



STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM  
*of* FLORIDA  
Board of Governors

# Agenda and Meeting Materials October 16, 2018

Ballroom  
Marshall Student Center  
University of South Florida  
4103 USF Cedar Circle  
Tampa, FL 33620



STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM  
of FLORIDA  
Board of Governors

**ACTIVITIES  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETINGS**

**Ballroom  
Marshall Student Center  
University of South Florida  
4103 USF Cedar Circle  
Tampa, Florida 33620  
October 16, 2018**

**By Telephone Conference Call  
Dial-in Number: 888-670-3525  
Board Member Code: 8893354522#  
Listen-Only Code: 4122150353#**

**Tuesday, October 16, 2018**

- 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.      Budget and Finance Committee**  
or upon                      Chair: Mr. Syd Kitson; Vice Chair: Mr. H. Wayne Huizenga, Jr.  
Adjournment of          Members: Cerio, Lautenbach, Salerno, Valverde, White  
Previous Meetings
- 10:30 – 10:45 a.m.      Break**
- 10:45 a.m. -              Facilities Committee**  
**12:00 p.m.**              Chair: Mr. H. Wayne Huizenga, Jr.; Vice Chair: Dr. Fernando Valverde  
or upon                      Members: Felton, Jordan, Kitson, Lautenbach, Morton, Patel  
Adjournment of  
Previous Meetings
- 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.      Lunch will be provided**
- 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.      Facilities Committee continued**

*Please note that this schedule may change at the Chair's privilege.*

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Budget and Finance Committee  
October 16, 2018**

**SUBJECT:** Performance-based Funding Model

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

For discussion

**AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION**

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Board adopted a performance funding model in January 2014 based on 10 metrics.

The Committee has been clear that the model will be reviewed annually to determine if any changes need to be made.

The following will be discussed during the workshop:

1. Hard deadline for university submissions
2. Rounding of benchmarks
3. Metric 1 – Percent of Bachelor’s Graduates Employed or Continuing their Education
4. Metric 10 – Board of Trustees Choice Metric
5. Allocation methodology

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

1. Performance Funding Model Overview
2. Regulation 5.001
3. Metric Definitions
4. Information Brief on Metric Changes
5. Benchmarks
6. Metric 10 Proposals
7. Allocation methodology - TBP

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Governor Syd Kitson, Board Staff

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Budget and Finance Committee  
October 16, 2018**

**SUBJECT:** Performance-based Funding Model

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

For discussion

**AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION**

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Board adopted a performance funding model in January 2014 based on 10 metrics.

The Committee has been clear that the model will be reviewed annually to determine if any changes need to be made.

The following will be discussed during the workshop:

1. Hard deadline for university submissions
2. Rounding of benchmarks
3. Metric 1 – Percent of Bachelor’s Graduates Employed or Continuing their Education
4. Metric 10 – Board of Trustees Choice Metric
5. Allocation methodology

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:**

1. Performance Funding Model Overview
2. Regulation 5.001
3. Metric Definitions
4. Information Brief on Metric Changes
5. Benchmarks
6. Metric 10 Proposals - TBP
7. Allocation methodology - TBP

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Governor Syd Kitson, Board Staff

## Board of Governors Performance Funding Model Overview

The Performance Funding Model includes 10 metrics that evaluate the institutions on a range of issues. Two of the 10 metrics are Choice metrics; one picked by the Board and one by the university boards of trustees. These metrics were chosen after reviewing over 40 metrics identified in the University Work Plans.

The model has four guiding principles: 1) use metrics that align with SUS Strategic Plan goals, 2) reward Excellence or Improvement, 3) have a few clear, simple metrics, and 4) acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

### Key components of the model:

- Institutions will be evaluated on either Excellence or Improvement for each metric.
- Data is based on one-year data.
- The benchmarks for Excellence were based on the Board of Governors 2025 System Strategic Plan goals and analysis of relevant data trends, whereas the benchmarks for Improvement were determined after reviewing data trends for each metric.
- The Florida Legislature and Governor determine the amount of new state funding and an amount of institutional funding that would come from each university's recurring state base appropriation.

### Metrics Common to all Institutions:

Seven metrics apply to all eleven institutions. The eighth metric, graduate degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis (8a), applies to all institutions except New College. The alternative metric for New College (8b) is "freshman in the top 10% of graduating high school class."

Metrics Common to all Institutions	
1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed (Earning \$25,000+) or Continuing their Education	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis
2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time	7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)
3. Average Cost to the Student (Net Tuition per 120 Credit Hours)	8a. Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis 8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class – for NCF only
4. Four Year Graduation Rate (Full-time FTIC)	9. Board of Governors Choice - Percent of Bachelor's Degrees without Excess Hours
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	10. Board of Trustees Choice

**Board Choice Metric** - All universities should be working to improve the percentage of degrees awarded without excess credit hours.

**Board of Trustees Choice Metric** - Each Board of Trustees has chosen a metric from the remaining metrics in the University Work Plans that are applicable to the mission of that university and have not been previously chosen for the model.

### How will the funding component of the model work?

To ensure each university is striving to excel and improve on key metrics, there must be a financial incentive. That financial incentive will not only be new state funding, but an amount of the base state funding reallocated.

## Board of Governors

### Performance Funding Model Overview

---

#### **State Investment versus Institutional Base Funding:**

The amount of the state investment appropriated by the Legislature and Governor for performance funding will be matched by an amount reallocated from the university system base budget. These “institutional base” funds are the cumulative recurring state appropriations the Legislature has appropriated to each institution. Any state investment funding appropriated would be allocated as follows:

#### State Investment Funding Allocation

1. Each university metric is evaluated based on Excellence or Improvement and has ten benchmarks ranging from low to high. The lowest benchmark receives one point, while the highest receives ten points. The higher point value for Excellence or Improvement on each metric are counted in the university’s total score.
2. The state investment will be allocated based on points earned, with a maximum of 100 points possible.
3. A university is required to earn more than 50 points in order to be eligible to receive the state investment.
4. A university not meeting the required point threshold or the three lowest scoring universities will not receive any of the state investment.
5. A university that is not one of the three lowest scoring institutions and has earned more than the required point threshold will receive the state investment funds proportional to their existing base funds with the highest scoring universities eligible for additional state investment funds.
6. All ties within the scoring will be broken using the Board’s approved tiebreaker procedure:
  - a. Compare the total of Excellence and Improvement scores
  - b. Give advantage to higher points earned through Excellence
  - c. Score metric by metric giving a point to the school with the higher score
  - d. If tied after three levels of tiebreakers, the tie will go to the benefit of the institutions

#### Institutional Base Funding Allocation

1. A prorated amount will be deducted from each university’s base recurring state appropriation.
2. A university earning more than 50 points will have their institutional investment funding restored.
3. A university scoring 50 points or less will have to submit an improvement plan to the Board of Governors and show improvement according to that approved plan in order to have their institutional investment funding restored.

### **5.001 Performance-Based Funding**

(1) The Performance Based Funding (PBF) model is based upon four guiding principles:

- (a) Align with the State University System's (SUS) Strategic Plan goals;
- (b) Reward excellence and improvement;
- (c) Have a few clear, simple metrics; and
- (d) Acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

(2) The PBF model measures institutional excellence and improvement of performance using metrics adopted by the Board of Governors. The metrics include graduation rates; retention rates; post-graduation education rates; degree production; affordability; post-graduation employment and salaries, including wage thresholds that reflect the added value of a baccalaureate degree; access; and other metrics that may be approved by the Board in a formally noticed meeting.

(3) The performance of an institution is evaluated based on benchmarks adopted by the Board of Governors for each metric. For each fiscal year, the amount of funds available for allocation to SUS institutions shall consist of the state's investment, plus the institutional investment from each institution's base budget, as determined in the General Appropriations Act. The amount of institutional investment withheld from each SUS institution shall be a proportional amount based on each institution's recurring base state funds to the total SUS recurring base state funds (excluding special units). Florida Polytechnic University is not included in the model until such time as data is readily available.

(4) On a 100-point scale, a threshold of 51-points is established as the minimum number of total points needed to be eligible for the state's investment.

- (a) All SUS institutions eligible for the state's investment shall have their proportional amount of institutional investment restored.
- (b) The three universities with the lowest points, regardless of whether they meet the 51-point threshold, are not eligible for the state's investment. The proportional amount of the state's investment that would have been distributed to the three lowest scoring institutions will be distributed to the top three scoring institutions based on the total points of the top three scoring eligible institutions.
- (c) Institutions eligible for the state's investment shall receive an amount based on their prorated share of recurring state base funds to the total SUS recurring base state funds.

