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Established in 1853
Land Grant Institution
AAU Member (Public) Since 1985
16 Academic Colleges (including Medical School)
2015 Enrollment 52,357
- Undergraduates – 34,002
- Graduates – 12,117
- Professional – 4,156
- Non Degree Seeking - 2082
- 150 Research Centers and Institutes
- 2,000-acre campus
- 900+ buildings (170 with classrooms and labs)
- 2014-15 Total Expenditures $5B
UF Enterprise Revenue Sources FY15

- Hospital and Component Unit Revenues, $2,673,530, 53%
- Federal, State and Local Grants and Contracts, $431,518, 9%
- State Appropriation (Noncapital), $654,120, 13%
- Student Tuition and Fees (Gross), $522,444, 10%
- Other Grants, Contracts, Gifts and Transfers from Component Units, $207,574, 4%
- Investment Income (Net), $126,601, 3%
- Auxiliary Sales and Other Revenues, $308,163, 6%
- Federal and State Student Financial Aid, $115,755, 2%

Total $5.04 Billion

Dollar amounts expressed in thousands
UF Enterprise Expenses FY15

Employee Compensation and Benefits, $2,706,048, 54%

Service and Supplies, $1,634,818, 32.4%

Scholarship Allowance and Scholarships, Fellowships and Waivers, $230,067, 5%

Space - Depreciation, $237,594, 5%

Space - Debt Service, $35,648, 1%

Space - Utilities and Communication, $67,727, 1%

Unexpended Future Obligations, $128,000, 2%

Total $5.04 Billion

Dollar amounts expressed in thousands
UF Chooses RCM

- RCM is a financial management philosophy
- Focuses on operational decentralization
- Designed to support achievement of primary academic priorities
- Budget follows priorities
- Aligns authority with responsibility
- Creates full cost view of academic operations
Forces for Change

- Five Years In
- Provost Questions
- New CFO
- Dean’s Listening Tour
Our Starting Point
Significant Decisions Made

- Weights by college and level instead of subvention methodology.
- 1% Rule
- 70%/30% allocation of appropriation and tuition revenue.
- Facilities and HSC Administration cost added to colleges pre-RCM base appropriation; weights adjusted.
- Student Services and Library processed as pass-through services.
- Grant expenditures would not be assessed overhead charges for IT, General Administration, HSC Administration, and Facilities.
- Spendable endowment funds transferred into Fund 171 exempt from overhead assessment.
Significant Decisions Made

- IFAS Research/Extension and HSC Clinical Practice expenditures would have a reduced overhead assessment rate.
- Overhead charged on expenditures instead of Employee/Student Headcount (except library and student services).
- 18 month (annualized) look back of both student credit hours and expenditures.
- Internal sales revenue would off-set direct expenditures, eliminate double taxation.
- Single payments $100,000 and subcontracts $25,000 or greater would be exempt from overhead assessment.
- State Funded Centers funded “Off the Top” of State Appropriations.
Revenue Allocation

Appropriation
Less:
• State Funded Centers/Student Services/Library Services
• IFAS Extension and Research
• Legislative Earmarks
• Preeminence
• Provost Commitments
• Salary increases and benefit changes
  = Allocable Appropriation

Projected Tuition
Less:
• Strategic Fund Allocation
• UG Differential Tuition

= Allocable Tuition

Weighted SCH
• 70% Teaching
• 30% Enrollment

Total RCM Appropriation and Tuition

Minus:
• Waivers
• Uncollected

ABOVE THE LINE
Revenue Allocation

BELOW THE LINE

- Undergraduate Differential Tuition
- Jump Start
- Dean’s Start Up Packages
- Faculty Enhancement
- Misc. Provost Allocation
- Salary Increases
- Fringe Benefit Adjustments
- Prior Year RCM Corrections
- Legislative Earmarks
- Strategic Funding
- 1% Subvention
- Preeminence

TOTAL STATE REVENUE
Revenue Allocation

Other College Revenue
- Entrepreneurial Activities
- Contracts and Grants
- Endowment Earnings and Gifts
- Other

TOTAL COLLEGE REVENUE
Eight Cost Pools

- Information Technology
- Bond Payment
- Facility
- General Administration
- HSC Administration
- Sponsored Project Administration
- Library
- Student Services
Expense Allocation

- Estimated Budget charged to all Responsibility Centers
- Overhead Tax Drivers
  - Colleges –18 month annualized direct expenditures – IT, Gen. Admin., HSC Admin, SPA
  - Weighted square feet – **Facility**
  - Weighted student, faculty, research staff headcount - **Library**
  - Weighted student headcount – **Student Services**
  - Three **Bond Payment**
Budget Oversight

