UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Budget Model 2.0

Recommendations from Expert Groups

April 2023

Prepared by:

RESOURCE PLANNING

Date:

6 APRIL 2023

Table of Contents

Introduction

This document outlines the final recommendations of five expert working groups, established to provide input to the development of a new budget model for the University of Alberta. Each group was chaired by either the Provost, or the VP (University Services and Finance). Over 60 individuals were engaged across the five expert groups six times between January and April 2023. Expert group topics, meeting dates, and membership are outlined in Appendices A, B and C respectively.

Recommendations

Tuition revenue sharing

Recommendation 1: Share international and domestic for-credit tuition (60% teaching unit, 10% program faculty, 30% university services)

Domestic and international for-credit tuition revenues should be shared in the following manner: 60 percent to the course teaching unit, 10 percent to the program faculty and 30 percent to university services.

Historically, 100 percent of domestic for-credit tuition was allocated to the course teaching unit. International for-credit tuition was shared; 70 percent to the course teaching unit, and 30 percent to university services.

Modeling undertaken by Resource Planning provided to the expert working group indicated that a domestic, for-credit tuition share arrangement that allocated any less than 30 percent to university services would result in an over-reliance on the provincial grant to cover university-wide service costs, and insufficient funding to support university services in line with enrolment growth.

The group recommends that the majority of tuition going to the faculty be allocated to the teaching unit, with a small share to the program faculty to recognise the costs incurred. The resulting recommendation was a tuition revenue share of: 60 percent to the course teaching unit, 10 percent to the program faculty and 30 percent to university services.

The expert group discussed the possibility of an alternative revenue sharing arrangement for international for-credit tuition to create greater incentives to pursue enrollment growth of international students. However, they also recognized that there is an existing incentive simply through the increased rate of tuition for international students, and the group also sought to maintain simplicity.The group therefore recommends that the revenue sharing arrangement noted above extend across both domestic and international for-credit tuition.

Recommendation 2: Share non-credit tuition revenue (85% unit offering the program, 15% university services)

Non-credit tuition revenues should be shared between the course teaching unit, program faculty and university services at rates of 85 percent and 15 percent respectively.

Historically, 85 percent of non-credit tuition is allocated to the unit offering the program and 15 percent to university services. The unit offering the program may be a faculty, or the Continuing Education department. The expert group recommends that this revenue sharing arrangement be carried forward to Budget Model 2.0.

Recommendation 3: Do not differentiate tuition share for online programs

Tuition revenue allocation should follow the rules outlined above, determined based on whether the course is for-credit, or non-credit and not differ whether the program is delivered online, blended, or on-campus.

Historically, the type of course (for credit, or non-credit) determined the tuition revenue allocation arrangement, not the mode of delivery (online, blended or on-campus). The expert group recommended that this approach be carried forward to Budget Model 2.0. The expert group discussed costs associated with online program development, and suggests further discussion between the Online and Continuing Education division and faculties and departments regarding how to suport online course management outside of the budget model.

Recommendation 4: Review tuition sharing arrangements in the future

Tuition revenue allocation formula should be reviewed in 3 years, to understand and correct for any unintended consequences of the chosen tuition revenue allocation approach.

The expert group recognises that there may be unintended consequences of the new revenue sharing arrangement for domestic tuition, and recommends that the future budget model review evaluate the revenue share arrangements to correct for any intended impacts. The group recommends that a review occur 3 years after implementation.

University services and functional efficiency

Recommendation 5: Introduce functional plans for university services

University services should be funded through a combination of a share of tuition (as per Recommendations 1 and 2) and the provincial government grant. Units should prepare a multi-year functional plan which defines service delivery, priorities and future budgetary needs over the coming five years. These plans should be used to guide annual budget allocations to university services, and hold unit leaders accountable both for their budget and service delivery.

Historically, university services were allocated the same operating budget as the prior fiscal year, with approved increases or decreases based on institutional cost pressures and/or emerging priorities. The expert group evaluated this approach, and an alternative approach that ties university services budgets to institutional growth (enrollment, revenues, and/or faculty). These two approaches are flawed in that they reinforce historical cost structures which may be inefficient and/or become outdated, and don't provide the right incentives for university services to pursue efficiency.

Instead, the expert group recommends university service leaders produce multi-year functional plans that define service delivery, priorities and budgetary needs over the coming five years. The annual budget should leverage these plans, with minor adjustments annually as necessary. A schedule of functional reviews should occur over a 5-year review cycle, so that all university service areas complete a review within the 5 years.

Recommendation 6: Adopt matrix budgeting for university services

To control costs and incentivize efficiency, the U of A should implement a matrix budgeting system which provides visibility to leaders of university services of associated spending across the entire university.