(5) Any institution that fails to meet the minimum threshold of 51-points for the state's investment shall submit a final improvement plan to the Board of Governors for consideration at its June meeting that specifies the activities and strategies for

improving the institution's performance. As of July 1, 2016, an institution is limited to only one improvement plan.

- (a) The Board of Governors will monitor the institution's progress on implementing the activities and strategies specified in the plan, and the Chancellor shall withhold disbursement of the institutional investment until the improvement plan monitoring report for each institution is approved by the Board of Governors.
  - (b) Improvement plan monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Board of Governors no later than December 31 and May 31 of each fiscal year.
  - (c) The December 31 monitoring report will be considered by the Board of Governors at its January meeting and if it is determined that the institution is making satisfactory progress on implementing the plan, the institution shall receive up to 50 percent of its institutional investment.
  - (d) The May 31 monitoring report will be considered by the Board of Governors at its June meeting and if it is determined that the institution has fully completed the plan, the institution shall receive the remaining balance of its institutional investment.
  - (e) Any institution that fails to make satisfactory progress shall not have its full institutional investment restored, and any institutional investment funds remaining shall be distributed to the three institutions that demonstrate the most improvement on the metrics based upon those institutions' share of total improvement points.
- (6) If an institution, after the submission of one improvement plan, subsequently fails to meet the 51-point threshold, its institutional investment will be redistributed to the institutions meeting the 51-point threshold, based on the points earned by each institution.
- (7) In the case of a tie in the number of points earned, the Board of Governors shall implement a tie breaker in the order shown as follows:
- (a) Compare the total of excellence and improvement scores;
  - (b) Compare only the excellence scores;
  - (c) Score metric by metric giving a point to the institution with the higher score; and
  - (d) If still tied, the tie will go to the benefit of the institutions, irrespective of whether the institutions are tied for placement among the top three scoring institutions or are tied for placement among the bottom three institutions.
- (8) By October 1 of each year, the Board of Governors shall submit a report to the Governor, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives on the previous fiscal year's performance funding allocation, including the rankings and award distributions.



Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const., Section 1001.92, Florida Statutes; History:  
New 9-22-16.

## PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING 2018 METRIC DEFINITIONS

### 1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+)

One Year After Graduation

This metric is based on the percentage of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are enrolled or employed (earning at least \$25,000) somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers and are not found enrolled are excluded. This data now includes non-Florida data from 41 states and districts, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) and Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

### 2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time

One Year After Graduation

This metric is based on annualized Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage data from the fourth fiscal quarter after graduation for bachelor's recipients. This data does not include individuals who are self-employed, employed by the military, those without a valid social security number, or making less than minimum wage. This data now includes non-Florida data from 41 states and districts, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) and Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

### 3. Cost to the Student

Net Tuition & Fees  
for Resident Undergraduates  
per 120 Credit Hours

This metric is based on resident undergraduate student tuition and fees, books and supplies as calculated by the College Board (which serves as a proxy until a university work group makes an alternative recommendation), the average number of credit hours attempted by students who were admitted as FTIC and graduated with a bachelor's degree for programs that requires 120 credit hours, and financial aid (grants, scholarships and waivers) provided to resident undergraduate students (does not include unclassified students).

Source: State University Database System (SUDS), the Legislature's annual General Appropriations Act, and university required fees.

### 4. Four Year FTIC Graduation Rate

This metric is based on the percentage of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students who started in the Fall (or summer continuing to Fall) term and were enrolled full-time in their first semester and had graduated from the same institution by the summer term of their fourth year. FTIC includes 'early admits' students who were admitted as a degree-seeking student prior to high school graduation.

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

### 5. Academic Progress Rate

2nd Year Retention  
with GPA Above 2.0

This metric is based on the percentage of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students who started in the Fall (or summer continuing to Fall) term and were enrolled full-time in their first semester and were still enrolled in the same institution during the Fall term following their first year with had a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 at the end of their first year (Fall, Spring, Summer).

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

### 6. Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

This metric is based on the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded within the programs designated by the Board of Governors as 'Programs of Strategic Emphasis'. A student who has multiple majors in the subset of targeted Classification of Instruction Program codes will be counted twice (i.e., double-majors are included).

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

### 7. University Access Rate

*Percent of Undergraduates  
with a Pell-grant*

This metric is based the number of undergraduates, enrolled during the fall term, who received a Pell-grant during the fall term. Unclassified students, who are not eligible for Pell-grants, were excluded from this metric.

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

### 8a. Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

This metric is based on the number of graduate degrees awarded within the programs designated by the Board of Governors as 'Programs of Strategic Emphasis'. A student who has multiple majors in the subset of targeted Classification of Instruction Program codes will be counted twice (i.e., double-majors are included).

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

## PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING 2018 METRIC DEFINITIONS

### 8b. Freshmen in Top 10% of High School Class

Applies only to: NCF

Percent of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school class rank within the top 10% of their graduating high school class.

Source: New College of Florida as reported to the Common Data Set.

### BOG Choice Metric

### 9. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

This metric is based on the percentage of baccalaureate degrees awarded within 110% of the credit hours required for a degree based on the Board of Governors Academic Program Inventory. Note: It is important to note that the statutory provisions of the "Excess Hour Surcharge" (1009.286, FS) have been modified several times by the Florida Legislature, resulting in a phased-in approach that has created three different cohorts of students with different requirements. The performance funding metric data is based on the latest statutory requirements that mandates 110% of required hours as the threshold. In accordance with statute, this metric excludes the following types of student credits (ie, accelerated mechanisms, remedial coursework, non-native credit hours that are not used toward the degree, non-native credit hours from failed, incomplete, withdrawn, or repeated courses, credit hours from internship programs, credit hours up to 10 foreign language credit hours, and credit hours earned in military science courses that are part of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program).

Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

## PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING 2018 METRIC DEFINITIONS

### BOT Choice Metrics

<b>10a. Percent of R&amp;D Expenditures Funded from External Sources</b> FAMU	This metric reports the amount of research expenditures that was funded from federal, private industry and other (non-state and non-institutional) sources. Source: Accountability Report (Table 6A), National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).
<b>10b. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities</b> FAU, FGCU, FIU	This metric is the number, or percentage, of baccalaureate degrees granted in an academic year to Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic students. This metric does not include students classified as Non-Resident Alien or students with a missing race code. Source: Accountability Report (Table 4I), State University Database System (SUDS).
<b>10c. National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on U.S. and World News</b> FSU	This metric is based on the difference between the Financial Resources rank and the overall University rank. U.S. News measures financial resources by using a two-year average spending per student on instruction, research, student services and related educational expenditures - spending on sports, dorms and hospitals doesn't count. Source: US News and World Report's annual National University rankings.
<b>10d. Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course</b> NCF	This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduate seniors who participate in a research course during their senior year. Source: New College of Florida.
<b>10e. Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded Annually</b> UCF	This metric is the number of baccalaureate degrees granted in an academic year. Students who earned two distinct degrees in the same academic year were counted twice; students who completed multiple majors or tracks were only counted once. Source: Accountability Report (Table 4G), State University Database System (SUDS).
<b>10f. Number of Licenses/Options Executed Annually</b> UF	This metric is the total number of licenses and options executed annually as reported to Association of Technology Managers (AUTM). The benchmarks are based on UF's rank within AAU institutions. Source: Accountability Report (Table 6A), University of Florida.
<b>10g. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses</b> UNF	This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduate full-time equivalent (FTE) students enrolled in online courses. The FTE student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll by course level. Distance Learning is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.). Source: Accountability Report (Table 3C), State University Database System (SUDS).
<b>10h. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees</b> USF	This metric is based on the number of post-doctoral appointees at the beginning of the academic year. A postdoctoral researcher has recently earned a doctoral (or foreign equivalent) degree and has a temporary paid appointment to focus on specialized research/scholarship under the supervision of a senior scholar. Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).
<b>10i. Percentage of Adult Undergraduates Enrolled</b> UWF	This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduates (enrolled during the fall term) who are at least 25 years old at the time of enrollment. This includes undergraduates who are unclassified (not degree-seeking) students. Source: State University Database System (SUDS).



# Information BRIEF

[www.flbog.edu](http://www.flbog.edu)

## Performance Based Funding - Schedule of Changes in Common Metrics

October 2018

### Performance Based Funding Metric Changes

The Board of Governors workshop changes to Performance Based Funding (PBF) metrics in October of each year and vote on them in November of each year. The changes become effective the following June when the next PBF scoring and allocations take place.

Data is submitted throughout the fall and not finalized until university Trustees review and approve. Data for the PBF metrics is finalized in March of each year by the Board of Governors. Metrics and benchmarks are not changed after November unless there is a legislative act requiring the Board to change the metrics.

Below is a schedule of metric changes.