- Each year, Support Centers will explain their value and services to a Budget Review Council to justify their budget requests.
- Council will be composed of representatives from colleges, VP areas, and faculty senate.
  - 12-15, with rotating membership.
- Every five to six years, each Support Center will go through a “zero-based” budget review.
Strategic Fund

- Designed to support new or key initiatives
  - Central fund funded by tuition increases as well as Pepsi fund, logo fund, etc.
  - Used at the discretion of the President and Senior Vice Presidents
## Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Grad I</th>
<th>Grad II</th>
<th>Grad III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Natural Resources</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>8.197</td>
<td>11.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>6.356</td>
<td>20.123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.743</td>
<td>4.425</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCE</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>10.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>7.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>4.666</td>
<td>15.446</td>
<td>15.463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>6.663</td>
<td>10.371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism &amp; Communications</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>7.486</td>
<td>12.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>8.107</td>
<td>23.919</td>
<td>39.594</td>
<td>42.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.002</td>
<td>20.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>9.024</td>
<td>10.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>6.507</td>
<td>3.718</td>
<td>11.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>6.975</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>12.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health &amp; Health Professions</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>5.073</td>
<td>3.277</td>
<td>9.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>7.503</td>
<td>4.288</td>
<td>13.458</td>
<td>25.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If it Was Working Ideally...

What would it look like?
Provost Questions

- How do we best align RCM with what we want to incentivize?
- The university has two special structures: These special structures have local business models that often do not align with RCM.
- Another special situation presents in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. It may present an attractive target for “poaching” students and credit hours. How to ensure appropriate funding for the college in the RCM model?
- Related to that, how do we minimize colleges battling for undergraduates?
- Does the phrase “each tub on its own bottom” really make sense in a large public institution like UF, where there is substantial cross-subsidization? If the goal of RCM is really to have each tub on its own bottom, what do you do with the colleges that are scraping bottom?
- We are aware that there are multiple versions of RCM. Do you have opinions about which ones work best?
We may be the only public institution to install a full weighted cost of delivery model. Do you have opinions about the pros and cons of the model?

Comments on the best strategic fund model?

Moving forward, what are the best models for the future?

We have a centralized admissions process. Some deans have spoken in favor of a decentralized admissions process, which would change radically the culture and processes of the institution.

How do you put planning and predictability into the model?

Can RCM work with all the constraints under which the colleges currently operate? Constraints are imposed by the state statutes and regulations and local policies.
Deans’ Common Concerns with Current Model

- Weights
- Classification of space
- Calculation too complicated
- Budget is a surprise each year
- Can’t predict outcomes of decisions
- Degree production not incentivized
- Retention not incentivized
- Interdisciplinary programs not incentivized
- Research not incentivized (linear tax)
- IDC vs SPA Tax
- Tax Driver/Assessment Metrics

- Start up issues for entrepreneurial activities
- Capped enrollment
- Tuition allocation
- Waivers
- Self funded courses lead to faculty overload
- Tax creep
- Subvention
- Strategic Fund
Onward We Go
RCM Committee Role and Responsibility

The Steering Committee:

- Defines the scope of the review process, project goals and guiding principles.
- Ensures that the resulting project plan, implementation efforts, and resources required align with the University’s strategic goals and initiatives.
- Provides leadership and guidance for any decisions, issues, and risks that may be escalated by the RCM Task Force.
Desired Outcomes and Guiding Principles

- Incentivize Specific Activities
- Simplify the Model
- Model should be:
  - Predictable
  - Ensures alignment with University strategic goals
  - Provides Clarity
- Creation of Dedicated Provost Strategic Fund
Scope of Review

- Identify what is working
- Review weights and their use
- Review special deals
- Review methodology for Base Budget and Subvention
- Review methods for funding Provost Strategic Fund
- Review how Tuition is allocated
- Review performance metrics used by State
- Review dependence on State timelines
- Review Support Unit budgeting process
- Provide ranked options/recommendations for changes to current model
RCM Task Force Role and Responsibility

The Task Force:

- Will be responsible for performing a review of the current RCM Budget Model and related business processes.
- Will identify the specific work streams to be carried out based on guidance provided by the Steering Committee.
- Will create working groups as needed and make all work assignments.
- Will provide guidance and support for participation from within the university to enable appropriate decision making.
- Will escalate issues to the Steering Committee when appropriate.
- Will provide monthly status reports to the Steering Committee.
Task Force Members