A matrix budgeting system is where functional service leaders (for example, the AVP HRHSE), have two budgets; one for their unit, and one for their function. Their functional budget will show the HRHSE spend across the entire university, not just in their unit, so they can see where services outside of their unit are being provided and work with the faculties or units to best understand how to deliver their services. This approach promotes transparency across the university as to how to deliver university services and continuously improve service delivery to faculty and staff.

The group recommends the matrix budgeting approach over the more restrictive approach of functional staff Full Time Equivalent (FTE) caps which simply limits how many staff could be hired, and could cause issues around backfilling in a timely manner leading to understaffing.

Recommendation 7: Implement space allocation approach

To control space usage, a space allocation (expressed as net assignable square meters) should be determined for faculties and university services. Faculties and university service units should be charged for space usage that exceeds the allocation. Incentives should also be introduced for those faculties and units that occupy less space than the allocated amount.

The expert group considered two alternative approaches to managing space usage: 1) a space charging approach whereby all faculties and university service units are charged for the space that they occupy; and 2) a space allocation approach whereby faculties and university service units are allocated a specified amount of space, and incentives are introduced in the budget model to reward more efficient space usage, and discourage usage above the specified amount. The expert group preferred the second approach, as it is seen to be a more collaborative approach, and less resource intensive.

The Facilities and Operations (F&O) portfolio should develop drivers and metrics to determine the space allocation for faculties and university service units, leveraging pre-existing guidelines. The college dean/VP, faculty dean, and university service unit leaders will be responsible for further allocating space within their faculty or unit. F&O should engage with college, faculty and unit leaders to understand idiosyncrasies and anomalies to ensure that exceptions are captured where appropriate in space allocations. Following this recommendation, F&O should explore how to operationalise the space allocation approach in practice.

Strategic initiatives and subvention

Recommendation 8: Establish a University Fund

Create one single consolidated University Fund to support strategic initiatives, research growth initiatives, funding to reward performance, and supplementary funding for selected units. The level of funding for strategic initiatives (one component of the broader fund) should be set at 1 percent of general operating revenues.

Under Budget Model 1.0, a strategic initiatives fund (SIF) was established. The SIF was intended to support strategic initiatives, which will normally be identified in the university's strategic plan. The target size for the SIF was 2 percent of the sum of provincial grant and tuition revenues (at the time equal to just under $20 million). A separate fund would be used to support those academic units whose resource allocations under the new budget model cannot fully support the costs of providing programs that are core priorities of the institution.

The expert group supports continuing the SIF, however, recommends that the scope of the fund be extended to include three types of support:

1. Support for university-wide strategic initiatives to the value of 1% of general operating revenues
2. Support for research growth initiatives to the value of 0.5% of general operating revenues (see Recommendation 14)
3. A small pool of performance funding to reward faculties based on agreed performance metrics (see Recommendation 16)
4. Supplementary funding units requiring additional support

This approach of one consolidated fund aligns with those implemented by peer institutions such as Queen's University, University of Toronto, McMaster University and University of Waterloo.

The group recommends that in the first instance, the level of funding for the strategic initiatives sub-fund be set at 1% of annual operating revenues (approximately $11 million per annum), with the flexibility to increase this over time and as we understand strategic initiative demand. The value of the research growth initiatives sub-fund should be set at 0.5% of annual operating revenues (approximately $5.5 million) as per Recommendation 14. The value of the performance fund is discussed further in Recommendation 16. The recommended budget for supplementary funding to units should be determined annually, based on consultation between the Provost, College Deans and Faculty Deans.

Recommendation 9: Take funding for the University Fund off the top of general operating revenues

Funds should be taken off the top of general operating revenues and surplus investment revenues (over and above the threshold for investment reserves), which are combined to meet the target percentage for each of the sub-funds, before allocating the grant to faculties and university services.

Under Budget Model 1.0, the SIF was funded through investment income (over and above the amount required to fulfill the requirement for an investment reserve) and revenue from the Land Trust. The expert group recommends an adjustment to the funding approach so that the fund is supported by a combination of general operating revenues and investment revenues. That is, any surplus from investment revenues (over and above the threshold for investment reserves) will form part of those general consolidated revenues, and reduce the amount needed to be taken from the provincial grant to meet the target size of the fund. This will provide a more stable funding stream to support strategic initiatives into the future.

Recommendation 10: Simplify the approach to allocating the provincial grant for teaching

Simplify the approach to allocating the provincial grant to support teaching activity by abandoning the 'Basic Revenue Unit' (BRU) and adopting a simplified measure to recognise the differential cost of teaching across faculties. Allocate the grant for teaching activity across teaching unit and program faculty, adopting the same sharing approach as domestic and international for-credit tuition revenues.