Fiscal Year		FY2013-14	FY2014-15	FY2015-16	FY2016-17	FY2017-18	FY2018-19
1	% Enrolled or Employed FT in FL	AY2010-11	AY2011-12	.	.	.	.
	% Enrolled or Employed FT in U.S.	.	.	AY2012-13	AY2013-14	.	.
	% Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+) in U.S.	.	.	.	.	AY2014-15	AY2015-16
2	Median FT Wage in Florida	AY2010-11	AY2011-12	AY2012-13	AY2013-14	.	.
	Median FT Wage in U.S.	.	.	.	.	AY2014-15	AY2015-16
3	Cost of Bachelor's to the Institution	FY2008-12	FY2009-13	FY2010-14	FY2011-15	.	.
	Cost of Bachelor's to Student	.	.	.	.	AY2015-16	AY2016-17
4	FTIC 6yr Grad Rate (FT & PT)	.	2007-13	2008-14	2009-15	2010-16	.
	FTIC 4yr Grad Rate (FT only)*	.	.	.	.	.	2013-17
5	Academic Progress Rate	.	Fall 2012 to Fall 2013	Fall 2013 to Fall 2014	Fall 2014 to Fall 2015	Fall 2015 to Fall 2016	Fall 2016 to Fall 2017
6	% Bachelor's PSE Degrees	.	AY2012-13	AY2013-14	AY2014-15	AY2015-16	AY2016-17
7	Access Rate* (benchmark change only)	.	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
8	% Graduate PSE Degrees	.	AY2012-13	AY2013-14	AY2014-15	AY2015-16	AY2016-17
# OF CHANGES TO COMMON METRICS		.	5	1	0	3	1
*Legislative act							

Performance Based Funding Model 2018-19 Benchmarks											
		EXCELLENCE <i>(Achieving System Goals)</i>									
Points		10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Key Metrics Common to All Universities											
1	Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed (\$25,000+) and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 Yr after Graduation	72.8%	70.5%	68.3%	66.0%	63.7%	61.4%	59.2%	56.9%	54.6%	52.3%
2	Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year After Graduation	\$40,700	\$38,200	\$35,700	\$33,200	\$30,700	\$28,200	\$25,700	\$23,200	\$20,700	\$18,200
3	Net Tuition & Fees per 120 Credit Hours	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$11,000	\$12,000	\$13,000	\$14,000	\$15,000	\$16,000	\$17,000	\$18,000
4	Four Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time FTIC</i>	50%	48.8%	47.5%	46.3%	45%	43.8%	42.5%	41.3%	40%	38.8%
5	Academic Progress Rate <i>2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0</i>	90%	88.8%	87.5%	86.3%	85%	83.8%	82.5%	81.3%	80%	78.8%
6	Bachelor's Degree's Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis <i>(includes STEM)</i>	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%
7	University Access Rate <i>Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant</i>	42%	38%	34%	30%	26%	22%	18%	14%	10%	6%
8.A.	Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis <i>(includes STEM)</i>	60%	57.5%	55%	52.5%	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%
8.B.	Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class <i>(Alternative metric for NCF only)</i>	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%
9	Percent of Bachelor's Degrees without Excess Hours	80%	77.5%	75%	72.5%	70%	67.5%	65%	62.5%	60%	57.5%
		IMPROVEMENT									
% Improvement		5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%
Points		10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Note: For Metric 3 only the percentage improvement should be negative in order to receive points.

Performance Based Funding Model 2018-19 Benchmarks											
		EXCELLENCE (Achieving System Goals)									
Points		10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Metric 10</b>											
10.A.	FAMU - Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources	80%	78%	76%	74%	72%	70%	68%	66%	64%	62%
10.B.	FAU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	40%	38%	36%	34%	32%	30%	28%	26%	24%	22%
10.B.	FGCU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	452	450	448	446	444	442	440	438	436	434
10.B.	FIU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%	25%	22.5%	20%	17.5%
10.C.	FSU - National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on a US and World News Report	75	67	59	51	43	35	27	19	11	3
10.D.	NCF - Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course	100%	99.5%	99%	98.5%	98%	97.5%	97%	96.5%	96%	95.5%
10.E.	UCF - Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually	12,300	12,250	12,200	12,150	12,100	12,050	12,000	11,950	11,900	11,850
10.F.	UF - Number of Licenses/Options Executed Annually	1st-10th	11th-20th	21st-30th	31st-40th	41st-50th	51st-60th	61st-70th	71st-80th	81st-90th	91st-100th
10.G.	UNF - Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses	13%	12%	11%	10%	9%	8%	7%	6%	5%	4%
10.H.	USF - Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	200	190	180	170	160	150	140	130	120	110
10.I.	UWF - Number of Undergraduate Students Aged 25 and Older Enrolled in Fall	25%	24%	23%	22%	21%	20%	19%	18%	17%	16%

Note: 10.H. The USF System revised the benchmark to match the Florida Preeminence criteria and be consistent with PBF Metrics 4 and 5 (excellence threshold is same as Preeminence threshold).

**Metric 10**  
**Status Report**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Current Metric</b>	<b>Three Options Submitted</b>	<b>Oct 2017 Workshop</b>	<b>Nov 2017 Board Meeting</b>	<b>Institution Choice</b>
<b>FAMU</b>	10.A. Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources	1. Total Degrees Awarded (Bachelor's and Graduate) 2. 4-Year Graduation Rates for Transfers with AA Degrees from FCS 3. Number of FCS Transfers with AA Degrees (Headcount Enrollment)	Discussed combining 4-Year Graduation Rates for Transfers w/ AA degrees and Number of Transfers w/ AA Degrees.	Proposal made to combine the two metrics: Increased Number of Degrees for Transfers with AA Degrees.  Discussed difficulty with a compound metric and metrics out of their control. 4-Year Graduation Rates for Transfers also discussed.	Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Transfers with AA Degrees from FCS
<b>FAU</b>	10.B. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	1. Bachelor's Degree Awarded to Minorities 2. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Distance Learning Courses 3. Total Research Expenditures	Discussed keeping FAU at their current metric, Bachelors Degrees Awarded to Minorities.	Proposal made to keep current metric.  Discussed Total Research Expenditures.	Total Research Expenditures
<b>FGCU</b>	10.B. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	1. Bachelor's degrees awarded annually to minorities (African American and Hispanic) 2. Bachelor's degrees awarded 3. Total research expenditures (in millions)	Discussion focused on Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually to Minorities. Discussed quality vs. quantity in scoring (number vs. percentage).	Proposal made to re-word: Increase Percentage of Degrees Awarded Annually to African American and Hispanic Students	Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually to African American and Hispanic Students
<b>FIU</b>	10.B. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	1. Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees 2. Average GPA of Incoming Freshmen 3. Total R&D Expenditures in Millions	Discussed Average GPA of Incoming Freshmen.	Proposal made for Average GPA of Incoming Freshmen.  Discussed Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees.	Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees
<b>FSU</b>	10.C. National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on a US and World News Report	1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates who took an Entrepreneurship Class 2. Four-Year Graduation Rate for FTIC Pell Students 3. Percent of Undergraduates Engaged in High-Impact Experiential Learning per Year	FSU President asked committee to consider Bachelor's Graduates who took an Entrepreneurship Class. Committee discussed re-working benchmarks.	Proposal made for Bachelor's Graduates who took an Entrepreneurship Class and to possibly re-work benchmarks to be higher.	Percent of Bachelor's Graduates who took an Entrepreneurship Class
<b>NCF</b>	10.D. Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course	1. Percent of alumni donors 2. Percent of undergraduate transfer students 3. Percent of graduates completing 3+ types of high-impact practices at New College	Discussed Percent of Graduates Completing 3+ Types of High-Impact Practices, which was NCF President first choice.	Proposal made for Percent of Graduates Completing 3+ Types of High-Impact Practice.	Percent of FTIC Graduates Completing 3+ High-Impact Practices