Director of Finance
Office of the Dean
College of Journalism & Communications

Associate Vice President and Director
Housing & Residence Education
Division of Student Affairs

Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Professor, Department of Chemistry

Senior Associate Dean & Director
Hough Graduate Programs
George W. and Lisa O. Etheridge, Jr. Professor
Warrington College of Business

Director, Office of Budget and Finance
IFAS

Assistant Dean
Finance & Human Resources
College of Public Health and Health Professions (PHHP)

Business Manager
College of Health and Human Performance (HHP)

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Professor of Education
College of Education

Associate Vice President, Finance and Planning
Office of the Sr. Vice President for Health Affairs

Dean, College of Medicine

Dean, College of the Arts

Vice President of Student Affairs
Division of Student Affairs

Associate Dean for Administrative and Fiscal Affairs
Levin College of Law
Administrative Memo

In an effort to ensure UF’s budgeting process meets the needs of the university, the Office of the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer is conducting a 5-year review of the university’s budget model.

A steering committee composed of the university deans and vice presidents has been established to provide leadership and guidance for this effort. A task force composed of key representatives from throughout campus will work at the direction of the steering committee to review the current budget model and related business processes. For a list of the steering committee and task force membership, please visit the CFO website at cfo.ufl.edu.

The scope of this review is to identify what is working with the current budget model as well as how it might be improved in the areas of revenue and expense allocation. The review process is expected to occur over the summer through early fall—with recommendations provided to the Sr. Vice Presidents by the end of the calendar year.

If you have questions or would like more information please contact Greg DuBois, Vice President for Finance and Planning, at gdubois@ufl.edu.
Process and Timeline

- Standing bi-weekly two hour long meetings
- Began in May with Steering Committee meetings
- Task force began work July 14
Research

- John Curry’s responses to Provost Questions
- Phone Consultation with Malcolm White/Andrew Law - Huron
- EAB Consulting Engagement
- White Paper Review – Ohio State University, University of Michigan, University of Illinois, Indiana University
John Curry’s Responses
Malcolm White/Andrew Law Conversation
University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

RCM Revisions (2005, 2007)

- Froze distribution of ug tuition for five years to make up for state budget cuts
- Abandoned full overhead cost allocation
- Majority of budget is still historically allocated, but began to shift some to metrics allocation

REVENUE ALLOCATIONS

State Subsidy
- Some portion allocated to units based on SCH and majors

Undergraduate Tuition
- Fixed allocation per SCH ($110 per lower division SCH, $170 per upper division)
- Shift some funds from historic support to metric based allocation (25% major, 75% SCH)
- non-residents weighted 1.5 residents, upper division weighted 1.5 lower division

Indirect Cost Recovery
- VCR gets 10% of all future growth of ICR

Cost Allocations
- Allocation of new overhead costs (but no return to full attribution of overheads)
- Some costs assigned based on use utilities, O&M, new facilities

Concerns with Model
- Declining state funding and small tuition increases meant no incremental revenue to fund increasing costs—forced reallocation from colleges through assessments
- concern about online—cheaper and easier to scale—capped at $100k in incremental revenue each year

Very much like UF model in their early years – too much funded off the top outside of the model.
Indiana University

Indiana University Bloomington


Highlights
- Simplified cost allocations
- Created additional central funds
- State funding not used to incentivize growth

REVENUE ALLOCATIONS

State Subsidy
- Each school receives fixed percentage of total state funding to improve transparency and accountability for changes in tuition and ICR
- 1.5% for chancellors fund

Undergraduate Tuition
- 100% instruction (previous year)
- No adjustment for residency status

Indirect Cost Recovery
- 95% to schools
- 5% to Vice President for Research

Cost Allocations
- Fixed rates per sf, SCH, tenure-line faculty, other employees

Concerns with Model
- Different algorithms used to allocate increases in state funding vs decreases in state funding—puts burden on larger units
- Centrally imposed limits on faculty salary increases
- Tensions between central marketing and school marketing
- Recruitment and professional development of school fiscal officers
- Need review of admin services (there are 10 different career services offices)

Support Units keep 40% of Carryforward.