Under Budget Model 1.0, 70 percent of the net provincial grant (base provincial grant revenues less university services costs) was allocated to faculties to support teaching activity. Funds were allocated on the basis of each faculty's share of Basic Revenue Unit (BRU)-weighted domestic student program enrollments.

A BRU is a weight assigned to each faculty that is intended to reflect the per student funding the faculty requires from the provincial grant to offer its programs to domestic students, relative to the other faculties. Each BRU is determined by taking the total cost (including space) of the faculty averaged over the last three years, subtracting the revenues allocated to them in the model, and dividing that figure by domestic program enrolments.

The expert group recommends that a simpler allocation approach is developed by the budget model Design Group, to reflect the differential costs of teaching across faculties without reinforcing historical cost structures. The group did not provide a recommendation on the alternative metric that should be used, and the Design Group will be examining the most appropriate metric to use in place of the BRU, that accurately reflects the appropriate relative costs of instruction.

The expert group also recommends that instead of being allocated on the basis of enrollments (to the program faculty) the grant be shared between the teaching unit and the program faculty. The sharing arrangement should mirror the arrangement for tuition share. The tuition share recommendation includes an allocation to central, so, excluding that allocation, the division between teaching unit and program faculty to align with Recommendation 1 would be 86 percent to the teaching unit and 14 percent to the program faculty[1].

[1] Recommendation 1 states that tuition revenues should be allocated in the following manner: 60% to the teaching unit, 10% to the program faculty, and 30% to university services. Of the amount allocated to faculties, 86% goes to the teaching unit (60% divided by 70%) and 14% goes to the program faculty (10% divided by 70%).

Research support and growth

Recommendation 11: Maintain allocation approach for RSF

Federal Research Support Funds (RSF) should be allocated in the following way: 50 percent to the faculties using research metrics, and 50 percent to university services. The Design Group should review and revise the weightings applied to research metrics during the model development phase. The faculty's allocation should be itemized on the budget letter to clarify how much has been directed to the faculty.

The U of A receives approximately $17 million per annum from the Federal Government to support indirect costs of research through the Research Support Fund (RSF). Funding is provided based on averaged Tri-Agency funding received in the previous three years. Budget Model 1.0 included a sharing arrangement for RSF, whereby 50 percent was allocated to university services, and 50 percent was allocated to faculties on the bases of four, weighted metrics:

1. Restricted Tri-Council research dollars received (representing 5 of the 30 percentage points)
2. Restricted research dollars from non-Tri-Council external sources received (5 of the 30 percentage points)
3. Number of successful external grant applications, both Tri-Council and non-Tri-Council (10 of the 30 percentage points)
4. Total dollars spent on graduate students or post-doctoral fellows (PDF) from restricted funds. These include scholarships that flow through the University payroll system, such as Tri-Council scholarships (10 of the 30 percentage points).

In practice, due to the budget cuts, this sharing approach was not implemented, and RSF funding was added to consolidated revenues, and allocated out in the form of base operating budget across all units and faculties.The expert group recommends maintaining the Budget Model 1.0 allocation approach for RSF, however, the group recommends that the weightings of each of the research metrics is reviewed and revised during the development of the budget model. The group recommends clear accounting for RSF in faculty base operating budget allocations.

Recommendation 12: Maintain allocation approach for indirect costs of research (ICR), but review policy outside of budget model

The distribution of ICR revenues is determined by the existing [UAPPOL ICR Policy](). This policy specifies that 100 percent of ICR revenues are allocated to the faculty collecting the ICR. The expert group recommends that the UAPPOL ICR policy be reviewed outside of the budget model development process to consider changes to rates, opportunities to apply waivers and controls and potential changes to the allocation approach.

The U of A generates approximately $9 million per annum in funding for indirect costs of research through inclusion of indirect costs in research project funding, under the guidance of the UAPPOL ICR Policy. The policy specifies that 100 percent of revenues collected in this manner are allocated to the faculty that holds the research project.

The policy requires the inclusion of indirect costs in all research project budgets at a rate of 30 percent of direct costs, however, in reality, the actual collection rate is much lower. This is due to frequent instances where the ICR is waived by the faculty, and/or a sponsor refuses to pay for ICR.

The expert group discussed the fact that the published rate of 30 percent is relatively low, and there may be opportunities to grow revenue generated to cover indirect costs through:

- Changes to the published rate of ICR from 30 percent to 40 percent to align with peers
- Changes to applications of the rate e.g. allowing it to waived for small grants, and the rate increased for larger grants
- Controls to limit instances where ICR is waived

The group also discussed the opportunity to revisit the allocation of ICR specified in the policy. The expert group therefore recommends that the UAPPOL ICR policy be reviewed outside of the budget model development process to consider changes to rates, opportunities to apply waivers and controls and potential changes to the allocation approach.

