



University of South Florida

Digital Commons @ University of South Florida

Campus Board: Minutes

Campus Board

7-20-2021

Campus Advisory Board Budget Workshop : 2021 : 07 : 20 Minutes

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/campus_board_minutes

Scholar Commons Citation

University of South Florida St. Petersburg, "Campus Advisory Board Budget Workshop : 2021 : 07 : 20 Minutes" (2021). *Campus Board: Minutes*. 102.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/campus_board_minutes/102

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Board at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Campus Board: Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.



**Campus Advisory Board
Budget Workshop
July 20, 2021
Microsoft Teams
10:00 am – 12:00pm**

Minutes

Attendance:

Lisa Brody

Susan Churuti

Scott Goyer- Vice Chair

Lawrence Hamilton

Reuben Pressman- Not able to attend

Melissa Seixas- CHAIR

Debbie Sembler

David Rosengrant (ex-officio)

Veronica Jimenez (ex-officio)

Martin Tadlock

Chair Melissa Seixas opened the meeting and asked Chancellor Tadlock to take roll call:

Dr. Tadlock took roll call: All Campus Board members were in attendance except Reuben Pressman.

Chair Seixas stated this is a meeting we scheduled a few weeks ago and she appreciates everyone's flexibility and understanding that we needed to make an adjustment to this date. Some important decisions were being made at the legislative level.

Chair Seixas wanted to acknowledge the announcement that came out yesterday that the President made the decision to retire and we wish him the very best and he wishes the very best of the continuing success

of the University of South Florida. We acknowledge and recognize that there is ongoing change across the university. In a conversation with the President and others in focusing on the search for the Chancellor's role, for Martin's position, in the announcement that came out yesterday, we will put on pause the search for Martin's position and other ones. It will be a short pause as Provost Wilcox steps in as the acting President. The Board will meet in the next few weeks to select an Interim. The Chancellor is 100% committed to remaining focused in leading through this tremendous amount of change.

We were supposed to have a listening session with the President for the Campus Board this week. We'll see another form of that in its place as we go through the process of learning more about the steps moving forward to select a new President for USF and for the very important work that will need to be done in order to find who will succeed Martin as our Chancellor. We will move forward.

Chair Seixas said it is extraordinary what the faculty and staff have done over the course of the last 18 months. It's a model for other institutions on your agility, flexibility, and it wasn't easy. Super excited we have students coming on campus for the summer and the fall.

Chair Seixas wanted to acknowledge Cathi Cardwell. Cathi has accepted an opportunity to go to Reno. We will miss you and thank you for your leadership. When we talk about the change that the University has encountered here at St. Petersburg, on the campus, you were at the very forefront of leading through that change. Even those who know in fine detail what you did, I don't think any of us will really know the amount of work, energy, commitment, dedication, a few tears, hoping some smiles along the way, to see what you were able to accomplish by getting students from the classroom onto virtual.

We have our Provost on with us today. Thank you, Dr. Wilcox, for being with us today.

Provost Wilcox thanked Chair Seixas for the kind welcome. He has been working with Dr. Tadlock and his leadership team over the past couple of weeks, along with Multi campus deans and vice presidents to ensure the proposed budget is to focus on its core missions, our faculty, staff and our communities. Provost Wilcox stated that as he steps in for the acting President role beginning in August, he looks forward to working with the BOT, members of the campus board, and leadership on the St. Petersburg campus. We are doing what we can to continue to advance the academic and student success in St. Petersburg. His familiarity with the St. Petersburg campus will play an incredibly important role in lifting USF to even greater heights.

Dr. Tadlock would like to take a minute to acknowledge Cathi Cardwell. No one understands the role unless you've been in it. It's a tremendous opportunity to take care of a campus and all of its aspects. Cathi has done that for three years. She has been a tremendous asset, working through difficult situations and staying close to the team. We appreciate everything she has done. Reno is lucky to have her.

Dr. Patti Helton said she remembers when the four of them came together. She is sad to see her go and is happy for her opportunity. In her 35 years, if she could choose to work with someone, Cathi would be one of the top three people she would choose. Cathi is smart, has a work ethic, she stays calm, she's inspirational. She wishes Cathi the best.

Cathi said it has been an honor working with everyone.