Constraint model for Support Unit budgets.
Guiding Tenant –
General Fund
revenues all flow to
the central
administration and
it is the Provost’s
task to determine
budget allocations –
model is simply an
aid in developing
the General Fund
Budgets.
University of Minnesota

RCM Revisions (2000, 2005)

**Highlights**
- Increased central strategic fund

**REVENUE ALLOCATIONS**

**State Subsidy**
- Allocated to academic strategic investments

**Undergraduate Tuition**
- Internal revenue sharing program for academic priorities takes some off the top
- 75% instruction, 25% enrollment

**Indirect Cost Recovery**
- 100% to academic units

**Cost Allocations**
- 9 cost allocation pools (8 cost drivers)
- university fee to fund central student support services and other central investments

**Concerns with Model**
- Fostering and managing interdisciplinary activity requires constant vigilance
- Need more predictability
Ohio State University

- Modified RCM model plus strategic investment of central funds.
- College Budget – Present Budget Allocation +/- Net Marginal Revenue.
- Central tax funds Support Units.
- Compensation increases funded from college budgets.
- Model incentivizes colleges to teach more credit hours, increase research activity, and release unneeded space.
Education Advisory Board Summary

▪ EAB summary of reasons for peer changes: incentivize growth, improve budget transparency, control costs

▪ EAB lessons learned:
  • Don’t Blame RCM for Everything
  • Keep It Simple - improves predictability
  • Budget Models Alone Don’t Solve the Problem
  • Growth Is the Only Solution
Committee Take-Aways

- General fund revenues all flow to central administration
- Auxiliary unit’s budget lie outside of the general fund but are taxed
- Activity based units receive a significant portion of their revenue as a function of what they do (Tuition & IDC)
- State subsidy used to help pay for General Fund Supplement and General Operating Budget
- Central Administrative units – Provost sets budget
- Activity based units pay a set of taxes
- Taxes based on Revenues
Things Considered Along the Way
# Tuition (Calendar Year of 2015)

70% By Teaching/30% By Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Under Grad (B)</th>
<th>Grad 1 (C)</th>
<th>Grad 2 (D)</th>
<th>Prof (E)</th>
<th>Total (F=B+C+D+E)</th>
<th>Under Grad (G)</th>
<th>Grad 1 (H)</th>
<th>Grad 2 (I)</th>
<th>Prof (J)</th>
<th>Out of State Fee Total (K=G+H+I+J)</th>
<th>Grand Total (L=F+K)</th>
<th>Net Tuition To Colleges (N-L-G)</th>
<th>General Fund Supplement (GFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Life Sciences</td>
<td>12,966,410</td>
<td>2,244,274</td>
<td>3,381,207</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,591,921</td>
<td>2,874,655</td>
<td>655,889</td>
<td>745,212</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,316,755</td>
<td>22,908,647</td>
<td>20,033,993</td>
<td>19,132,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>4,498,862</td>
<td>376,065</td>
<td>233,434</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,108,361</td>
<td>875,400</td>
<td>875,400</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
<td>927,505</td>
<td>6,036,866</td>
<td>5,160,436</td>
<td>12,970,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>11,408,324</td>
<td>9,558,702</td>
<td>142,111</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,109,137</td>
<td>4,004,494</td>
<td>4,658,709</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,716,655</td>
<td>29,825,792</td>
<td>25,825,308</td>
<td>6,768,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>485,331</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>12,115,986</td>
<td>12,694,863</td>
<td>162,959</td>
<td>151,319</td>
<td>109,589</td>
<td></td>
<td>314,277</td>
<td>12,919,141</td>
<td>12,191,141</td>
<td>14,373,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, Construction &amp; Planning</td>
<td>2,846,661</td>
<td>2,911,627</td>
<td>647,731</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,860,020</td>
<td>992,903</td>
<td>1,359,106</td>
<td>289,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,621,827</td>
<td>8,427,847</td>
<td>7,494,994</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCE</td>
<td>2,983,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,983,650</td>
<td>1,139,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,139,951</td>
<td>4,123,601</td>
<td>2,983,650</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,622,610</td>
<td>4,800,759</td>
<td>3,071,777</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,725,145</td>
<td>759,213</td>
<td>644,826</td>
<td>347,374</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,751,413</td>
<td>12,476,558</td>
<td>11,717,346</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>13,345,750</td>
<td>10,361,282</td>
<td>8,124,948</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,776,978</td>
<td>2,386,168</td>
<td>8,352,747</td>
<td>624,612</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,845,727</td>
<td>45,620,705</td>
<td>34,274,936</td>
<td>47,060,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td>5,756,970</td>
<td>1,476,317</td>
<td>585,995</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,818,682</td>
<td>1,641,571</td>
<td>550,857</td>
<td>93,147</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,245,574</td>
<td>10,064,256</td>
<td>7,822,682</td>
<td>4,920,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism &amp; Communications</td>
<td>5,915,417</td>
<td>601,804</td>
<td>160,062</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,477,284</td>
<td>1,905,513</td>
<td>377,890</td>
<td>54,941</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,338,344</td>
<td>8,815,628</td>
<td>6,491,104</td>
<td>325,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>34,825</td>
<td>209,652</td>
<td>22,422</td>
<td></td>
<td>316,699</td>
<td>25,862</td>
<td>20,016</td>
<td>6,764</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,642</td>
<td>389,342</td>
<td>343,479</td>
<td>2,402,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,824,674</td>
<td>17,838,776</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,665,367</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>383,495</td>
<td>886,758</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,270,465</td>
<td>20,935,832</td>
<td>20,935,832</td>
<td>7,786,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1,771,309</td>
<td>682,758</td>
<td>2,616,561</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,070,668</td>
<td>200,039</td>
<td>8,283</td>
<td>130,732</td>
<td></td>
<td>339,045</td>
<td>5,409,713</td>
<td>5,209,674</td>
<td>5,400,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health &amp; Health Professors</td>
<td>2,609,427</td>
<td>4,092,515</td>
<td>5,149,341</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,785,083</td>
<td>445,797</td>
<td>655,266</td>
<td>166,848</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,248,033</td>
<td>13,033,116</td>
<td>12,587,137</td>
<td>6,046,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHEM-OM Integrated Programs</td>
<td>110,085</td>
<td>208,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>318,520</td>
<td>101,944</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>105,362</td>
<td></td>
<td>423,846</td>
<td>53,828</td>
<td>332,739</td>
<td>366,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>39,257</td>
<td>195,747</td>
<td>91,872</td>
<td>8,748,559</td>
<td>9,075,235</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>89,195</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>82,433</td>
<td>9,157,668</td>
<td>9,153,920</td>
<td>20,457,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: 118,425,075

