal facility
   - Theme #5 – new vivarium; issues of compliance
   - Also a part of Goal #1 – teaching
   - Supports the state of RI, enhance the University
e. **Psychologist**
   - Quality of student experience
   - Theme #1, Goal #1; student success
   - Theme #4 – embracing diversity; new mental health challenges for students; impacts faculty; training; preparedness
   - Safety of campus
f. **Assistant Director, Capital Planning & Design**
   - Fits Goal #1 – enhancing student success with construction
   - Fits Goal #2 – need space to do it in; this would get it faster, etc.; this person would ensure space is appropriate
   - Fits Goal #5 – streamlining
   - Vice Chair – it is the end of a reorganization
   - Fits Goal #6 – infrastructure
g. **Two Athletic Trainers and One Strength and Conditioning Coach**
   - Benefits #1 – enhancing student success; need to provide them treatment and development;
   - Enhances athlete performance and positive visibility for the institution; recruitment
   - Athletics using NCAA funding from the $641K recently received
   - Example that will not touch many students
   - Benefits #6 – experience
   - Benefits #3 and #4 financial impact and promotes a positive reputation for URI
As team wins we received funding back from the NCAA – operating funding that follows success

4. Discussion
   - Looking for consistency and priorities; how to differentiate; two top; next two;
   - VOTE: Prefer top two and next three highest vote and no discussion; all voted yes; no abstentions;
   - What, in addition, to build into the memo? Could include in the letter the travel coordinator; SBPC will recommend to the President; Final recommendations to the President completed

5. Critique of Process
   - Could be clearer that presenter would present overview and reviewers do more of a constructive critique
   - Three areas: Strengths, limitations and questions
   - The process took too long
   - Vice Presidents’ focus on the strengths; should review team focus on academic plan and benefits?
   - Focus only on the questions and challenges?
   - Should every team get the same set of questions? Not narrow questions
   - After proposal was made, felt it should be differently configured- what should the process be?
   - Originator of the request should make the change
   - Positions we are being asked to fund after the fact; should we as a Council be asked to fund positions? We end up voting on the mechanism
   - If the positions are not funded via new funds; the division must reallocate within their division
   - Became ironic because SBPC process does not happen in isolation; goal was in the interest of greater transparency
   - Chair: There is flexibility for the Vice Presidents to really reallocate
   - If division asks for new funds to fill a position, still must come to the Council
   - Vice Chair: This is advisory to the President and his interest in greater transparency
   - Council was formed by the President to address new funding requests
   - When there is a frequency distribution, how do we make a decision?
   - Should we be saying those items that had 50% or more make it to the next step?
   - Found redundancy in the process; takes a long time; tedious, complicated and long; not regulated enough; Need to have a good thoughtful process
   - How can we streamline without losing the good part? The outcomes are good
   - Incredible effort and valuable to the University
   - Recap of process used in the past; subcommittee to review and if appropriate bring recommendations to Council

Meeting adjourned at 3:40pm
Next Meeting: TBD
Minutes by Linda Barrett and Lisa Fiorio Budget & Financial Planning Office