Dr. Tadlock said an announcement was made for the Interim RVCAA and Deni Elliott has delayed her retirement. You'll learn a lot more about her as time goes forward.

Chair Seixas turned the meeting over to David Everingham.

1. Campus Advisory Board Budget Workshop- David Everingham, Interim Regional Vice Chancellor
 - a. David has been with USF for 17 years, starting in July is the Interim Regional Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance.

Budget Workshop Agenda- David reviewed the [Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget Planning Overview Documents](#)

- b. Legislative Results and Current Challenges
 - i. We will receive back the 6% of FY21 state appropriations to be released: \$2.2 million non-recurring to SP Campus.
 - ii. Citizen Scholar Partnership: \$306,176 non-recurring appropriation.
 - iii. Florida Retirement System employer-paid rates increase: cost to SP campus to be determined.
 - iv. Faculty salary cap from state funds and associated budget reduction: minimal for SP campus. There are exclusions for certain disciplines like engineering, mathematics, and some others. It needs to be kept in mind as we move along, as new faculty are hired in some of these programs, that the salary we will be looking at may exceed \$200,000.
 - v. Performance-Based Funding (PBF) appropriation maintained at current level: USF allocation decreased with changes in SUS proportional share. For the SP campus that ended up being around a \$160,000 decrease.
 - vi. Capital Improvement Trust Fund (CITY) Appropriation: received \$638,050 to St. Pete Campus. This will go towards our USC renovation project.
 - vii. \$350 million from FL's federal COVID relief funding for deferred maintenance at state agency & public higher education facilities. David believes these funds need to be requested through the Governor's office, and USF is preparing to send the request.
- c. Current Challenges:
 - i. Uncertainty regarding long-term enrollment: Impacts on recurring tuition and fees revenue, housing occupancy.
 - ii. Operational funding and space/infrastructure for new and expanded academic program offerings. Including biology, the arts, the sustainability and environmental sciences program.
 - iii. Achieving and maintaining parity across campuses in support of USF's core commitments: e.g., Faculty Excellence, Student success, Staff Distinction, Research Support.

1. Employee Compensation continues to be a challenge because of budget constraints
 2. Levels of Service & Support- On -campus and online
 3. Infrastructure- Facilities, Equipment, Technology
- d. Operating Budget Overview- All Sources
- i. David reviewed the slide and discussed the variances between last fiscal year and this year. The E&G budget has increased mainly because of anticipated tuition revenue (Last year \$17 million and this year \$18.5 million was budgeted). Contracts and Grants has increased due to increase in grant activity. Auxiliaries: dining was previously budgeted in SP, now its budgeted in Tampa. Student Activities & Fees: the reduction is due to less cash carryforward from prior years available to expend).
- e. Focus: Housing & Parking Auxiliaries
- i. As most of you are aware, we have had challenges opening the third residence hall on campus and the timing of that. We were working through consolidation and then the pandemic. It's an ongoing challenge and things are looking good now.
 - ii. We achieved only a 0.88 debt service ratio, which included some federal funding that was transferred to cover some of the shortfall we had.
 - iii. As a reminder, the preferred debt service ratio is a 1.4, and we're working on bringing that up.
 - iv. Our original budget assumptions in May were for 500 residents, and we now anticipate approximately 680 residents in the fall. Projected debt service ratio of 1.13

Question:

Board member Lawrence Hamilton asked in terms of housing, what percentage of fill or bed spaces filled do we have today versus what we expected?

David Everingham stated we're at 680 residents and will be at 74% occupancy. There are 916 beds in residence halls. We currently want to achieve a 95% occupancy and that is the way he believes the finances were built when the third facility was constructed and financed. He believes that 870 residents is where they want to be.

Melissa- Action item for next board meeting to understand the strategy to close the gap on residency housing occupancy.