Total In-State Tuition: 44,160,544

Total Out-of-State Fee: 37,549,640

Total Expenses: 89,620,680

Total Income: 269,621,940

Total Costs: 29,160,803

Total Profits: 20,113,666

Total Revenue: 4,426,062

Total Expenditures: 187,690

Total Income: 53,888,220

Total Expenses: 323,510,160

Total Profits: 294,349,357

Total Revenue: 303,379,638

Total Expenditures: 8,347,919

Total Profits: 1,790,777
| IT and GA [T=N*10%+R*10%] | HSC Admin [U-N*2.15%+R*2.15%] | Facilities [V] | Total OH [W=T+U+V] | FY17 Revenue to Hold Harmless (Y=N+R-W) | FY17 State Revenue to FY17 Additional GFS | FY17 Recurring Legislative Specials (AB) | FY16 College Faculty and Staff Raises (AC) | FY17 UG Differential Tuition (AD) | FY17 Non-Recurring Legislative Specials (AF) | Preeminence (AG) | SubTotal (AH=AB+AC+AD+AF+AG) | Overhead on Additional Allocations in FY17 | IT/GA [AU-AH*10%] | HSC Admin [AK-AH*2.15%] | SubTotal [AL-AJ+AK] | FY17 Net State Revenue (AN=YA+AH+AL) |
| 10.00% | 2.15% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3,635,470) | (4,872,088) | (9,905,558) | 30,448,141 | 817,816 | - | 1,943,445 | 2,761,261 | (275,126) | (275,126) | 32,993,275 |
| (1,819,864) | (2,307,969) | (4,127,833) | 14,070,809 | 379,318 | 228,420 | 165,550 | 773,088 | (77,309) | (77,309) | 14,766,588 |
| (3,405,348) | (1,928,673) | (5,335,021) | 28,718,457 | 747,471 | - | - | 747,471 | (74,747) | (74,747) | 29,381,181 |
| (2,736,209) | (588,649) | (3,614,898) | 21,420,986 | 528,691 | - | 150,000 | 678,691 | (67,869) | (67,869) | 22,017,207 |
| (1,531,264) | (1,672,042) | (3,003,807) | 10,309,465 | 275,088 | - | - | 275,088 | (27,509) | (27,509) | 10,557,014 |
| (396,061) | - | (396,061) | 3,564,549 | 12,329 | - | - | 12,329 | (1,233) | (1,233) | 3,575,645 |
| (1,212,134) | (1,268,929) | (3,981,063) | 17,830,279 | 400,000 | 461,450 | - | 2,000,000 | 458,500 | 3,195,950 | (331,955) | (331,955) | 20,818,254 |
| (9,142,572) | (14,616,059) | (23,758,624) | 67,667,958 | 1,803,336 | - | 3,568,653 | 5,372,189 | (557,219) | (557,219) | 72,500,605 |
| (1,334,392) | (1,986,183) | (3,922,555) | 10,611,362 | 231,891 | - | 150,000 | 381,891 | (38,189) | (38,189) | 10,950,044 |
| (1,373,780) | (800,633) | (2,174,413) | 11,563,387 | 283,392 | - | 328,500 | 610,892 | (61,089) | (61,089) | 12,113,189 |
| (274,613) | (85,181) | (359,794) | 2,385,336 | 67,292 | - | 150,000 | 217,292 | (21,729) | (21,729) | 2,381,645 |
| (2,885,902) | (2,052,609) | (4,935,511) | 25,929,509 | 535,103 | - | 250,000 | 785,103 | (78,103) | (78,103) | 24,636,102 |
| (12,674,264) | (14,264,694) | (26,939,940) | 99,803,522 | 2,835,508 | 304,560 | 2,051,152 | 5,191,220 | (519,122) | (519,122) | 104,475,620 |
| (8,773,511) | (1,887,473) | (12,741,332) | (23,402,317) | 64,332,794 | 1,675,157 | - | 1,230,000 | 2,489,110 | 3,414,267 | (541,427) | (116,479) | (657,306) | 69,083,155 |
