University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
Tuesday, June 20, 1:00pm-4:00pm
Ballentine Hall, Thomson Boardroom

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Abigail Rider, Samuel Adams, Linda Barrett, David Bergeron, Thorr Bjorn, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Kathy Collins, Barbara Costello, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Ellen Reynolds, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Kim Stack, W. Michael Sullivan, Naomi Thompson, Barbara Wolfe

Members Absent: Ryan Buck, Kathryn Jervis, John Kirby, Lindsay McLennan, Adam Quinlan

Guests: Richard Kubica, Mark Conley

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 will be shared from member returns
   - In addition to providing data,

2. Distribution of June 13, 2017 and June 14, 2017 Minutes (copies attached)

3. Identification of top proposals; Final recommendations to President completed

   IT
   - Clear line between projects
   - Is the amount sufficient for IT?
   - Phase I will get us thru the first part of the IT implementation
   - Phase II will get University on board
   - Phase III will get us portal services
   - CIO must impress importance to university; not taking away from area; protection
   - Takes two-three years to implement
   - Really a study of each directory; takes time
   - One school uses year end funds; has done so for four to five years
   - Really fundamental work and next CIO should know how to implement the IT projects
   - Could recommend it over multiple years
   - Suggest we add this to the recommendation to the President
   - Large piece of this is one-time-only; in terms of the base budget is $250K
   - Additional component is maintenance of the software
   - Total of ~$260K continuing
   - Phase III, all one time; could be purchased as a cloud service
   - Could do an RFP subject to budget, so can begin process prior to FY2019
• Could go forward with this project as a top choice and do we want to recommend to President to take it through phase III
• Do we include a time frame in the recommendations?
• One time only requests may be able to tap into fund balance and not necessarily be in the budget request
• Rich was asked to provide a matrix by year with ongoing and one-time-only requests displayed
• This will be the highest priority recommended to the President
• Council voted unanimously

Graduate Assistantships
• Question on whether all should be included based on funding
• Recommendations are based on strategic value
• Have two huge multi-year projects; two little projects
• Usually highest recommended goes to President
• See this item as also essential to the University as it correlates with our mission
• Have two clear high priorities; put forward to President
• Lot more moving parts to this proposal
• Touches on many of the academic plan themes
• Will impact faculty recruitment
• Commitment made for new reallocation process; proposal and recommendation to President will include this condition
• Our current GA plan is lacking relative to diversity
• Must give weight to departments who develop plans to recruit diverse GA’s
• Need alignment to # years of being a TA and the proposal
• Benefits new faculty
• Two highest priorities should have been done years ago
• Still won’t be where we need to be today
• Move that we rank this high and recommend to President with the condition stated previously
• Council voted unanimously

Grant Writer
• Limited challenges due to small budget in Fund 100
• The way Research is structured, they have a unique challenge since there are no funds to reallocate; believes Research is pinched in that regard
• Overhead funds are available for reallocation
• No ability to reallocate funds per VP
• Peer data presented a few years ago indicated URI has
• Having a grant writer or consultant vs where the funds would come from
• Seems to be beneficial
• There are no funds available in SPA; if not from here, won’t happen
• Where are areas with biggest return on investment that this position/consultant could impact
If motivation to bring forward, is there some soft money approach for 1-2 years and if see positive impact; consulting contract may be a better approach

- How do we best support our new colleagues?
- Looking at the numbers; grant writer and video; only got 1 vote ranking above average and significant difference; in past with significant deltas, we chose that as a breaking point; nothing to do with the amount of the proposal
- Eight voted as lowest; this council members indicating a message
- Less than half the weighted points;
- Concern that there was a year when
- Anything that we put forward, recognize that the order can be reversed if we recommend
- Only send forward those with highest priority if want to send a clear message
- President has charged council to only send him strategic proposals
- Have discussed, voted and need to be true to our mission
- Improve our interactions with DOD – former endowed chair at Naval War College; funds contributed from various areas; being discontinued
- We are maintaining TIG which is separate from this
- Propose top two total points proposals for recommendation to the President
- Council unanimously approved

Summary of Recommendations to President
- Complete thru 3-year implementation
- Potential for savings in the future
- Labor costs in areas that may be handled centrally
- Describe potential long term savings
- This IT priority item emerged from IT planning and the IT Governance Council
- Graduate Teaching Assistantship will include condition mentioned above
- Tied to diversity
- Desired to accelerate
- Also in response to federal situation
- Mission critical
- Probably operate on a three-year time frame
- Reference the well vetted process for the new GA reallocation process
- Council members asked to hold off on the recommendations until the President receives the official recommendation from the Council

Critique
- Feedback on new twist in process
- VP’s presented all and questions; then evaluation committee; then VP and Team;
- Little bit of duplication
- Budget slide was a good addition
- Strong Team reviews
- Later and firm deadline was good
Could there be a more substantive role for the Council to play into the “global” item? Could dictate agendas for the fall

Pre-filtering the “global” proposals could be a mistake
What is best way to identify an institution wide proposal
How should the global proposal come to/from the Council?
How are some of past proposals doing? What impact have they had? Ranking of institution?
This holds the division heads accountable
Psychologist and Assistant Director Veterans Affairs; those positions moved forward; not always funding; President and senior team approved one-time-only and then base funds the following year were committed
Impact both qualitative and quantitative on all proposals
Could produce a regular report – here is impact of work of Council
Need to see where all the NCAA funds are going before I could comment on the video coordinators
Opportunities to make proposals better; some come back a year or two later
Discussion was thoughtful and very rich this year
Tough questions were asked, and were candid and useful
Council members wear a URI hat; look at all from University perspective
Chair thanked all for their efforts and thoughtfulness
This process has URI focusing on resources and institutional value

Meeting Adjourned at 3:37pm

Next Meeting TBD

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