- f. E&G: Budget Walk-Forward & Composition
 - i. David reviewed this slide which shows how we got from last year's E&G budget to this year's E&G budget.

g. E&G: Budget Overview & Priorities for Allocation

- i. This slide explains the summary of the budget, how it's currently budgeted from last year's budget carrying over each area.
- ii. All items were carried over from last year, with one exception. In the bottom he made a note under assumptions, that 1.5 million in tuition revenue budget increase does have a cost associated with it. With this profile for admission, we do need to pay for scholarships that are offered to those students coming in. Based on the estimates coming from our enrollment area we had to set aside \$650,000 on top of what was already budgeted for scholarships. This is included already under the central expenses budget.
- iii. Within the central expenses area there is a portion that is the differential tuition revenue that is required to go towards need-based financial aid. There also are the USF shared services or indirect costs that we pay each year, about \$2 million budgeted. There are also funds for leases, for properties that we are leasing.
- iv. Looking at what is unallocated we have about \$3.4 million in that budget, and that is about the amount that we had been anticipating as an 8.5% reduction for SP campus. We are looking at how to allocate those funds to cover commitments and maybe restoring things that we cut last year, as well as some new things.
- v. One thing that we try to do every year is set aside funds for salary increases. There were no salary increases last year but he thinks each union will be negotiating those (no update on where those stand at the moment). We have set aside \$500,000 or at least we plan to set aside half a million dollars here, which is about 2% of our base salaries. He thinks it is wise to do that as these are recurring increases when they happen.
- vi. Next line is the FRS Employer Contribution Increase, that is what he mentioned earlier from the legislation and the estimate for that is \$500,000. We will need to monitor that and see what it does to our benefits expenses.
- vii. Then we have the big \$2.1 million, which we will go back to in a moment
- viii. Last is the Transfer to USF Health, that the president asked us to include in the budget again this year.

Question:

Board member Susan Churuti asked about the \$250,000. I just want to circle back on that because, to my mind, that is a priority in the medical school budget and we really haven't gotten anything from them. I mean their budget is \$147 million and our budget is \$88 million. For us we have our own set of USF priorities, relating to our own students on campus. And these are not our students, these are medical students. I would think, that is roughly two full time professors, for the priorities that we have been asked to fulfill by the legislature and the priorities we would set. I'm confused as to whether we have any ability to not approve this, to suggest we go back to the medical school and ask them about their thoughts about why is this not a priority for them? I believe if we asked Dr. Tadlock, could he spend that money on our

priorities, do we have programs that we are waiting to fund that we think are important, the answer would be yes. Is this money gone, and is it gone for the next 5-10 years or is it something we retain any power to say we don't think this is a priority to us?

Board member Lawrence Hamilton commented this is the second year, at least, in a row that we've had this discussion. And we still don't have a satisfactory response as to why this is in our budget. He thinks last year they voted to remove it, and they were overturned. But it's a bit of a thorn, giving us a tightening in our budget and we still haven't gotten any kind of explanation as to why a quarter of a million dollars spend for USF Health, for which there doesn't appear to be any return to the SP campus. So, he is with Susan, it is confusing to him.

Nick Setteducato wants to address the concern. If you recall last year, there was a \$250,000 reduction in USF Health budget corresponding to the John Hopkins Children's Hospital arrangement. President was asked by USF Health administration to offset this. While we don't see a direct benefit from the relationship between USF Health and John Hopkins Children's Hospital, being one university geographically dispersed and having John Hopkins Children's Hospital located within feet or yards of our footprint, he would say that is major part of the impetus for asking the SP campus to provide that offset to the cut made, which hasn't been restored.

To answer about the permanency of this, we are taking it one year at a time. He recommended David fund this on an annual basis, as requested through the office of the president.

To answer does the Campus Board have the ability to remove this from the recommended budget they provide back to the president, and then send to the BOT for approval, the answer is yes. It is up to the Advisory board to do that. The request of the President's office was to include this. He advises to include it.

Question:

Vice Chair Goyer commented as he understands, the answer is the hospital is located in SP, therefore, the SP campus is being requested to pick up the gap. But it doesn't impact what's happening at the SP campus?

Nick answered He believes it's that and what he mentioned before, that at the time the USF Health had this veto affect them, which it resulted in a commencer \$250,000 cut directly to this particular support between JHCH and USF Health, the campus here had already been given incremental support. It was both the concept of availability and one USF trying to pitch in for something that had been done and potentially could have done harm to what that support is.

Question:

Vice Chair Goyer stated, with the logic then being reversed, if it were to happen to something that was important to the SP campus, would that be true potentially asked of the other two campuses?

Nick answered that he would hope so, that the same sort of thought process would go regardless of which direction it went.