| (1,060,987) | (228,254) | (1,288,234) | (1,709,776) | 8,900,084 | 214,088 | - | 150,000 | 364,088 | (36,408) | (36,408) | 9,218,949 |
| (2,225,250) | (478,725) | (2,703,953) | (1,999,983) | 18,148,945 | 441,351 | - | 850,000 | 1,291,351 | (129,351) | (129,351) | 19,283,580 |
| (1,891,021) | (406,821) | (1,587,843) | (3,879,664) | 15,030,730 | 361,078 | - | 750,000 | 1,111,078 | (111,078) | (111,078) | 16,066,818 |
| (81,040) | (17,434) | (88,489) | (387,577) | 422,825 | 26,753 | - | 598,326 | 625,079 | (62,079) | (62,079) | 971,494 |
| (3,145,127) | (676,191) | (4,803,164) | (6,622,438) | 22,808,791 | 522,618 | - | 400,000 | 922,618 | (92,261) | (92,261) | 23,619,298 |
Indirect Cost Recovery and Sponsored Program Administration
SPA Subcommittee Role and Responsibility

- The SPA subcommittee is responsible for a focused review of the Sponsored Projects Administration portion of the budget model and providing recommendations for changes to the Task Force.
- Research enterprise is a significant factor at the University, and SPA is the only cost pool that had multiple components.
- Biweekly standing meetings - two hours
- Work began September 16
Subcommittee Members

Dean, College of Engineering
Associate Dean for Administration & Faculty Affairs, University Libraries
Sr. Assoc. Dean, Div. of Grad Studies & Res, College of Journalism
Associate Dean of Research, HHP
Director, Office of Budget and Finance, IFAS
Associate Dean for Research & Planning, PHHP
Associate Dean for Research & Grad Education, Pharmacy
Associate Dean for Research & Scholarship, College of Nursing
Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs, DCP
Associate Dean for Research, College of Dentistry
Sr. Associate Dean & Director Hough Graduate Programs, Business
Associate Dean for Faculty Development, College of Law
Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, Education
Assistant Dean for Research & Faculty Programs, College of the Arts
Desired Outcomes

- Minimize disincentives within expenditure-based model for accepting low IDC bearing grants and contracts
- Simpler and more predictable model for IDC distribution
- Minimize significant deviations to historical revenue streams during the transition to a new IDC model
- Distribute returned IDC in a way that supports research operations and infrastructure, factoring in research costs and other available resources within units
Significant Decisions Made

- Grant expenditures would not be assessed overhead charges for IT, Gen Admin, HSC Admin, and Facilities.
- Overhead charged on expenditures instead of Employee/Student Headcount or Revenue.
- 18 month (annualized) look back on expenditures.
- Training Grants earning less than 10% IDC will be exempt from overhead assessment.
- Subcontracts $25,000 or greater would be exempt from overhead assessment.
- Sub-pools would be used for IRB-1, IRB-2, IRB-3, IACUC, Animal Care Services and Biostatistics
Revenue Allocation

