

 UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA	UCF University Budget Committee Meeting Minutes
Date:	November 17, 2020
Time:	1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Location:	via Zoom
Voting Members in attendance:	Michael Johnson, Joe Trubacz, Misty Shepherd, Maribeth Ehasz, Deborah German, Elizabeth Klonoff, Theodorea Berry, Stephanie Blanco, Mike Kilbride, Mike Sink, Sissi Carroll, Paul Jarley, Joe Harrington, Steven Collins, Fernando Rivera, Reshawna Chapple, Cissy Glowth, Edwana Andrews
Staff (non-voting members) in attendance:	Kristie Harris, Rebeca Richards, Derek Horton, Kathy Mitchell, Tracy Slavik

UBC Budget Philosophy: *An effective budgeting process transforms strategic goals into achievable operating plans, and:*

- *Properly and continuously aligns resources with universitywide strategic priorities*
- *Employs an “all-funds” approach*
- *Maintains fiscal responsibility with those closest to operational decisions*
- *Provides a degree of predictability to promote multi-year planning on a universitywide basis*
- *Increases communication, transparency, and accountability*
- *Provides timely funding recommendations to the President*

----- **Agenda Topics** -----

1. Approval of the minutes from November 10, 2020 – Joe Trubacz

Approved as submitted.

2. Discussion of administrative divisions’ plans for meeting the 3% and 6% budget reallocations (see attached summary with items **highlighted in red** for reconsideration) – Michael Johnson

The committee voted whether or not to accept the cuts for each division as proposed by the division’s vice president. The total Yes and No votes for each item listed are recorded on the attached spreadsheet in the far-right column. A Yes vote was to take the cut as proposed by the VP; a No vote was to refuse the cut as proposed by the VP.

VP proposed actions accepted by the committee are shown **in green**; proposed actions not accepted by the committee are shown **in red**; proposed actions to be discussed further are shown **in yellow**.

The provost requested that the committee document its rationale for divided votes, noting that people of good faith will often disagree. The divided votes included:

- A. Administrative Affairs cuts to Provost faculty positions and inclusive excellence faculty positions (line 11) –
- “Yes” voters (13 votes) stated that cuts were necessary and VPs closest to the division budget had proposed cuts they felt were least harmful to their division; there were sufficient other opportunities for these hires to be made; belief that the positions had been unfilled for too long and the programs are poorly conceived.
 - “No” voters (5 votes) argued against any cuts to faculty positions as the university is trying to improve the faculty to student ratio.
- B. Administrative Affairs cuts to the Library (line15)
- “Yes” voters (5 votes) stated that the Library’s initial 3% cut was not unreasonable, and the Library should be cut just as other academic units are cut.
 - “No” voters (13 votes) argued that Library subscription services increase about \$300,000 each year; these resources are critical to faculty and student success.
- C. Academic Affairs cuts to the Burnett Honors College InSpire Scholars program (Line 18)
- “Yes” voters (16 votes) stated that the cuts were those proposed by the Dean.
 - “No” voters (2 votes) argued that the cuts were to financial aid that was aimed at diversifying the student demographic.
- D. Administration Division’s proposal to move Housekeeping employees to contracts, service reductions; cut \$1 million from division reserves, and hold harmless other division units (Lines 33-49)
- “Yes” voters (5 votes) stated that the VP had made the least harmful cuts for her division.
 - “No” voters (13 votes) argued that the division has been badly stretched by declines in funding from the state for maintaining buildings on campus. Also, this would eliminate jobs or reduce salaries & benefits of the lowest paid and most vulnerable employees on campus. The division did not receive \$2 million in funding for PO&M that it had received in the prior two fiscal years. The unfunded cost to maintain the additional 800,000 s.f. added is approximately \$2.5-3 million. There was also concern about holding Public Safety harmless when other units were not held harmless; however, Police already had its non-recurring carryforward budget cut. The initial 3% cuts were to middle management; the second 3% cuts were to the custodial staff.
 - Provost requested that Shepherd bring back detailed plans with amounts listed for each unit (i.e., current funding and proposed cuts) so that the committee might accept portions of the proposed cuts and not accept other cuts and/or holding certain units harmless from cuts.

- All decisions about cuts to the Division of Administration were tabled until Shepherd can bring back additional information at the next meeting.

E. President's Division's request to hold \$1,066,923 in insurance premiums harmless from the cuts (Line 74)

- “Yes” voters wanted to ask the President's division to take the 6% cut on the \$1.1 million for university insurance premiums, requiring an additional cut to other operations to cover this cut.
- “No” voters argued that this amount should be held harmless, because unlike utilities, the university is unable to easily influence the costs of insurance premiums; as claims against older equipment/buildings increase, insurance rates are increasing 6-12%/year.

3. **Recommendations to the President for reallocation of administrative budgets** – Michael Johnson

Recommendations were postponed until the December 9, 2020, UBC meeting when the committee can finalize voting on all proposed action items.

4. **CARES Act discussion** – Joe Trubacz & Kristie Harris

Postponed until the December 9, 2020, UBC meeting

5. **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 3:03 p.m.