Minutes
University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
Tuesday, June 19, 2018, 1:00pm - 4:00pm
Ballentine Hall, Thomson Board Room

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

Members Absent: Naomi Thompson, Kathy Collins

Guests:

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
   - Results from Likert scale will be presented
   - Discussion and recommendations will follow
   - Should not be recommending everything to the President
   - Have included additional notes with the recommendation to the President
   - Critique of the process used this year; tweaks have improved the process

2. Approval of June 12, 2018 and June 13, 2018 Minutes (copies attached)
   - Not ready to approve; will approve when these minutes are approved

3. Identification of top proposals; Final recommendations to President completed
   - Discussion: What is strategic and what is defense? Must be part of the discussion. Critique the process, benefits, and value. For example, compliance may not be serving the mission, but, we have to do this. Should we flag what is tangible vs. intangible? Not inconsistent that there may be some of these that should be bundled together with a characteristic of defense. Compliance, Information Technology and Risk Management appear to be defense. Should the overall risk management item be reviewed for URI. Where does legal fit? Must be careful that we do not automatically assume that the defense proposals should rise to the top; even if benchmark shows the data; it is our job to determine if it should be done with new funds; this Council adopted a principle that reallocation should be looked at first; if we say Information Technology needs an average of $X each year; but, if Information Technology needs more, then the Council will follow the process. Single sign on and directory fell into the category of institutional needs and serves the entire University. Information Technology is resource constrained and investment is beneficial to all of our students. Could think about incorporating a risk assessment. Incorporate it into each project. At some point it is good to develop a zero based budget with all non-personnel. We do not take the potential for reallocation
seriously; we don’t like to do it at URI; many institutions do it; URI is a lean institution; won’t change with the existing revenue stream.

- Good benchmarking and an objective study would be beneficial
- Believe we have a clear split with a high percentage of members voting for the top three point projects
- Would consider putting more proposals forward; have a number of smaller items; can we reallocate staff? More important question is if it is a one time only or continuing cost; President told us that we should focus on priorities and not the amount of dollars;
- Motion: Automatically accept the top three proposals as our recommendation; reject the bottom two proposals; and spend the rest of the meeting discussing the middle four proposals
- Council may be penalizing efficiency of the process because we are getting less and less proposals and we are only going to submit a portion of them
- Middle proposals could be presented next year; or maybe the competition will be less; we could say the top three proposals are the ones the institution needs to move on; we think they are valuable and the four are valuable and we could suggest that President Dooley fund for the next year?
- Present a hybrid model by themes and say within defense our highest priority is Information Technology; but, recognize others like Risk Management and Compliance and within Institutional Research; then President Dooley decides
- If the Council is not recommending the top priorities it impacts the integrity of the process
- We should look at and propose what is strategically necessary for the university. What does the Council think about the next four proposals?
- Potential impacts of the last proposal that is only $35,000. Can we reallocate $35,000 from the $40 million Administration and Finance divisional budget (.09% of the division budget)?
- Council should consider value; our role should not be to include; but, to rank all proposals
- The last proposal that would be in the bottom group is custodial and maintenance support; not sure new funding is the best source to support this item
- As our physical plant grows must add more assets
- Struggle with when we “reject” items, it means others have a higher importance or we feel the benchmarks do not support it and that it can be done via reallocation
- Heavy on risk; strategic; clear divide between risk and strategy; then will always be equalizing strategic and risk – takes the balance away; could compromise the balance between strategic and risk; if benchmarking is not good then Council does not know if the proposal is good
- No quorum is met except for the other three proposals
- Question called and seconded and all voted “yes”
- Accept the first three proposals; reject the bottom two proposals and continue discussion of middle four, all voted “yes”
- Discussion of the four “middle” proposals
- Institutional Research Proposal would add staff to institutional research
- Purchasing relates to the $1 million delegation; potential negative impact; impacts our ability to retain faculty
- Risk Management is for a Coordinator; our peers have three to four Risk Management staff and we have one while our institution has grown; manage compliance with insurance policies; claims; environmental and emergency management; global initiatives; concern is it seems like some of these risks issue funds are better spent on experts; how can one person specialize in all of these kinds of risks? This is just the day to day need; how does global fit in? enhanced risk; not suggesting our staff become experts; identify who the company is who can provide a country risk assessment; state department does this as well as our insurance companies; on global side since International Office is in the middle of it, should a position be coordinating with that office or a position be there; division rated this forth of four priorities
- Now we view from a university-wide standpoint; let’s assess what we are doing in Purchasing and realign resources; if we don’t fund this position then what are you going to change in Purchasing; handing over 200 more purchase orders per year;
- In the case of Risk Management, it is a work volume related request while it is a contract to Business Services reorganization; two weeks per person per contract
- Compliance Office – increased reporting
- Not questioning resources; do we confuse adding more staff with hiring and retaining the right staff?
- Assistant Director, Compliance position is needed as we could fail our students without it
- There is a clear divide after the top three proposals
- The University’s reputation came up and this could be an area that we invest in
- Not hearing strategy or examination of themes
- Institutional Research is related to our ability to do data analytics; on-line course evaluation instrument is half time position
- Many federal and philanthropic grants take into consideration the characteristics of the institution
- Extensive amount of reports that must be produced by IR office; in addition there are ongoing requests for information
- Data quality is a key output of Institutional Research Offices;
- Motion already voted and accepted top three proposals and to remove the bottom two proposals
- Motion to move Institutional Research and Purchasing to the top priority
- Move next two items (Risk Management and Assistant Director, Compliance) to second level recommendations
- Vote: Motion approved with one opposed and one abstention
- Any other subjective or narrative words we want to add?
- Council struggled with how to balance proposals risk vs. strategy
- For some Council members the recommendations seemed to fall into two themes and may be considered as groups
- Proposals get better and tighter each year
- Describe proposals in recommendation to the President
- A portion of Information Technology proposal was for FY2021 and Research and Economic Development proposal also had a portion related to FY2021
4. Review of processes during last year