10/5/2018



**Metric 10  
Status Report**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Current Metric</b>	<b>Three Options Submitted</b>	<b>Oct 2017 Workshop</b>	<b>Nov 2017 Board Meeting</b>	<b>Institution Choice</b>
<b>UCF</b>	10.E. Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually	1. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to African-American & Hispanic Students 2. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses 3. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually	Discussed Percent of Degrees Awarded to African-American and Hispanic Students.	Proposal made for Percent of Degrees Awarded to African-American and Hispanic Student.	Percent of Degrees Awarded to African-American and Hispanic Student
<b>UF</b>	10.F. Number of Licenses/Options Executed Annually	1. Six-Year Graduation rate 2. Four-Year Minority Graduation rates 3. Capital Campaign	Discussion focused on 4- or 6-Year Graduation Rates.	Proposal made for 4-Year Graduation Rate for African-American and Hispanic Students.  Discussion: UF would like to focus on 6-Year Grad Rates.	6-Year Graduation Rates
<b>UNF</b>	10.G. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses	1. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses 2. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Engaged in Internships 3. Number of Students Engaged in Original Scholarly Work under the Direction of a Faculty Member	Discussed keeping UNF at their current metric, Percent of Undergrads in Online Courses.	Proposal made to keep current metric.	Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses
<b>USF</b>	10.H. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	1. FTIC 6-Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time students) 2. Percent of Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health 3. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	USF President proposed new metric (not on their Board approved list), 4-Year Graduation Rate for African-American and Hispanic Students.	USF BOT Chair would like to go back to their original first choice, 6-Year Graduation Rates.	6-Year Graduation Rates
<b>UWF</b>	10.I. Number of Undergraduate Students Aged 25 and Older Enrolled in Fall	1. NSSE Results (participation rates) in two or more "High-Impact Practices" subsections for seniors 2. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses 3. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees in STEM and Health	Discussion focused on NSSE Results (participation rates) in 2+ High-Impact Practices Subsections for Seniors. Committee proposed changing it to all students.	Proposal made for NSSE Results (participation rates) in 2+ High-Impact Practices Subsections (would apply to all students).	Percent of Baccalaureate Graduates Completing 2+ Types of High-Impact Practice





STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM  
of FLORIDA  
Board of Governors

**AGENDA**  
**Facilities Committee Workshop**  
**Ballroom**  
**Marshall Student Center**  
**University of South Florida**  
**4103 USF Cedar Circle**  
**Tampa, Florida 33620**  
**Thursday, October 16, 2018**  
**10:45 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

**or**

**Upon Adjournment of Previous Meetings**

**Chair: Mr. H. Wayne Huizenga, Jr.; Vice Chair: Dr. Fernando Valverde**  
**Members: Felton, Jordan, Kitson, Lautenbach, Morton, Patel**

1. **Call to Order and Opening Remarks** **Governor H. Wayne Huizenga, Jr.**
2. **Housing Study** **Mr. Chris Kinsley**  
*Assistant Vice Chancellor for  
Finance & Facilities*
3. **P3 Guidelines** **Mr. Kinsley**
4. **SUS PECO Project Presentations** **University Representatives**
5. **Concluding Remarks and Adjournment** **Governor Huizenga**

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Facilities Committee  
October 16, 2018**

**SUBJECT:** Fall Housing Occupancy Levels Report

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

For information

**AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION**

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

At its meeting held January 25, 2017, the Committee reviewed detailed information concerning each university's housing system, including information regarding current and historical rates charged to students. One outcome of the meeting was the approval of an amendment to Board Regulation 9.008, University Facilities with Outstanding Revenue Bonds, effective 06-22-17, which enhanced university transparency and reporting of all auxiliary operations with outstanding bonds.

As a further continuation of that effort, Board staff coordinated a Data Request in order to collect updated University Housing occupancy and rate information for Fall 2018, as well as Fall 2017, for historical comparison purposes.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** 2018 Housing Update

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Mr. Chris Kinsley

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
University Housing Data  
*prepared on September 19, 2018*

UWF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	1563	1345	1496	1321	\$2,900
Percentage	97%	86.10%	91.70%	88.30%	\$3,000

FPU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	665	637	697	698	\$ 2,970.00
Percentage	89.5%	84.0%	92.0%	92.1%	\$ 4,032.00

FAMU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 7, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	2593	2549	2534	2494	2,719
Percentage	92	98.3	92	97.92	3,406

FIU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	3,269/3,302	3,257/3,302	3,273/3,302	3,298/3,302	\$2,250
Percentage	99.00%	98.64%	99.12%	99.88%	\$2,850

UNF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	3259/3504	3383/3504	3259/3504	3435/3504	2,250
Percentage	93.00%	96.54%	93.00%	98.03%	3,300

UCF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	6296	6416	6296	6362	\$2,470
Percentage	98.00%	99.82%	98.00%	98.88%	\$2,835

UCF Rosen Campus				
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Beds	376	384	376	373
Percentage	98.00%	100.00%	98.00%	97.14%

UCF Campus Adjacent - NorthView				
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Beds	582	592	582	588
Percentage	98.00%	99.66%	98.00%	98.99%

UCF TOTAL				
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Beds	7254	7392	7254	7323
Percentage	98.00%	99.66%	98.00%	98.80%

UCF Affiliated Housing - Knights Circle				
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Beds	3752	3742	3752	3742
Percentage	100%	99.50%	100%	99.60%

Board of Governors Committee Meetings - Facilities Committee

USF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	5296	5457	5975	5830	\$ 2,954.00
Percentage	95.0%	97.9%	95.0%	92.7%	\$ 4,378.00

FSU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 12, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	6712	6692	6684	6613	2,995
Percentage	100%	99.70%	100%	98.90%	3,740

FGCU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	4558	4632	4605	4754	\$2,410
Percentage	96.00%	97.56%	97.00%	100.13%	\$2,410

UF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	7860	7987	7849	7989	\$2,648
Percentage	98.5	100.1	98.5	100.3	\$3,729

FAU					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Boca	3915	4182	3998	4356	\$3,050
Percentage	94.0%	100.4%	96.0%	104.5%	\$3,650

	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Jupiter	254	259	259	258
Percentage	94.0%	95.9%	96.0%	95.6%

	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018
Both Campuses	4169	4441	4257	4614
Percentage	94.0%	100.1%	96.0%	104.0%

NCF					
	Projected Fall 2017 Occupancy	Actual Fall 2017 Occupancy	Projected Fall 2018 Occupancy	Fall Occupancy as of Sep. 1, 2018	Lowest - Highest Rate Double per Semester 2018
Beds	8/18/17 - 699	9/1/17 - 683	8/17/18 - 648	9/1/18 - 633	\$2,256
Percentage	8/18/17 - 111.13%	9/1/17 - 108.59%	8/17/18 - 103.02%	9/1/18 - 100.64%	\$4,048

Percentage is calculated based on NCF current housing capacity, 629.

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Facilities Committee  
October 16, 2018**

**SUBJECT:** Public Private Partnership Guidelines

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Discussion of potential amendments to the Public Private Partnership Guidelines.

**AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION**

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution; Sections 1013.171, Florida Statutes

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The initial Public-Private Partnerships Guidelines (P3 Guidelines) were approved by the Board on September 3, 2015. The Guidelines provide a conceptual framework intended to inform both the board of trustees as well as the Board of Governors with respect to key aspects useful in evaluating proposals.

The Facilities Committee was given a retrospective presentation at its March meeting on the working effectiveness of the P3 Guidelines, and suggested that Board staff work with the universities as well as Bond Finance to develop proposed amendments to improve the current process. Accordingly, a workshop was held on July 13, 2017, where Board staff, the Division of Bond Finance staff, and university staff met to discuss the Guidelines and proposed changes. The proposed changes were included as a discussion item at the 2017 Facilities Workshop.

During 2018, no P3's have been placed on the agenda for consideration by the Board of Governors. Only 3 P3 Projects have made it to the staff review level. Of these 3, 2 were converted by the university to bond deals, with the one P3 project remaining still outstanding. Meanwhile over the same time frame, 2 debt deals were fully approved by the Board.

The draft amendments reflect possible changes in language to address certain concerns that have surfaced in the course of implementing the P3 Guidelines.

The proposed amendments for discussion are:

### **Eliminate the LLC exception**

Current state: Section II, (c), “Projects not subject to the Guidelines” contains an exemption for certain transactions between a limited liability company (LLC) in which the university and/or DSO is a controlling member or manager and a private party. The provision permits an LLC to enter into a transaction with a private party for financing and construction of a facility without Board approval where the real property involved is not owned by the university or by the state and leased to the university, and the property is not on-campus or next to campus.

Proposed Amendment: Eliminate

Rationale: The LLC exception has seen limited use (1 project), and the exception did not save either staff time or project development time; i.e., it would have been faster and simpler to have the project come to the Board for consideration.

### **Clarifies that market demand testing is permissible**

Current state: Universities have authority to conduct pre-solicitation conferences or Request for Information solicitation activities. However, the P3 Guidelines are silent regarding these activities.

Proposed Amendment: Spells out the pre-solicitation activities and makes clear that, though not required, these tools may be used to explore the market and receive input from the vendor community. The proposed amendment will also require information used as part of the pre-solicitation procedure to be provided with any eventual request for P3 approval.

Rationale: Clarifies that pre-solicitation fact-finding is a permitted activity which may assist universities with determining the feasibility of moving forward with a proposed P3 transaction. This is developing as a national best practice for P3s.

### **Clarifies lease term**

Current state: Section V, (k), provides that the term of any lease agreement may not exceed forty (40) years or the life expectancy of the facility.