Provost Wilcox suggested that what Scott asked (SP receiving support from other campuses) is already happening. What we don't see on the budget proposal for the SP campus, is the significant number of allocations that USF is making from the Tampa campus to the SP campus in the coming year. For instance, \$500,000 allocation to the Kate Tiedemann School of Business and Finance. Dean Limayem will be working with faculty across the MUMA College and the Tiedemann school to identify how best to invest those funds in Fintech priorities from the SP campus. In addition, he has already shared his expectations with the current interim Dean of the College of Education and our incoming Dean of the College of Education that he expects to see a significant investment in the STEM k-12 initiative and center on the SP campus. In addition, they are making commitments to the College of Marine Science. This is a conversation that needs to continue as we find our way through the consolidation process and invest our resources strategically and transparently. That is critically important to lift all of our campuses to best serve the needs of our students, faculty, staff, and communities.

Board member Susan Churuti commented that looking at the result of the academic cluster meeting of June 29 that Dr. Tadlock sent to all board members, that we have a lot of initiatives that would be a higher priority, including exploring offering of a psych based mental health practitioners' program and a neonatal nursing program at all children's hospital as part of our budget. It seems we would better off putting things that relate to our budget in our budget and having our campus board vote on those items, than having all of these not transparent decisions be made.

Board member Lawrence Hamilton commented the \$500,000 to the School of Business, the investment in STEM k-12 initiative, and the Marine Sciences is a direct investment to our students and we see the direct investment with USFSP campus. But the \$250,000 doesn't have a direct investment with our students and there is no apparent benefit. We've been asking for two years what it is, and unfortunately it has not been transparent. As we are all asked to tighten the budget, here we are a year later talking about a quarter of a million dollars that leads to nowhere to the benefit of the students.

Chair Seixas commented she anticipated this discussion. She believes that as a board, they can take a formal vote on the issue, but this particular item (Transfer to USF Health) we need to note that the board does not recommend this to go forward with the budget. She understands this would go the office of the president and an annual assessment.

Question:

Chair Seixas asked did the original source of funding come from the state allocations? If so, her thought is that the expectations from those officials who helped to secure that funding was that the dollars be spent on the SP campus for SP programs.

Nick answered that the reduction came from, he believes, a Governor's veto to support what had been provided through USF Health for JHCH. It was through the USF Health appropriation, that was directly cut through that veto, for appropriation support that had been provided years before to the level of \$250,000.

Question:

Chair Seixas asked provided years ago by the state?

Nick answered yes, correct. In a direct appropriation for this purpose to support JHCH through USF Health.

Provost Wilcox commented that he believes this is to support pediatric residencies.

Chair Seixas raised the concern that moving forward, if other similar actions are taken, what other portions of our budget may be vulnerable to a similar set of action. Melissa said year to year budgets vary driven many influencing factors. We are all willing to participate in a conversation about this. Laying out the expectations for transparency but to know every year we will need to have a conversation about this particular amount of funding.

Nick in speaking about transparency. One of the things we are committed to is a transparent shared service model. David alluded earlier to a charge that is just under \$2 million that the SP campus gets for services rendered from Tampa. That allocation model is almost decades old and has not been revisited in enough time, not only for the SP campus but also the USF Health and the Sarasota campus. It goes both ways. The intent is to have an up to date living model on an annual basis that provides transparency in terms of those costs that need to be shared or consumption of services. We are committed to doing that, it's an aspect of consolidation that Covid-19 got in the way of last year. We had been wanting as a financial group to tackle and bring in representatives from each campus.

Chair Seixas expressed her appreciation for the forward view. She believes the board needs to make a decision on what they will recommend for this particular budget.

Question:

Chair Seixas asked from a procedural standpoint, at the end of the presentation is David looking for the Campus Board to approve the components of this particular budget to move forward to the BOT?

David said yes. He is expecting to get the advisory board's feedback on what they would like to be included or excluded so we can finalize the budget so we can approve the recommendations at the August 5th meeting.

Melissa asked that this item be noted as one of concern for the board. We recommend not moving forward, we can move it to a vote, but Melissa gets a sense of consensus with the board on this issue.

