Minutes
University of Rhode Island
Strategic Budget and Planning Council
Tuesday, November 14, 2017, 2:30-4:00 pm
Ballentine Hall, Thomson Boardroom

Members in Attendance:
Don DeHayes (Chair), Abigail Rider (Vice Chair), Linda Barrett, David Bergeron, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Mark Conley, Jeffrey Konin, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Adam Quinlan, Ellen Reynolds, Kim Stack, Barbara Wolfe (VPRED member is Don DeHayes)

Members Absent:  Samuel Adams, Thorr Bjorn, Ryan Buck, Kathy Collins, Kathryn Jervis, John Kirby, Naomi Thompson, Oleg Kazakov

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 (5 minutes)
   - Budget adjustments to submission for FY2019; original request was for an annual increase of $8.3 million in state appropriation; had a $62/year mandatory fee increase, of which $44 was for the technology fee, $6 for Memorial Union, and $12 for Health Services; mandated to eliminate the needed annual increase (political mandate); inconsistent with the Governance standards of NEASC; needed annual increase of $8.3M in state appropriation has been changed and a $4.4M annual increase is reflected, the elimination of the increase in the technology fee results in $700K less revenue.
   - Early in FY2018, we may have to look at budget reductions; have never cut back on strategic initiatives in the past; as they may be the only strategic items and this is not the place to cut; it could be counterproductive
   - Will know more about our enrollment in February
   - The Chair attended the Associates of Public Leaders (APLU) meeting; the theme was disruption in higher education; people are starting to ask different questions; re-thinking of the traditional narrative; need to talk about and understand what we do through a different lens; (e.g. we may need to own some of the $1.5 billion in student debt); historically the federal government invested 40 trillion and 40% of students have actually acquired a degree; the same could be said for research funding; are there other ways to deliver what we value?
   - Would like to talk through performance metrics with the SBPC
   - Higher Education is ineffective in letting the general public know of what we do

2. Approval of minutes (attachment) (5 minutes)
   - October 17, 2017
3. Divisional, IT, and University-wide proposals - follow up (attachment) (15 minutes)
   - Should we continue with the “global” proposal?
   - Other possible “global” examples could be e.g. Institutional Research Office RIGL expansion
   - Another example may be more communications staff to communicate what we do locally and nationally; our communications and marketing focus on the Providence Journal; could be beneficial if we had exposure in the New York Times
   - Struggling with the question of what is difference of the division heads making that request?
   - Perhaps division heads should be working together prior to developing their proposals
   - **There is a concern that all of a sudden the Council would be getting proposals already approved by five members**
   - IT assessment and governance strategy provided us with last year’s IT proposal
   - Actually had several Human Resource proposals that were not supported by SBPC; which was not a strategic approach; the proposals recommended more staffing because they had problems
   - More strategic approaches could be implemented in the future
   - Need to expect that every year we will have something that emerges out of the IT Governance
   - What if we have grown and need more bodies; this forum does not appear to be the forum for that kind of budget request; how do you propose an increase in staff? What is the process? SBPC principle is reallocation at the divisional level; employees do retire, etc.
   - Have added positions where there isn’t new vision; e.g. 55 faculty initiative; athletics trainers; charter flights; Psychologist; case still has to be made

4. Updates on performance funding and metrics (attachment) (15 minutes)
   - RIGL to develop funding formula and performance funding which would add to the base
   - The three mandated categories are: 1. Graduation and persistence; 2. High-Demand/High-Wage (HDHW) certificates/degrees, and 3. Mission Specific
   - Team of faculty and Provost staff met over 18 months
   - Serious metrics that make sense was our decision rather than game the system
   - Total degree completions is on the governor and commissioner’s agenda
   - HDHW fields identified from RI Labor Market research 10 year data; broad definition $18.77/hr and >50 jobs; RI does not always have the numbers (e.g. elementary/secondary teachers)
   - Mission Specific: important and distinctive to our mission
   - First Time Full Time (FTFT) cohort completing 90 credits with 3 years; when we started 45% of freshmen had 90 credits by third year and now it is 74%
   - Experiential learning is an area of investment; students learn more and better
➢ Finish What You Started Program (FWYS): been focused on our students that had 70 or more credits; without the resources, not sure they can expand; 120,000 adults in RI with college credits; but, no degree; not just prior URI students

➢ Sponsored research expenditures: speaks only to funded research

➢ The area that was not here was a metric for economic development; had to abandon due to not having an accurate measure

➢ Came up with level 1 and level 2 for business contacts engagements with the University; potential of 3 contacts with the university; had to get a baseline and it was not solid enough for us to go forward, so this is not an existing metric

5. Accounting for the University ’s economic impact (attachment) (20 minutes)

➢ Reference to the comprehensive economic impact study done for FY2012; SBPC may want to recommend this to be completed every five years

➢ Committee on Public Private Partnerships discovered that our procedures and regulations are in need of work; as we move along, impact and assessment would be easier;

➢ Seems like Mission Specific should be land, sea, and urban grant; what do we do as a research institution? research and economics are metrics URI could focus on; whatever we come up with the first time may not be easy to modify; however, we must be able to measure the metrics

➢ Do not have an opportunity to talk about our full mission; economic impact study helps us do this

➢ May have an opportunity to add mission specific and for FWYS not be a metric on its own; but, included with graduation rates

➢ Graduation rates seem to be what everyone is focusing on; there is concern about the good management penalty

➢ Community service metric could be important to URI

➢ Need to continue to work on the metrics

➢ Need to craft a tight paragraph and attach it to our metrics; want to express our economic impact, community service and broader range of scholarly impact in the community

➢ There is a group looking at a funding formula; The Office of Postsecondary Commissioner is starting meetings again in January

➢ Could run it by this Council

➢ Biggest concern is it is all smoke and mirrors; e.g. once they decided our +$8.3 million needed to change to +$4.4 million and it will be called performance funding

➢ How much time to we want to spend on it?

6. University efficiency in resource utilization (attachment) (15 minutes)

➢ Will discuss at next meeting

7. Feedback on NEASC visit (10 minutes)
> Impressions from the Council: thorough comments from the NEASC Team; very struck by comments about ambiguity of the boundaries of the Council; this came up repeatedly; completing loop from policy and processes to end users and feedback
> Related to this: recent group of faculty and research office staff are meeting
> How do we utilize what the NEASC Team reports serve us in the best way?

Meeting Adjourned at 3:55 pm

Next Meeting:

December 19, 2017 from 9:30-11:00 am, Thomson Boardroom, Ballentine Hall

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