Proposed Amendment: Establishes that 40 years is not a bright line test, but an analytical threshold. Clarifies that for student life projects, the lease term may not exceed the life expectancy of a facility which is fifty (50) years as established in section 1013.64, Florida Statutes. However, all leases in excess of forty (40) years will still require a demonstration of benefits for any term exceeding 40. For other projects (non-student life), the proposed amendment will require the lease term to be supported by information establishing the expected useful life of the facility based on industry practice for the proposed type of facility.

Rationale: Experience over the past two years indicates that a 50 year term for student life facilities, which is the current P3 life expectancy for such projects, is the industry expectation. Terms shorter than 50 years do not reduce the private partner return on investment; rather, the shorter term increases student rates over the life of the project, and reduces yield of the university share of the project revenues. For non-student life facilities, a requirement to demonstrate industry practice for the proposed facility type is proposed.

#### **Eliminates the advance approval process**

Current state: In section VI, the P3 Guidelines provide for an advance approval process for P3 projects and sets out the procedures to follow.

Proposed Amendment: Eliminate the advance approval process.

Rationale: Since the effective date of the P3 Guidelines, only one project has been submitted for advance approval. Board staff found the process impractical since enough information was not available to properly evaluate the project and the project ultimately was required to go through the full approval process.

#### **Increases university disclosure requirements**

Current state: The P3 Guidelines currently require a “summary of key terms” of the lease as a required document. The P3 Guidelines don’t specify when a university P3 solicitation, such as an Invitation to Negotiate (ITN), must be provided to Board and Division of Bond Finance staff.

Proposed Amendment: Requires that a full draft lease be required in place of the “Summary of key terms” and that a copy of the ITN be provided at the time it is publicly posted.

Rationale: Contract review cannot take place without the contract in hand and it has been our experience that a summary of key terms is insufficient. In practice, ITN notification has varied widely; this will standardize university submission expectations.

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Draft Revised Guidelines

**Facilitators/Presenters:** Mr. Chris Kinsley



## **PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP GUIDELINES**

**Table of Contents**

I. PURPOSE OF GUIDELINES ..... 3

II. DEFINITIONS ..... 3

III. USE OF QUALIFIED PROFESSIONALS ..... 5

IV. PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES ..... 6

V. PROJECT FEASIBILITY AND REQUIREMENTS ..... 7

VI. APPROVAL PROCESS AND REQUIRED INFORMATION ..... 9

VII. TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT ..... 15

VIII. REPORTING REQUIREMENT ..... 17

IX. BOARD OF GOVERNORS POWERS ..... 18

DRAFT

## I. PURPOSE OF GUIDELINES

Section 1013.171(1), Florida Statutes, authorizes each university board of trustees to negotiate and enter into agreements to lease real property under its jurisdiction to non-profit and for-profit corporations registered by the Secretary of State to do business in this state, for the purposes of erecting thereon facilities and accommodations necessary and desirable to serve the needs and purposes of the university, as determined by the system-wide strategic plan adopted by the Board of Governors. Section 1004.28(6), Florida Statutes, specifies that agreements by a DSO to finance, design and construct, lease, lease-purchase, purchase, or operate facilities are likewise subject to the provisions of sections 1013.171 and 1010.62, Florida Statutes. With regard to property that is owned by a direct support organization (DSO), section 1013.171(3) requires that the university board of trustees obtain a long-term lease from the DSO prior to construction of educational facilities. A long-term lease is defined as the greater of 40 years or the useful life of the facility.

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide: (i) a structure for the universities and university DSO to use in evaluating certain transactions with private third parties that will result in the construction of facilities for the use and/or benefit of a university, its students, faculty or staff, and (ii) the process for approval of such transactions. Monetization of existing university facilities is not permitted under these guidelines absent specific legislative authorization.

## II. DEFINITIONS

As used in these Guidelines, the term:

(a) "Facility" means a building or other facility and related improvements (but not landscaping or appurtenances alone) that: (i) is for purposes related to the housing, transportation (including parking), health care, research or research-related activities, food service, retail sales or student activities of the university or, if authorized by specific legislation, hotels, convention centers, stadiums or other facilities; (ii) is being constructed primarily for use by the university and/or its students, faculty, or staff; and (iii) is located on land under the jurisdiction of a state university, including property leased from the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund.

(b) "Public-Private Partnership" or "P3" means an agreement or agreements between a university board of trustees, or a DSO, and a Private Party whereby the Private Party will, at least, be responsible for the construction and capital financing of a Facility.

(c) “Private Party” means a natural person, corporation, general partnership, limited partnership, joint venture, business trust, public-benefit corporation, non-profit entity, or other private business entity.

(d) “Project” means a Private Party’s construction and capital financing of a Facility on the campus of a state university or on other real property directly owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the university or by the state and leased to the university, accomplished through a Public-Private Partnership, with the Project costs being paid for, whether up front or over time, with revenues generated by the Project or other university or DSO revenues allowable for such purpose pursuant to section 1010.62, Florida Statutes. Project costs shall include construction and financing and may also include design and/or operational costs of the Facility.

(e) “University Board” means a university’s Board of Trustees when acting as a board to review or approve a matter.

### **Projects not subject to the Guidelines**

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following transactions are not Projects and therefore not subject to these guidelines and may be accomplished by the universities or their DSOs in accordance with any requirements under applicable laws, regulations and Board of Governors’ and relevant university’s policies and guidelines:

(a) Any transaction where the university or the DSO will be directly responsible for repayment of any debt associated with the construction of a Facility pursuant to section 1010.62, Florida Statutes, and the Board of Governors’ Debt Management Guidelines.

(b) Any transaction where the university or DSO is hiring a Private Party to provide services including, but not limited to, management services agreements, unless such agreements involve a Private Party’s construction and financing of a new facility or facility renovations costing more than \$5,000,000.

~~(c) Any transaction between a limited liability company in which the university and/or DSO is a controlling member or the manager (LLC), and a Private Party for the capital financing and construction of a Facility on real property that is not directly owned by the university or by the state and leased to the university, and which is located off campus and not immediately adjacent to, or across a public way from, the university’s campus. However, the university shall notify the Board Office and the State Division of Bond Finance of any transaction contemplated by the LLC under this exception at least sixty (60) days prior to solicitation of binding agreements with the Private Party. The university shall provide any relevant information requested by the Board Office or the State Division of Bond Finance. If the information raises any issues~~

~~regarding the proposed Facilities, financing, activities, or operations to be conducted, then the Chancellor shall consult with the Chair of the Facilities Committee about whether to submit the proposed transaction to the Board of Governors for review.~~

(d) Any operating lease where the university or the DSO is the lessee for a building or portion thereof not on the university's campus.

(e) Any transaction involving construction of a Facility being funded solely with state fixed capital outlay appropriations or other legislative appropriation, or by those non-state source and other funds authorized pursuant to section 1013.74(2) (a), Florida Statutes, excluding lease arrangements otherwise controlled by these guidelines, or by other non-state source funds that are appropriate for use for the Project, or by both such appropriated state funds and non-state source funds.

(f) Any Project with a total cost of \$5,000,000 or less.

(g) Any Energy Performance-Based Contracts, in accordance with the provisions of section 1013.28, Florida Statutes, not to exceed \$10,000,000.

### **III. USE OF QUALIFIED PROFESSIONALS**

The use of qualified professionals, whether in-house or external to the university or DSO, or both, is essential to the success of any Project. A university or DSO should determine that current university or DSO staff have the requisite experience to negotiate the type of Project under consideration by the university and that, if necessary, external independent financial advisors and outside legal counsel, such as bond counsel, have been retained prior to Project solicitation as described in Section IV.

### **IV. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION OR PRE-SOLICITATION CONFERENCE**

A university may hold a pre-solicitation conference and/or issue a request for information to inform the business community of a potential opportunity, and to solicit feedback regarding the parameters and methodology of the solicitation prior to its formal release of a solicitation.

Any notice for a request for information or pre-solicitation conference should be advertised in conformance with the university's procurement announcement procedures or regulations. Neither a request for information, nor a pre-solicitation conference, are a

solicitation, and a university is not required to utilize any information, nor is a vendor who responds excluded from participating in any resulting solicitation.

In the event the university uses a pre-solicitation procedure, this information should be included in any submission of materials to the Board of Governors for consideration.