Provost Wilcox stated his appreciation for the role of the board, and believes we need to find a solution for the board to not be consumed by this item and like items on a recurring basis. The defined path forward, once the campus board settles on a proposed budget, it's forwarded to the president from Chancellor Tadlock and the president decides what to present to the BOT for final consideration. Provost looks forward to conversations in the short term and resolutions in the short term so we're not revisiting it on an annual basis. Urges the board to consider these through a different lens. Your students are all of USF students at this point in time, while he understands the role of the Board in serving the immediate needs of students, faculty, and staff served in the SP campus, we all have to consider the broadened and best interest of USF.

- ix. The last line item is Salary Market Equity Adjustments, which is a 0. We felt it was important to leave it there as a place holder because that is a challenge we continue to face. We don't have the funds to address the perceived salary/compensation inequities across campuses holistically. If we could allocate a million or two million dollars for our campus to set aside to deal with that inequity, which might not be enough. But we currently do not have the funding to address that.
- x. Chair Seixas made a note of that on the front end of the presentation when David spoke about challenges.

Melissa-Action item for next board meeting- How to better understand the strategy for closing the gap on equity discrepancies.

- The university is going through contract negotiation, which might need to happen before addressing the equity discrepancies that we have.

Provost Wilcox believes that David represented well the two big challenges, one is available resources and the other, as Melissa pointed out, is the ongoing collective bargaining negotiations. The fact is with faculty, with the faculty union, we are under contract and we don't currently have the authority to make discretionary awards. That is problematic for everyone involved, whether it's an office trying to retain a faculty member that is being recruited, or as its represented here the need to consider equity adjustments.

Faculty Hiring Plans

David stated several people will now go through the Budget Priorities for their area. Reflect on the positions that we have in the list of priorities to allocate budget for, those are the ones highlighted in yellow.

Cathi Cardwell gives a background to create context for the list.

Some of these positions are the result of coming and goings of people, however the architecture for this plan started many years ago, even prior to consolidation. We had an emphasis on environmental chemistry, some programs that were growing, last year's retirement opportunity left some positions open for reconfiguring and finding the best fit. Journalism and chemistry are part of the hiring for environmental and oceanographic cluster. We work closely with Tom Frazer and the deans for this particular cluster.

There was a lot of changes in journalism, a couple professors took other positions, and we had three retirements. It was an opportunity for journalism to redefine itself and look at themselves as science journalists. On this plan, we have Muma, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the library. These are the traditional colleges that are on the SP campus. College of Education is getting a new Dean. We don't see College of the Arts and College of Behavioral Communications because prior to consolidation, these were a part of the College of Arts and Sciences. We are open to talk about how to expand instruction.

Terry Chisolm who oversees new programs on campus, will start a master planning process. We need to have a plan going forward, like we did in the past. That will give an opportunity to the College of Arts and the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences to get in on the planning. Wants to ensure the colleges that they will be part of the programs Terry will be planning on campus.

David mentioned that the Dean of the Kate Tiedemann School of Business and Finance and the library with Cathi's departure, this worksheet is focused on faculty not on faculty administrators positions.

Chair Seixas stated that an attrition is something all industries are facing, whether its retirement, post Covid world reassessment of priorities and stepping away from professional commitments.

Question:

Chair Seixas stated from a historical standpoint, are we at a higher level of vacancies than in years before? Its vacancies and new programs that are launching that we are trying to fill.

Cathi Cardwell mentioned that we had faculty who left due to consolidation and one USF is not what they wanted. There is often a lot of turnovers in instructors, especially visiting instructors, because the positions are more temporary. We've had a good stability with the faculty, in terms of faculty staying and continuing. It doesn't seem unusual in terms of faculty.

Summary of the Proposed Allocations:

David- These are incremental, they do not include anything that is already budgeted in the Colleges or Areas. We focused on looking forward.

2021-2022 Budget Priorities

Academic Affairs: Cathi Cardwell

Cathi says that they are focused on restoring the budget that has been cut.

- i. Some positions were reimagined and not restored to the same as before they were cut. For example, the library she gave back a position that had a different focus. When she brings it back

the position will be reimagined. The university is working towards ARL and AAU, and they are trying to hire a librarian that will support that.