Distribution of F&A Assessed in Prior Fiscal Year

10% to Principal Investigators

7.5% to Departments

7.5% to Centers (optional)

75% - 82.5% to Colleges
Expense Allocation

- Estimated Budget for units charged to all Responsibility Centers
- Overhead Tax Drivers
  - **SPA** – 18 month annualized direct research expenditures
    - Includes usage-based Sub-Pools
  - **Bond Payment** – Medicine, IFAS, CLAS
- In most cases, colleges offset SPA/Bond Payments against IDC returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Project Administration (avg)</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Things Considered Along the Way

- Exemptions (training grants, tuition, pass-throughs)?
- How to address (incentivize) strategic awards (Keck, etc.) that may not carry significant F&A?
- How to incentivize interdisciplinary research?
- Model may involve both a formula-driven component and a fixed component
- Should the Research Enterprise be funded “off the top”, as fee-for-service, or some mixture of the two?
- If the Research Enterprise is funded “off the top” what accountability is there for the Vice President for Research?
The university has a research infrastructure that must be supported, currently that infrastructure is approx. $40M.

IDCs on low IDC grants/contracts, below a floor of 10%, would fully contribute to the SPA tax.

All IDC will be distributed to college Deans (or comparable administrative units) for subsequent internal distribution, net of SPA taxes.

PI’s, departments and centers will not receive an IDC distribution from any projects where the IDC rate is at or below a college’s average SPA rate.

The deans and VPs support the university’s research goals by making investments in our infrastructure. As such, internal transfers within the 2xx series of fund codes and used to purchase equipment and renovate space would not be subject to SPA tax.

A statement regarding returns to the PI should be a minimum of 10% of the IDC returns for all projects with full IDC returns.
Model Development

- Started by reviewing entire SPA budget and how funds were utilized
- Reviewed portfolio of projects by unit
  - Average F&A rate
  - Projects generating less IDC than tax
- Negative IDC Fund
- Reviewed historical percentages of IDC that units retained after taxes
Model Development

Taxing Revenues vs. Taxing Expenditures

- Single Year Impact
- “Exceptions” Implicit
- No disincentive for accepting low IDC grants
- Tax cannot exceed revenue
- Taxing initial revenue eliminates the need to tax IDC, residuals, strategic support
- Correlation between revenue and costs to institution?

- Lookback Impacts
- Explicit exceptions
- Disincentive for accepting low IDC grants
- Requires subsidies
- Previously taxed expenditures in all grant-related funds
- Tax based on usage of resources
Model Development

- Deduct research enterprise costs from gross IDC revenue
- Distribute net IDC proportional to gross earnings
- Similar model, with low IDC grants (below tax rate) excluded
Model Development

- Revenue tax on IDC
  - 3 Tiers
  - Higher average IDC rates resulted in lower tax rate tiers

- Similar model, with tax rate a function of a unit’s average IDC rate
  - Effectively a continuous sliding scale instead of distinct tiers
  - Higher average IDC rates resulted in lower tax rates
Model Development

- Hybrid Model
  - Central SPA costs taken “off-the-top”
  - Sub-Pool costs allocated based on usage
The New World
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17 Colleges

- General fund revenues (Tuition, State Appropriations) all flow to central administration – then distributed to Colleges
- Colleges receive a significant portion of their revenue as a function of what they do (Tuition & IDC)
- Distribute all (collected/net) tuition using 70/30 teaching/enrollment except for new undergraduate student out of state fee – Differentiate tuition from fee
- Tuition revenue determined using terms from CY 2015 (Spring, Summer, Fall 2015)
- Revenues from new undergraduate out of state students (Fall 2015 – 300 new students = approx. $3.6m) will establish the Provost Strategic Fund
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17 Colleges

- State appropriation used to help pay for General Fund Supplement

- Distribute General Fund Supplement to hold harmless for FY 2017 – same budget as FY 2016 – with additions for FY 16 raises, Preeminence changes, PO&M

- General Fund Supplement will be the same in future years unless significant or strategic changes occur

- OH assessed using fixed rates on revenues (GA/IT 10%; 2.15% HSC), Facilities no change – commitment is that support units costs will be managed and controlled to stay within this budgeted revenue stream – significant unfunded mandates may require special assessments
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17 Colleges