## **IVV. PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES**

(a) A university or DSO shall solicit proposals from Private Parties for the Project and provide an electronic copy of the solicitation document to the Board Office and the State Division of Bond Finance at the time it is disseminated. The solicitation should be in the form of an Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) or other procurement process to ensure the flexibility necessary to structure the Project in a manner that:

1. Is in the best interests of the university or the DSO.
2. Is for a Facility that is owned by the university or the DSO or for a Facility for which ownership will be conveyed to the university or the DSO. Removal of the Facility and restoration of the property at the option of the university or DSO by, or at the cost of, the Private Party upon the expiration or termination of the agreement may be provided to the extent permitted by law.
3. Includes a plan with adequate safeguards in place to reasonably mitigate and manage foreseeable risk of future costs or service disruptions for the university or the DSO in the event of material default or cancellation of the Public-Private Partnership. For example, restrictive covenants, recognition and subordination agreements, and/or recordation obligations, or other protections may reasonably protect the interests of the university or DSO in the Project and, if applicable, the real property owned or controlled by the university or the DSO on which the Project is located.
4. Has adequate safeguards in place to reasonably ensure that the university's or DSO's debt rating will not be adversely affected by the Project.
5. Assures an open, competitive and transparent procurement process.
6. Provides criteria and metrics to allow an objective evaluation of any competing respondents' proposals.

(b) At a minimum, the procurement process (which may be conducted in phases) should require the following information from respondents:



1. A description of the Facility, a schedule for the initiation and completion of the Facility, and the total Project cost based on the initially identified Project scope and conditions.
2. If applicable, a description of the method by which the Private Party proposes to secure the necessary property interests that are required for the Project.
3. A financing plan sufficient to determine the adequacy and expected type of revenues or assets to service the proposed debt or equity investment of the Private Party and related covenants or conditions. If the Private Party intends to use its own assets for the Project, sufficient information must be provided that substantiates the availability of the assets to be used for the Project (e.g., financial statements, etc.). For residence halls, parking facilities, and any other Facility where students will be charged a fee for use or occupancy of the Facility, an explanation of university involvement in establishing and overseeing the assessment of fees, a schedule detailing the proposed fees used to prepare pro-forma cash flows over the term of the Public-Private Partnership and the methodology, limits, and approvals for, and circumstances that would allow, increases to such fees over the term.
4. A description of the qualifications of the Private Party, the qualifications of any other entities that will provide services on the Project, and key persons who will be responsible for the Project.
5. A schedule of projected revenues, expenses, debt service, excess cash flow, the distribution of excess cash flow to the university, DSO or Private Party and the anticipated return on investment and internal rate of return to the Private Party for the term of the P3.

## **VI. PROJECT FEASIBILITY AND REQUIREMENTS**

Prior to entering into a binding agreement for a Public-Private Partnership subject to these guidelines, the university or DSO shall consider the feasibility of the Project and have sufficient information to determine:

- (a) The need for the Project in relation to other facility needs of the university and whether current or projected demand exists that is adequate in relation to the cost of the Project.

(b) The financial feasibility of the Project, including all sources of revenues necessary to fully fund the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project, together with an assessment of whether the total cost is reasonable in relation to similar facilities, taking into account the total value of the Project to meet university goals and the availability or unavailability of any lower-cost means to achieve the same total value, and for student facilities, such as housing, that costs to the student have been considered. To the extent the Project contemplates the payment of funds by the university or DSO in connection with required Project costs, such as debt service, utilities, or maintenance, then such revenues are subject to the revenue restrictions of section 1010.62, Florida Statutes, and applicable Debt Management Guidelines. If the Project contemplates mixed uses (e.g., housing, parking, retail sales, food service, etc.), the financial feasibility analysis should consider whether a functional relationship exists between the various uses, while not inequitably shifting additional costs to students if the Project entails student use.

(c) The cost of any services to be provided by the university or the DSO in relation to the Project.

(d) The effect, if any, of the Project on the university's or DSO's credit rating. If any debt of the University or DSO (direct or imputed by a rating agency) is being used to finance the Project, provide an explanation as to the effect, if any, of the Project on debt previously issued and an analysis of the impact, if any, on the financial performance of similar auxiliary enterprises and why the Project is not being included as a part of the existing auxiliary enterprise system.

(e) The percentage equity in the Project by the Private Party in relation to total Project costs, and the credit quality of all debt associated with the Project, including any public or indicative ratings provided by any rating agency.

(f) The projected revenues to be received by the university or DSO over the term of the agreement if the Project is revenue-generating, and the proposed use(s) of those revenues. For revenue-generating Projects utilizing debt, the projected revenues should provide a coverage ratio of 1.20x projected debt service during the first full year of Project operations and each subsequent year. If a coverage ratio of 1.20x is not projected to be achieved, a justification should be provided as to why the proposed debt does not meet this coverage ratio. If the Project only meets the required 1.2x debt service coverage ratio due to the deferral of debt repayment beyond the construction term of the Facility or using ascending debt service to reduce initial debt service payments, a justification should be provided as to why the structure does not comply with the Board's Debt Management Guidelines.

(g) The provision of an adequate reserve fund for expenses relating to operations, maintenance and renewal or replacement, if applicable.

(h) Any material economic, operational, or technological risks associated with the Project.

(i) Whether the Private Party has the available sources of funding or other financial resources that are necessary to carry out the Project.

(j) That the Private Party has sufficient staff with the necessary experience and qualifications to perform the construction activities and any operational, managerial, or technical services for the Project.

(k) For student life Projects (such as student housing or student parking), the term of any lease agreement associated with a Facility shall not exceed forty (40) years, or the life expectancy of the Facility, and shall include consideration for eventual ownership of the Facility by the university or DSO. As a practical consideration, the university shall provide a summary of its ownership interests in the property, including if applicable, the remaining term on the lease from the state. In making the determination of the life expectancy of the Facility, the standard fifty (50) year assumption found in section 1013.64 (1)(a), Florida Statutes, may be used, if the Facility is being constructed in conformity with university construction standards and codes. However, any lease term in excess of forty (40) years requires an analysis to demonstrate the benefits, including the additional cash flow distributions to the university, the DSO and the Private Party of the longer term period when compared to a 40 year term. The analysis shall also include a comparison of the return on investment and internal rate of return to the Private Party under a 40 year lease to the longer term. All other Projects require an analysis indicating that the lease term is reasonable based on industry norms; however, in no case may a lease exceed 99 years. As a practical consideration for all Projects, the university shall provide a summary of its ownership interests in the property, including if applicable, the remaining term on the lease from the state.

(l) The term of the debt should not exceed thirty (30) years, exclusive of the time required for construction of the Facility.

## **VII. APPROVAL PROCESS AND REQUIRED INFORMATION**

All Projects that are subject to these guidelines must be approved by the university board of trustees and the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors and the State Division of Bond Finance should be notified when a Project is contemplated by the university to come before the trustees for consideration.

In advance of entering into binding agreements for a Project that is subject to these guidelines, a university or DSO shall obtain approval by the Board of Governors. ~~Approval can be requested either prior to soliciting competitive bids or proposals for a Project if the university or DSO provides all necessary information to enable the Board of Governors to reach a determination, or at the conclusion of the negotiation process with the Private Party.~~

~~For Projects receiving advance approval from the Board of Governors, the university or DSO shall submit the final draft agreement with the Private Party and a certification to the Chancellor's Office at the conclusion of the negotiation process with the Private Party, but prior to the university or DSO entering into a binding agreement(s), that either: (i) affirms the final Project agreement(s) is within the parameters previously approved by the Board of Governors, or (ii) provides an explanation of the areas where the Project agreement(s) departs from those parameters. If the certification affirms the final Project agreement(s) is within the parameters previously approved by the Board, no further action of the Board is required unless the Chancellor, in consultation with the State Division of Bond Finance, within ten (10) business days of receiving the university or DSO's submission, concludes the final Project Agreement(s) is outside the scope of the prior approval. In that event, or if the certification indicates a departure from the prior approval, the final Project agreement(s) will be submitted to the Board of Governors for consideration.~~

(a) For Projects that are subject to these Guidelines, the following Project information is required to be submitted to the Board Office and to the State Division of Bond Finance no later than ninety (90) days prior to the meeting at which the issue could be considered by the Board of Governors. Universities may provide the information in advance of the competitive procurement process, or at any stage during the procurement process ~~if seeking prior approval:~~

1. Evidence of approval of the Project by the university board of trustees for both university and DSO projects, and by the DSO board for DSO projects, or the dates on which all such required approvals have been scheduled and noticed. ~~For advance approval, evidence that the university board of trustees or DSO has approved the parameters of the Project and will be responsible for reviewing and approving the final Project prior to the university or DSO entering into binding agreement(s) for the Project, and the names and qualifications of any external legal and financial experts who will advise the university or DSO.~~
2. The Facility Program, feasibility studies or consultant reports (if available), and any financial studies or analysis of the financial feasibility of the Project, including the impact of the Project on similar activities of the university.