- ii. Faculty promotions will be coming.
- iii. They cut the summer school budget, and one of the things that we wanted to do is have the colleges add more classes as necessary.
- iv. Academic Advising is really intensive work for student success, with emphasis on PBF and progression, and we need another advisor to help with the workload.
- v. This year we will need MathLab support, the \$15,000 there is for staff.
- vi. The positions for the College of Arts and Sciences have visiting instructors there for immediate needs that will transition into longer term plans for the environmental chemist. It will help us get through the stage we are at the moment.
- vii. The research impact has increased, we have more faculty getting grants. We've had a lot of challenges that post award and pre award efforts are being addressed. We have more faculty applying for grants. The College of Arts and Sciences is getting, through this allocation, a unit research administrator and it will be modeled after what they do in Tampa.
- viii. Operating funds were restored, as well as adjuncts to respond to student demand and need.
- ix. The media technologists are the person who goes around and helps faculty in the classroom. This needs to be shifted into a permanent position to help with the hybrid instruction and other technologies.
- x. Security guards were cut in the library from 40hrs/week to 20hrs/ week maybe 30hrs.
- xi. Muma College of Business- some of these are restorations like the faculty service administrator, the adjunct, and the operating funds. The assistant professor of finance is a highly paid position, which is the market demand. The finance department is homed on our campus, so we should have a strong finance person. Not on this list, is the fact that we recently had an assistant finance professor resign.
- xii. Adjunct instruction and operating funds were restored.
- xiii. Prior to consolidation, we managed our DL fee budget differently than Tampa. Tampa has a method of innovative ed, spends their DL fee and if there is any remaining its divided up, proportionally, to its various colleges. However, on SP campus, we managed it differently. We've supported more staff lines with DL fees. We've always had strict guidelines on who we've supported with the DL fee.
- xiv. Now we have to align with the method of InEd in Tampa to have a more coherent approach to managing that. Last year, on the budget cut, Muma and the finance school transitioned some of their people supported with E&G to DL. Some of the lines are moving back from DL to E&G. Cathi has been working with Cindy to move our DL budget model and align it with Tampa's budget model.
- xv. College of the Arts has rethought their way to paying adjuncts, there are many in COTA. The \$25,000 is to help support that new salary structure for the adjuncts.

- xvi. We want to help increase the arts and arts programming in our campus, so there is an additional \$25,000. For example, we've had a request to have students staff a gallery, which has not been done before.

These are the highlights of the academic priorities for this year's budget. This and the hiring plan will be rolling out. We are working behind the scenes, e.g., for the chemistry people we have to build labs and need to have startup funds.

Question:

Board member Lisa Brody asked regarding the revisioning process of the School of Education. They are not reflected anywhere as a budget priority, so the revisioning process will be taking most of 2021-2022?

Cathi Cardwell believes it will. The provost is already working with the College of Education and with the STEM. One of the key areas for the clusters was STEM education, that will have a renewed emphasis. It will be a priority.

Student Success: Patti Helton

- i. Most of them are picking up funds for things we are already doing but we were using carry forward money to do that. We have to pay money to use the space at the USC for convocations, career fairs, orientations, etc. (carry forward money was used for this). We had cut some of the funds when we had the 6% cut. That is restoring the funds for those operating expenses.
- ii. The two items we're highlighting are the two positions for resource management. We need an additional person for entry level Administrative Specialist to support Resource Management shared services for all of Student Success. The second position we are proposing is a student advocate, currently we have two student success advocates that work in Compass (one for 1st/2nd year students and one for 3rd/4th year students). We propose to have three, where one works with only first year students, one for seniors, and one for 2nd and 3rd year students to give individual support to students who are struggling.
- iii. We are adding something for financial aid verification, as we are basically outsourcing verification.

Question:

Chair Seixas asked Patti your responsibilities are not just for SP but also all of USF?

Patti clarified that her responsibilities for health and wellness are for all USF.

Question:

Chair Seixas asked David now that university has a refreshed strategy with those focus areas, will those be adjusted to reflect budget priorities? How do they go back to the overall strategy?

Provost Wilcox said David is doing exactly what he's been asked to do. He has asked all of the Deans of USF to plan their strategic reinvestment plan of the 6% cash that was returned to them. He commended

David for his initial efforts here. A budget needs to be more than a numerical representation of the university or organization strategic plan, a budget needs to have transparency.