- Perhaps Council could entertain next year – lot of proposals cut across departments and divisions; within strategic budgeting and planning, SBPC may want to make recommendations; e.g. Risk Management and Institutional Research
- What is the cost of not funding this item? Implications of not funding this?
- Benchmarking data is not always included; different proposals referred to different schools
- At least a minimum of specific schools; use same schools for consistent data
- Team needs access to the data sheet; ask Vice President’s to include a scanned copy of the pertinent data set
- Peer set for Enrollment, for Performance Funding
- Likert scales display the division and each division’s rankings
- Limit each division to one proposal
- Every proposal should have a review team
- Could apply an extra five minutes for each additional proposal
- Teams should be neutral; not pros or cons; need to be unbiased
- Reallocation question is not usually addressed; how can we obtain more information on this because not effectively addressed
- Charge includes all spending; how is the division using its resources; cross division efficiencies
- Second slide about reallocation could be added
- Could this Council spend time in the fall around reallocation?
- Percentage of division budget is shown on the budget slide
- Council has time in the fall to discuss reallocation; if divisions could pre-vet their proposals
- Three-four review teams for three-four proposals
- Teams could score the proposal; strengths and weaknesses
- Need a methodology to review reallocation
- Could ask what is the division going to eliminate?
- Can indicate to Human Resources certain kinds of positions no longer needed; could be part of the discussion
- Alternative model for the Team's job; perhaps the Team's job could be in critiquing the proposals; allegiance to the project; look for shortcomings and get the answers
- Written charge to the Team
- Our Team had a lot of holes and met with Abbi and they responded and it helped them prepare a better proposal
- Team meeting with division heads made their presentation stronger; richer discussion afterwards
- Good system interviewing the division heads; rest of the committee does not hear about the questions the Team had for the division head; perhaps need written responses to their questions
- Could develop an evaluation tool; send out in advance and spend time on other questions
- Might be useful for a few members to capture this in writing; bring revisions back to a September meeting
- Members: Faye, Trish, Kim
- Revisit process and broader discussion of reallocation and how do we encourage cross unit/divisional investment
5. Next Steps
   - Draft recommendation to the President will be distributed to the Council and then finalized and sent to the President

Meeting Adjourned at 3:40pm
Minutes Submitted by: Lisa Fiorio and Linda Barrett, Budget & Financial Planning