3. An analysis that provides the quantitative metrics justifying the need for the construction of the Project.
4. A copy of the proposed agreement(s) ~~or a statement of key terms of the proposed agreement(s)~~ with the Private Party, and letter from legal counsel describing, with particularity, the provisions in the agreement(s) that are designed to protect the university or the DSO in the event of a material default by the Private Party. ~~If seeking advance approval, information must be submitted explaining the key terms of the proposed agreement(s) including: (i) the maximum term of the lease and the term of the debt, and provisions designed to protect the university or the DSO in the event of a material default; (ii) a description of financing options and parameters; (iii) what will be required of the Private Party to demonstrate the ability to obtain financing and, if applicable, service the Project; (iv) the type of experience and qualifications the Private Party and its key personnel should possess; (v) the anticipated schedule for solicitation, negotiation, design and construction; (vi) a statement whether the university or DSO will own the Facility upon the end of the term or may have an option to require the Private Party to remove the Facility at its own expense; (vii) a statement explaining options for addressing maintenance and repairs of the Facility; (viii) projections showing anticipated revenues, expenses, debt service, excess cash flow, and the expected return on investment and internal rate of return to the Private Party for the term of the Project; (ix) and an explanation of university or DSO involvement, methodology, limits, or controls in approving initial and future fees or rental rates if student fees or rental rates are a source of revenue for the Project, including a description of the parameters applicable to such fees or rental rates (e.g., not more than X% above the cost of comparable existing facilities or existing fees).~~
5. An analysis calculating the expected rate of return for a revenue-generating Project or other appropriate quantitative metrics, and the anticipated uses of any revenues returned to the university or DSO.
6. Information demonstrating the provision of an adequate reserve fund for expenses relating to operations, maintenance and renewal or replacement, if applicable.
7. A cost benefit analysis showing that the P3 methodology is a cost effective method of delivering the Project that provides the best value to the university or DSO, taking into account the availability or unavailability of other funding sources, including: (i) the cost of tax-

exempt financing; (ii) the costs of constructing, operating and financing the Project; (iii) any quantifiable savings in operational or other costs; (iv) the benefits to be realized by the university or DSO by using the P3 methodology; (v) and, if the Project will be primarily utilized by students, the cost-benefit to the student that considers the cost of existing campus and market options as compared to the Project and the value added to students in amenities or other material aspects of the Project. A value for money analysis, or other such analysis used by the university in reaching this conclusion may be included.

8. Projected cash flow analyses showing revenues, expenses, debt service, excess cash flow, the distribution of excess cash flow to the university, DSO or Private Party and return on investment and internal rate of return to the Private Party for the term of the Project. The projected cash flow should include any anticipated or planned refinancings by the Private Party and how any such refinancing will affect cash flow distributions to the university, DSO or Private Party and the internal rate of return or return on investment to the Private Party.
9. A description of any purchase option, how the purchase option for the Facility was developed, and the price and terms of the purchase under the option if known at the time the Project agreements are signed, or if not known unless and until the option is later exercised, the methodology for determining the price and terms of the purchase at that time and anticipated funding plan.
10. An explanation of how the Project is consistent with the strategic priorities and mission of the university, with appropriate references to both the university strategic plan and mission statement.
11. A statement that the Project is included in the campus master plan, or is not required to be included in the campus plan, with appropriate references and documentation. The specific location of the Project shall be provided on the current campus map if located on campus.
12. A description of any amounts to be paid to the Private Party by the university or DSO, the purpose of the payment, and the timing and source(s) of revenues for such payment. In addition, an explanation of whether the university or DSO intends to fund any aspect of the Project, and if so, an explanation of the purpose, timing and the source(s) of revenues to be used.

13. A description of any liens or other encumbrances that will be placed on real property owned by the state, university, or DSO.
14. All other information provided to and relied upon by the university board of trustees in making the decision to approve the Project and enter into the agreement as outlined in Section V above; and any other data that the university wishes to be considered by the Board of Governors or Board staff.
15. Identify whether the university or DSO is following the authority provided by section 1013.171 (1), or section 1013.171 (2), or section 1013.171 (3), Florida Statutes.
16. Any other information reasonably requested by the Board of Governors or the State Division of Bond Finance.

(b) The foregoing information shall be submitted to the Board office and the State Division of Bond Finance in duplicate, hard copy, and bound in a three-ring binder, together with one electronic copy. The formal letter of transmission must be signed by the official point of contact for the university or DSO, ~~and specify the type of approval being sought, e.g., regular or advance approval.~~ The letter will identify the legal counsel for the university or DSO, the financial advisor for the university or DSO, and other university or DSO officials as appropriate. All private and public partners will be identified, including contact information, and the source of financing will be identified, ~~unless seeking advance approval.~~

(c) The information shall be analyzed by Board of Governors staff and by the State Division of Bond Finance. The Board of Governors staff will consult with the State Division of Bond Finance in reaching a recommendation regarding Board of Governors' approval made in sufficient time for consideration of the Project at the Board of Governors' meeting ninety (90) days following submission by the university or DSO. Should the State Division of Bond Finance disagree with any recommendation of the Board of Governors staff or suggest that any additional information be presented to the Board of Governors, such recommendations or information shall be included with the recommendation provided by the Board of Governors staff to the Board of Governors. Any material amendments to the submission by the university or the DSO after university board of trustees' approval may require re-authorization by the respective boards. The ninety (90) day period in this clause and the following clause may be reduced if the university has kept the Board of Governors' staff and State Division of Bond Finance well informed of the Project and associated material terms in advance of the submission, in which event the Board of Governors staff and State Division of Bond Finance may reasonably agree with the university on a shorter review period in support of the commercial feasibility of the Project. Supporting documentation shall also

include a draft resolution to be adopted by the Board of Governors approving the Project and any associated transactions as necessary.

(d) The Board of Governors will consider the following factors in connection with its review and approval of the Project and proposed agreement(s):

1. The Project is necessary to fulfill a need of the university, is consistent with the university's mission and master plan, and is in the best interests of the university.
2. The Project information supports the need, demand, and cost of the Project, and demonstrates that the Project is both financially and operationally a prudent undertaking by the university or DSO, in light of the objectives of the university.
3. The proposed agreement(s) contain adequate recourse for the university or the DSO in the event of a material default by the Private Party.
4. The cost to students, if it is a Project that entails student use, in order to keep the cost of education affordable.
5. The material business terms of the Public Private Partnership, including the distribution of any excess cash flow from the Project to the university, DSO or Private Party and the reasonableness of the related return on investment and internal rate of return.
6. The nature of the auxiliary enterprise and its impact on any existing university or DSO enterprise or system.
7. Any other factors which the Board of Governors determines are appropriate to consider in reaching a decision on any issue relating to the review and approval of the Project and the proposed agreement(s).

(e) Any real property lease or use agreement involving real property owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund must receive approval from the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund to the extent required by law or by the university's master lease agreement with the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund.

(f) If circumstances exist such that the university or DSO contemplate any material change in the terms of the Project Agreement after a Project receives Board of Governors' approval, the university or DSO must notify the Board Office and the State



Division of Bond Finance within ten (10) business days and in any event, prior to entering into a binding amended agreement with the Private Party. If the change in terms raises any issues regarding the proposed Facilities, financing, activities, or operations to be conducted, the Chancellor shall consult with the Chair of the Facilities Committee about whether to re-submit the proposed transaction to the Board of Governors for further review and approval. In addition, if a material change in terms is contemplated by the university or the DSO at any time after the Project Agreement has been executed, the university or DSO shall notify the Board of Governors staff and the State Division of Bond Finance prior to amending the Project Agreement.

## VIII. TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

Depending on the risks presented to the interests of the university or DSO and the type of Project, taking into account the location (on or off campus), purpose, and effect of disruption to use of the Facility (for example, the severity of effects of disruption to a parking facility, office, or dormitory, may be different), any agreement with a Private Party should provide adequate provisions in relation to the risks posed, and generally should include (or have sound justification to not include) the following:

(a) Procedures that govern the rights and responsibilities of the university or DSO and the Private Party in the course of the construction, or construction and operation of the Project, and in the event of the termination of the agreement or a material default by the Private Party. The safeguards for mitigating and managing disruption of use and operations should be proportionate to the risk, including for example, if applicable, restrictive covenants, recognition and subordination agreements, and/or recordation obligations, assumption of the duties and responsibilities of the Private Party by a party that funded, in whole or part, the Project or by the board, or other protections to mitigate and manage foreseeable consequences of a material default by the Private Party of the Public-Private Partnership or the Private Party's financing. If required by section 1013.171, Florida Statutes, the agreement must provide for the transfer or purchase of property or other interests of the Private Party by the university.

(b) Review of the design of the Facility by the university or DSO and, if the design conforms to standards acceptable to the university or DSO, the approval of the university. This subparagraph does not require the Private Party to complete the design of the Facility before the execution of the agreement.

(c) Delivery of performance and payment bonds, letters of credit, or other security acceptable to the university or DSO in connection with the construction, or construction and operation of the Project, in the form and amount satisfactory to the university or DSO.