Administration and finance: David Everingham

- i. We're essentially restoring our cuts. We took substantial cuts when we were planning the second part of the overall budget of the last FY. We looked at the minimum we needed to restore. In each area we took a 25% reduction of each of our non-salary operating budgets. We cut positions and are looking to get some of them back. We need a groundskeeper and a Helpdesk IT person.

Central Areas: Debbie Read

- ii. We are trying to restore a position that we previously had. The position is an Assistant Director of Constituent Engagement, to engage new individuals to get involved with the campus and raise additional funds.
- iii. We took on the responsibility last year with the changes in the financial aid office, that all of the donor funded scholarships for the campus are being administered for the selection of students as well as the administration of funding those students from our staffing here. The ADCE will also be responsible for part of this.
- iv. Am very pleased during this time of covid and consolidation, we've exceeded our goal again and this year raising \$3.6 million.

DIEO- David mentioned that Michelle Madden has been operating on a small budget. But by providing some recurring funds we can get a partial scholarship in place. When we get to carry forward, we have one-time funds that we can make available.

- v. Michele mentions that they have been operating with the funds they started with in 2018. They had one scholar graduate early, two students graduating this year and once they graduate, without these funds that would be the end of the program. We are looking for ways to reconfigure, maybe a partial scholarship, building out the mentorship component and partnering with other support systems in the campus. Would like to continue with this program and support other initiatives outlined in the University Diversity and Inclusion outline.

- a. E&G: Carryforward Spending Plan Summary

- The carry forward balance is mainly due to the budget reductions last fiscal year that were not totally necessary. We are projecting about \$19 million, when the FY is closed, we will have the exact number. David reviewed the commitments for what is needed.

David expressed that over the last five years, we've been very disciplined about balancing our budget. The campus is in a good position and generally we don't have any recurring costs on carryforward.

Question:

David Rosengrant asked about the waterline pipeline in the Marine Science building, how much out of our budget is being used for College of Marine Science building?

Generally, none, since the infrastructure is around the whole peninsula. It's not just part of Marine Science budget, it's part of the SP campus.

David Everingham notes that with the \$350 million available through the Governor's office for declared maintenance projects. USF put a request of about \$20 million (TBD on approval). \$3.7 million were for projects in SP, \$2 million of which were for the MSL facility.

- b. Federal COVID Relief Funds
 - i. There are several items on this list that affect our campus
 - ii. Housing lost revenue, lost fee revenue, and several of the direct expenses affect us as well.
- c. Fixed Capital Outlay Budget
 - iii. We need to make our recommendations as well.
 - iv. Carryforward funded projects are ongoing such as David Hall and Student Life Center.
 - v. The USF Foundation Gift Funded Projects
 - 1. Harbor Hall First Floor renovation- talked about the relocation of the pool.
- d. Facilities Update
 - vi. August 2021 Completion
 - 1. Davis Hall First Floor Renovation
 - 2. Harbor Hall First Floor Renovation
 - 3. Student Life Center Meeting Space Reconfiguration
 - 4. Poynter Memorial Library Renovation

Heller Hall Co-Curricular & Wellness facilities project, previously the board approved the request to go forward to the BOT to change the project to a new relocated pool.

Board Member Susan Churuti highlighted that it is a wellness area. She thinks it's important to highlight the pool and say our students should have this as a wellness issue.

Next Steps- Campus Board meeting is August 5th, 2021. The purpose of the meeting is to approve the recommendations for the budgets to go forward to the president and the BOT.

Approval for the operating budget is slated for August 10th. BOT approval for fixed capital and carryforward spending plan is August 24th.

Chair Seixas said many thanks to David and his team. We appreciate that. Susan advocated for these budget workshops to allow us to dig into the details. When we reconvene on August 5th that we will leave

time for discussion. If you have questions, send them to the Chancellor who will get them to our financial team. If you want other board members to be aware, include the other board members.

Melissa thanked Cathi Cardwell and welcomed Deni Elliot.

Chancellor Tadlock appreciates all of the Board members.

Chair Seixas stated she would like to have the August 5 meeting as an in-person meeting. If you are not comfortable, we can make arrangements to ensure participation from everyone.

Adjourned 11:56am.