The University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
May 21, 2015
10:00 am – 11:30 am
Thomson Board Room, Ballentine Hall

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino (Vice Chair) via phone, Linda Barrett, Sharon Bell, Thorr Bjorn, Wendy Bucci, Lori Ciccomascolo, Steven D'Hondt, Rachel DiCioccio, John Kirby, Lindsey McLennan (incoming GSA President), Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Bahram Nassersharif, Ellen Reynolds, Devon Swanson(outgoing GSA President), Naomi Thompson, Kim Washor

Members Absent: Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Tom Dougan, Ken Kermes, Joseph Maynard, Gerry Sonnenfeld

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
a) Jim Hopkins is the new Interim Director of the URI Foundation.

b) Chair welcomed Kip McMahan as the new Director, Capital Planning and Design and Lisa Fiorio, Executive Assistant, Budget & Financial Planning Office.

c) Chair welcomed Lindsey McLennan, new President of Graduate Student Association

2) Approval of March 26, 2015 minutes and April 23, 2015 minutes
a) Minutes Approved.

3) Capital Improvement Plan (Discussion)
a) CIP materials distributed; Question was raised if we should look at these by year or all together.

b) Summary of what was sent to the council; Public Safety had lowest scores; none of the projects received over a four relative

c) Are there any projects that must be done to satisfy regulatory requirements?

d) Vice Chair: public safety building reflects moving to a new accreditation; ongoing functionality of research programs and NIH review;

e) Chair: Mentioned the outcome of last year. Also, the different methods and that it results in a different way of looking at it; Public Safety was supported, just not a new building; other space on campus was discussed.

f) Discussion of normalizing the data.

g) Chair: Some that get a low priority need to be removed from the final CIP submission; there is a middle category that could get re-visited;

h) When Capital Planning received the SBPC recommendations, Capital Planning revised their list before

i) Suggest not to put a date on it; should remove the projects; Could look at the top in both years together and the same with the lowest

j) Part of where projects landed low in scoring may be because of the quality of the proposal, e.g. the landscaping, etc. said give us $10M.

k) Top two Projects for FY18 is Edwards and Shepards; could take the top five Projects of FY17 with these and look at them together. Is this the kind of investment the institution should be making? Regardless of funding, need to look at what is strategically best for the institution.
m) Informal proposal: take the top two Projects for FY18 and top five Projects for FY17

n) Horn Lab Renovation – primary academic buildings at GSO; renovation estimate could change if too many problems should move to FY18. Earliest could start it is FY17 only for A & E

o) Can always amend request to state e.g. demolish and build instead of renovate

p) Could be ways to bring multiple sources to a project

q) Chair: Could identify four Projects for lowest priority:
   ➢ Public Safety Building
   ➢ Storm Water Management
   ➢ Repaving, Hardscape & Landscape
   ➢ Facilities Service Sector Upgrade

Projects that are high:
   ➢ Hope Commons Expansion
   ➢ Biological Resources Lab (Vivarium)
   ➢ NBC Hazmat Storage
   ➢ Utilities Infrastructure Phase 1

Projects that are High-Medium:
   ➢ Horn Lab Renovation (pending master plan and A & E)
   ➢ Athletics & Recreation Facilities – Advanced Planning
   ➢ Edwards Hall Renovation
   ➢ Shepards Building Improvement

Projects that are Medium-Low:
   ➢ Fraternity Circle Improvements
   ➢ Utilities Infrastructure Phase 2

r) Chair: All in consensus; Members: “yes”

i) Process Streamlining Discussion
   a) Reported on the two meetings of the subcommittee; identifying key stakeholders; will have a third meeting; plan to survey.
   b) In subcommittee, areas identified, could compare the two; chair spoke about institutional processes and distributed his contribution to streamlining ideas. Sometimes it takes three-four weeks to get the “automated” forms approved.
   c) Chair: Can’t rely on people to do something; need a mechanism; e.g. What is the purpose of signatures?
   d) Since electronic format has been implemented, I need to sign more now; lot of issues is lot of training; need commitment of signers, worried that moving the electronic systems to something is just like the paper system.
   e) Role clarity, accountability, resources,
   f) Chair: Strategic Plan led by JCAP;
   g) Key and critical element for streamlining to being a major part of the next Strategic Plan; this will be a topic for the senior leadership retreat;
   h) Chair: Will be hiring a large number of faculty; once in a lifetime opportunity to diversify the faculty; faculty and staff hiring process; if we will do 50-60 searches this next year; get one RF-I for approval for all the authorized positions? Need training for our staff; the right people with the right skill set in the right places. Focus on outcomes (e.g. you did not check the box).
   i) Chair: Move from process to focus on outcomes; concept of service is really important; there are offices that the only reason they exist is to serve the University; we need to celebrate that; offices have different roles and they are all important; need to fix this before going forward.
j) How should the subcommittee best use your document? Only have the document from Provost and no other divisions. Part of it is external; his office is still operating under old process; new Board of Education wants to give more authority to campuses, but they have not defined it. OPSEC – Chair: will think about this.
k) Discussion regarding the student affairs streamlining document.
l) When we actually implement changes, we may need outside assistance; but that is not the place to start; need to engage the community prior to a consultant. Staff in the offices need to identify steps that need to be taken. Need to engage our people first.
m) Key stakeholders – speak with them, e.g. researchers, chairs, looking for ideas on who to include in the stakeholders.

n) Vice Chair: agreed with the discussion; Vice Chair has a list by department of system improvements; there are many improvements that are in the details that we are not aware of; have shown some progress; people themselves doing the work know what can be improved.

o) This will enable or disable what we need to do.
p) Academic Plan is taking shape; drafty goals, strategies, actions; perhaps the subcommittee’s work that will be reviewed by Strategic Budget & Planning Council will be incorporated into the Strategic Plan.

q) Hoping to have a draft at end of summer; discussions across campus, modified,
r) Subcommittee could just identify areas vs. delving into it; a balance; strategy could be that campus is to hold focus groups; need higher level focus.
s) This item will need a top down commitment; leadership role as evident by Bahram Nassersharif changing some Faculty Senate processes as president of the Faculty Senate.
t) Is there a charge that could go to every leader?

Meeting Adjourned at 11:46 am

Next Meeting Wednesday, June 3, 9:00 am-12:30 pm

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