UCF Faculty Senate  
Budget and Administrative Procedures Committee

MEETING MINUTES – October 5, 2016, Room CSB 221

ATTENDEES: Linan An, Pradeep Bhardwaj (chair), Tina Buck, Romain Gaume, Florencio Hernandez, Anthony Kong, Stephen M. Kuebler, Laszlo Marosi, Kimi Sugaya, Anna Valdez, Xin Yan.

REMOTE ATTENDEES: Melissa Dodd, Keri Watson, Nan Hua, Jacqueline LaManna

EX OFFICIO: Tracy Clark (Finance & Accounting)

GUESTS: Christina Tant (Finance and Accounting)

AGENDA  
1. Call to order  
2. Roll call  
3. Approval of minutes of March 16, 2016  
4. Announcement and Recognition of Guests  
5. New College Budget Model presentation  
6. Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER  
Meeting called to order at 3:05 pm.

TOPICS DISCUSSED  
Minutes of previous meeting  
Before we heard a motion for approval of the minutes of March 16, 2016 minutes it was brought up that many members were new to the committee and hence were not present at that meeting. This was a common occurrence each year.

There was a motion to approve the minutes, as submitted by the previous committee, which was seconded and approved by majority vote.

New College Budget Model  
Tracy Clark and Christina Trent presented the new, College Budget Model. The Pegasus model that used a formula based on credit hours has been out of existence for close to seven years. About a year ago Provost set up a committee to develop a new budget model that could be applied to Colleges.

The 2016-17 operating budget approved by the Board Of Trustees is $1,6038 M and if we take out financial aid we have close to $1,100 M. The E&G budget for College of Medicine (COM) is $41.7 M and that for the rest of UCF is $602.7 M. It is not permitted to move funding between these two as these are state appropriations. There are three broad sources of E&G funds – State Performance funds, Emerging pre-eminence, and Tuition growth.
The committee, when designing the college budget model, started with a College’s last year budget and then made a positive or negative adjustment to it based on the metrics. The budget model is frozen for a year so that the Deans can brainstorm about it with their respective colleges. For each College, the Budget Model committee calculated for last five years what the budget would have been for that college if the New Model was used. We were informed that there was not a very large difference that would adversely affect the success of any college.

The New Model is a function of Workload funding, Incentive funding, and Strategic funding. The workload funding is based on Student Credit Hours (SCH), $95 per Undergraduate SCH (70% of instate tuition) and $288 (100% of instate tuition) for Graduate SCH. This funding would be phased in over two years with 50% being given on July 1, 2016 and remaining 50% on July 1, 2017. There were questions about how this allocation would be done for interdisciplinary courses.

The Incentive or Performance funding will be allocated in three areas. First is Degree Efficiency = (Number of degrees awarded)/(# of majors with 60 credit hours or more). This would be allocated to top 5 colleges. The second is Endowed Faculty Support and is $40,000 per $1 M of new endowed funds. The third is Research Growth which is measured by increase in research awards (minimum $350,000) and is allocated to top 5 based on share of Top 5’s total growth. It was mentioned by the presenters that the metric for “quality” is still evolving. It should depend on student experience, faculty quality, student employment, and percentage of students making more than $25,000 on graduation. The available data for the last metric is from 2012-13.

There were questions about the fairness of this allocation to a College that has historically not raised large sums of money and is not a part of NIH or NSF grants process. For example, Colleges that are not a part of STEM may not be raising a lot of money. As such they may never reach the minimum $350,000 cut off. There were concerns raised that such a measure could lead to two sets of Colleges, one more research focused, and the other more teaching focused. It was suggested that a more equitable metric would be one that would use a weighted average of percentage growth in research awards and absolute growth in research awards.

A Mock Example was presented which helped in understanding the New College Budget Model. There were questions about what the weights were on each incentive funding metric. The committee was also informed that the purpose of the model is to allocate resources to enhance quality and to assist each Dean in achieving the College’s strategic goals.

The presenters graciously agreed to answer, in subsequent meetings, any questions that the committee members may have about this new model.

ADJOURNED: 4:15 pm.

Submitted by Pradeep Bhardwaj (October 9, 2016)