- Provost in consultation with Sr. VPs sets budgets for Support Units
- Library and Student Services funded by the Provost
- State funded Service Centers and other appropriated units funded by State appropriation
- Other distribution/assessment arrangements stay the same for the upcoming budget year (FY 17)
- Auxiliary unit’s budgets lie outside of the general fund but pay tax on expenditures
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17
Sponsored Program Assessment

- Revenue is shared based on a percentage of total accrued IDC to a given unit in the prior year.
- The percentage applied for the Sponsored Program Assessment is not the same for all units. Instead, there are four tiers:
  - Tier 1 (36.8%): High research intensity, high in-unit research infrastructure costs, little or no additional resources to support research infrastructure
  - Tier 2 (49%): High research intensity, high in-unit research infrastructure costs, some additional resources available to support research infrastructure
  - Tier 3 (53.5%): Units with research portfolios that have additional resources to support research infrastructure, lower in-unit research infrastructure costs, or have lower research intensity
  - Tier 4 (75%): Units with little or no research activity; 25% of the returned IDC is reserved in the event that a PI, dept, or center is eligible for returned IDC under UF policy.
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17
Sponsored Program Assessment

- The overall model was required to collect very near the same total amount of assessment as was collected in FY 16, effectively using FY 16 as a baseline.
- The individual percentages for each tier were optimized to yield manageable shifts in the assessment within the context of FY 16.
- No change to existing distribution policy for PI’s, Departments or Centers.
- As the research portfolio grows, this model allows the available resources for central research services supported by SPA (Office of Research, Contracts & Grants, EH&S, Cost Analysis) to increase proportional to IDC growth. In addition, this same group of units will need to be able to withstand fluctuations downward in IDC in any given year.
Year 1 Changes Implemented – 2016-17

Sponsored Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY15 Accrued IDC</th>
<th>FY16 SPA tax (under expenditure-based model used last year)</th>
<th>Proposed Model: Percentage of total accrued IDC to be collected as SPA tax</th>
<th>Proposed Model: SPA tax for FY2016 (last year) if proposed model had been applied</th>
<th>Difference in SPA tax (last year) with proposed model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>7,224,308</td>
<td>2,839,686</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>2,658,545</td>
<td>-181,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14,222,992</td>
<td>5,064,691</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>5,234,061</td>
<td>169,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHP</td>
<td>898,827</td>
<td>287,451</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>330,768</td>
<td>43,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2,412,537</td>
<td>784,771</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>887,814</td>
<td>103,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHHP</td>
<td>2,825,881</td>
<td>1,078,853</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1,039,924</td>
<td>-38,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>3,237,458</td>
<td>1,054,478</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1,191,385</td>
<td>136,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHHP-COM</td>
<td>1,533,071</td>
<td>493,523</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>564,170</td>
<td>70,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>336,527</td>
<td>89,403</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>123,842</td>
<td>34,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Am Stu</td>
<td>290,004</td>
<td>110,030</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>106,721</td>
<td>-3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney Lab</td>
<td>587,979</td>
<td>227,333</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>216,876</td>
<td>-10,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLMNH</td>
<td>1,267,935</td>
<td>363,172</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>466,600</td>
<td>103,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>28,823,233</td>
<td>14,804,628</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>14,123,384</td>
<td>-681,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM-JAX</td>
<td>2,108,416</td>
<td>1,679,317</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1,033,124</td>
<td>-646,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICHP</td>
<td>2,567,655</td>
<td>972,255</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1,258,151</td>
<td>285,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>1,774,308</td>
<td>909,802</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>869,411</td>
<td>-40,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2,637,128</td>
<td>1,449,391</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>1,410,863</td>
<td>-38,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAS</td>
<td>11,600,630</td>
<td>6,289,615</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>6,206,337</td>
<td>-83,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Grant</td>
<td>372,398</td>
<td>126,217</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>199,233</td>
<td>73,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,708,694</td>
<td>885,047</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>914,151</td>
<td>29,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>23,930</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>521,523</td>
<td>268,345</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>279,015</td>
<td>10,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>35,360</td>
<td>46,678</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>18,918</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel Center</td>
<td>53,674</td>
<td>20,265</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>28,715</td>
<td>8,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>134,217</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>13,284</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>46,247</td>
<td>18,649</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>24,742</td>
<td>6,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>69,919</td>
<td>40,776</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>37,407</td>
<td>-3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items Yet to be Considered

- Auxiliary Tax
- Graduate Student Waivers
- Facility Tax
- Other Distribution/Assessment Arrangements
- Dual Degrees – 2 diplomas/2 colleges
- Subvention