(d) Inspection rights of the Facility to ensure that the Private Party's activities are acceptable to the university or DSO in accordance with the agreement.

(e) Maintenance of general liability and property insurance by the Private Party in the form and amount satisfactory to the university or DSO and sufficient to provide reasonable coverage of tort liability to the public and employees and to enable the continued operation of the Facility.

(f) If the agreement includes operation and maintenance of the Facility by the Private Party, maintenance, repair and replacement requirements for the Facility, and monitoring and remedial rights for the university or DSO to ensure that the Facility is properly maintained.

(g) If applicable, periodic filing by the Private Party of the appropriate financial and operating information for the Project and/or Private Party, which may include financial statements and audit rights for the university or DSO, to ensure any requirements in the agreement are met.

(h) A provision that deems the Private Party's failure to fund current operational and maintenance costs if required by the agreement to constitute a material default.

(i) A provision describing all fees to be charged to users for use or occupation of the Facility, and the methodology, limits, approvals for, and circumstances that would allow for increases or decreases to such fees. Such fees should be within the range of fees customarily charged for the use or occupation of like facilities in the State University System, taking into account the purpose, amenities, and location of the Facility.

(j) A provision that outlines the responsibilities of the Private Party, including the terms and conditions that the university or DSO determine serve the best interests of the university.

(k) A provision under which each party agrees to provide notice of default and cure rights for the benefit of the other party.

(l) A provision that requires transfer of the Facility to the university or DSO at the expiration of the agreement or in the event of earlier termination of the agreement, if required by section 1013.171, Florida Statutes, or a provision that otherwise provides for the removal of the Facility and the restoration of the real property as a university or DSO option.

(m) If the Private Party's financing for the Project is secured by a leasehold mortgage or other instrument affecting title to the Facility and the Facility is ultimately to be transferred to the university or DSO, a provision requiring the Private Party to satisfy the same at the conclusion of the term of the agreement or upon earlier termination so that Facility is transferred to the university or DSO without any such encumbrances at the conclusion of the term of the agreement or upon earlier termination.

(n) If the agreement provides to the university or DSO a purchase option at any time prior to the termination of the agreement or a termination payment, a provision describing the terms of the purchase option.

(o) A provision stating that: (i) the full faith and credit of the university, Board of Governors or State of Florida has not been pledged to secure the financing of the Private Party and (ii) if the university or DSO chooses to assume the development or operation of the Facility on account of the Private Party's default, the assumption of the development or operation of the Facility does not obligate the university or DSO to pay an obligation of the Private Party from sources other than revenues from the Facility.

(p) A provision identifying the party responsible for the payment of any property taxes on the Facility, and what entity receives the benefit of any future waiver of property taxes.

(q) A provision that the term of the Project debt should not exceed thirty (30) years after the construction period.

## **IXVIII. REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

At a minimum, the Private Party should provide an annual report to the Board of Governors staff office and the university as soon as practical, but not more than ninety (90) days, following the close of the fiscal year. Additionally, the university will comply with any reporting requirements specified in the Project approval resolution of the Board of Governors, which shall, at a minimum, require a comparison of actual results to original projections. To the extent required by generally accepted accounting principles, information regarding any Public Private Partnership arrangement must be included in the university's or DSO's annual financial report, and such financial information as deemed necessary by the State's Chief Financial Officer or Chancellor should be submitted in connection with submissions required by Board Regulation 9.009, Preparation of State University System Financial Statements.

## **IX. BOARD OF GOVERNORS POWERS**

These guidelines provide a framework for review by the Board of Governors of proposals for Public-Private Partnerships involving a university or DSO. The guidelines do not limit the authority of the Board of Governors to review any proposal of a university or DSO. These guidelines do not provide a university or DSO with a legally enforceable right to have a proposal approved by the Board of Governors.

DRAFT

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Facilities Committee Workshop  
October 16, 2018**

**SUBJECT:** Project Presentations Related to the 2019-2020 State University System  
Fixed Capital Outlay Legislative Budget Request from PECO

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Review and discuss university high priority PECO Project requests. No votes will be taken on this item.

**AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION**

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Board, at its meeting held on September 13, 2018, adopted a lump sum PECO budget as the initial budget request for 2019-2020. The proposed amounts are in accordance with the official estimated amounts as provided by Florida law. At today's workshop, the Committee will review selected high priority PECO projects with detailed project presentations by university representatives, per the attached list.

Following the workshop, a prioritized PECO project list will developed for consideration and review at the November 6, 2018 Board meeting. If adopted by the Board, this will represent the amended and final 2019-2020 FCO LBR prior to the start of the Legislative Session.

---

**Supporting Documentation:**

Presentation List

**Facilitators/Presenters:**

Mr. Chris Kinsley  
University Representatives

## **Schedule for University Presentations**

*11:15 – 11:30*

FIU 1

- Engineering Building Phase I & II

*11:30 – 11:45*

USF 2

- Interdisciplinary Science-Research Lab Build Out
- Morsani College of Medicine and Heart Health Institute

*11:45 – 12:00*

FGCU 3

- School of Water Resources & Integrated Sciences

*12:00 – 12:15*

UF 4

- Data Science and Information Technology Building
- Music Building Remodeling & Addition

*12:15 – 12:30*

POLY 5

- Applied Research Center

### **12:30 – 1:15 Lunch**

*1:15 – 1:30*

FAMU 6

- Student Affairs Building (CASS)

*1:30 – 1:45*

FAU 7

- Jupiter STEM/Life Sciences Building

*1:45 – 2:00*

FSU 8

- Interdisciplinary Research Commercialization Building (IRCB)
- College of Business
- STEM Teaching Lab

FAMU/FSU College of Engineering

2:00 – 2:15

UNF 9

- Roy Lassiter Hall Renovations
- Honors Hall Reno/Add (Coggin Business Expansion)

2:15 – 2:30

UWF 10

- Campus Roof Critical Replacement

2:30 – 2:45

NCF 11

- Multi-Purpose Building

2:45 – 3:00

UCF 12

- Engineering Building Phase I & II

**STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Facilities Committee  
2019-20 PECO Workshop Projects**

PECO Projects to be presented by University Staff

Current Univ Priority	Univ	Project Name	Total Prior State Funding	State Funding % Completed as of 2018-19	Remaining PECO PECO Request	Total Project Cost (State \$ Cost)
2	USF	Interdisciplinary Science - Research Lab Build Out	\$74,732,583	89%	\$9,267,417	\$84,000,000
1	USF	Morsani College of Medicine and Heart Health Institute	\$97,893,118	87%	\$14,655,000	\$112,548,118
1	FGCU	School of Water Resources & Integrated Sciences	\$30,553,504	55%	\$25,446,496	\$56,000,000
1	UF	Data Science and Information Technology Building	\$50,000,000	50%	\$50,000,000	\$100,000,000
2	UF	Music Building Remodeling & Addition ?	\$5,927,338	11%	\$49,072,662	\$55,000,000
1	FPU	Applied Research Center	\$7,000,000	39%	\$11,126,850	\$18,126,850
1	FAMU	Student Affairs Building (CASS)	\$16,155,000	39%	\$24,845,000	\$41,000,000
1	FAU	Jupiter STEM/Life Sciences Bldg.	\$12,881,247	37%	\$22,118,753	\$35,000,000
1	FSU	Interdisciplinary Research Commercialization Building (IRCB)	\$16,274,101	37%	\$27,725,899	\$44,000,000
2	FSU	College of Business	\$13,500,000	31%	\$30,500,000	\$44,000,000
3	FSU	STEM Teaching Lab	\$4,233,813	9%	\$41,766,187	\$46,000,000
1	FIU	Engineering Building Phase I & II	\$30,641,537	29%	\$74,358,463	\$105,000,000
3	UCF	Engineering Building I Renovation	\$3,620,723	17%	\$17,745,473	\$21,366,196
1	UWF	Campus Roof Critical Replacement	\$0	0%	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000
1	NCF	Multi-Purpose Building	\$0	0%	\$46,900,000	\$46,900,000
1	UNF	Roy Lassiter Hall Renovations	\$0	0%	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
2	UNF	Honors Hall Reno/Add (Coggin Business Expansion)	\$0	0%	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$363,412,964</b>		<b>\$479,528,200</b>	<b>\$842,941,164</b>

Presentation Guidelines

Each presentation should not exceed 5 minutes

Each university is allowed one presenter

Q & A will not be time constrained

The entire Workshop is estimated to take 2.5 hours

Sample presentation format is provided

Supplemental funding must be described using standard SUS terminology, such as donations, bonds, E&G, Housing Auxiliary, etc.

Terms such as University Funds, Auxiliary, Private should not be used.