Recommendation 13: Simplify the approach to allocating the provincial grant for research

Simplify the approach to allocating the provincial grant to support research activity by focussing on research revenues (Tri-council and non Tri-Council) and evaluating the use of weightings. Communicate the allocation in advance as a 'cents per dollar of research revenues earned' to improve transparency.

Under Budget Model 1.0, 30 percent of the net provincial grant (base provincial grant revenues less university services costs) was allocated to faculties to support research activity. Funds were allocated on the basis of the same four weighted metrics used to allocate RSF (see Recommendation 12).

The expert group did not provide a recommendation on the overall level of funding that should be allocated from the provincial grant to support research, however, the group did recommend that the metrics used to allocate it should be simplified to consider total research revenue (tri-council and non-tri-council) and that the weightings should be reviewed as part of the model development phase. The group also supported the idea of the allocation for research being communicated as a 'cents per dollar of research revenues earned' to improve transparency.

Recommendation 14: Initially, allocate 0.5% of operating revenues for research growth initiatives

Introduce a dedicated funding stream within the University Fund (Recommendation 8) for research growth initiatives initially at the level of 0.5% of general operating revenues, with opportunity to grow to 1.0% into the future.

The expert group recommends the creation of a research growth fund, similar to that of peer institutions such as McMaster and University of Waterloo. The fund should be established as a stream of a broader University Fund (see Recommendation 8), with a starting level of 0.5% of general operating revenues. The size of the research growth stream should be reviewed into the future, and opportunities to grow the fund to 1.0% over time should be considered.

On implementation of the fund, the group recommends that:

- Clear priorities are established for the fund, aligned with the strategic research and innovation plan.
- The fund supports a balance of large institutional initiatives (collaboration, interdisciplinary learning) with the incentives of the individual researchers
- Decision-making criteria/metrics to guide the allocation of funds are inclusive, regardless of size or discipline
- The fund offers a range of supports, including supporting protected time for researchers, matched funding, and indigenous engaged research.

Multi-year mechanisms

Recommendation 15: Introduce an activity smoothing mechanism

To avoid large year-to-year changes in faculty revenues as a result of sharp movements in activity, implement a smoothing mechanism for all activity-based budget allocations. Use a 5-year horizon, with 2 years of historical activity data, the current year activity data, and 2 years of projected activity data.

Under Budget Model 1.0, to avoid large year-to-year changes in faculty revenues as a result of movements in program and course enrollments, as well as from lumpiness in some revenues, a revenue smoothing mechanism was planned to be employed. Revenues would be allocated to the faculties based on the three-year average of the faculty's share of each major revenue type.

The expert group supports a similar smoothing mechanism for Budget Model 2.0, but the time horizon is extended to consider 5 years of activity - 2 years of historical activity data, the current year activity data, and 2 years of projected activity data.

In practice, what this means is that:

- When determining a faculty's share of the **provincial grant,** a faculty's share of the grant will depend on faculty enrollments and research activity in the two years prior to the current fiscal year, in the current fiscal year, and projections over the coming two years.
- When determining a faculty's **share of RSF funds and ICR funds,** the allocation will be based on 5 years of research activity data - two years prior to the current fiscal year, in the current fiscal year, and projections over the coming two years.
- When determining a faculty's budgeted **tuition allocation** for the upcoming fiscal year, the allocation will be based on tuition revenue data from two years prior to the current fiscal year, projected tuition revenues in the current fiscal year, and projections over the coming two years. This will require a combination of enrollment actuals and projections, assumptions for tuition fee changes and adjustments to reflect an understanding of the difference between enrollment projections and actuals. This approach may involve the application of weightings to each of the years' data, for example, by weighting future projections by less than historical actuals.

This is "data smoothing" and combines two different benefits:

- It encourages a greater focus on medium-term planning and projections, so that we are constantly looking forward rather than back.
- The use of 5 years' worth of data means that any unexpected fluctuations - such as the main Covid-19 year - are "smoothed" out and have less of an impact on the values used to determine budget allocation.

Recommendation 16: Introduce a performance funding pool for faculties with collaboratively-determined performance metrics.

Introduce a dedicated stream of funding within the broader University Fund to reward faculties for performance on the basis of collaboratively-determined performance metrics. Allocate funding annually through the budgeting process, on the basis of performance in the prior year.

The expert group recommends providing funding to reward faculty performance through a relatively small, dedicated funding pool, that is allocated to faculties at the beginning of the year on the basis of performance in the prior year.

The group recommends a hybrid approach to establishing performance targets whereby the Provost & VPs, College and Faculty leadership collaboratively develop strategic themes and a series of metrics for each theme. Faculty Deans can then select a subset of these metrics that best reflects their priorities.

The expert group did not recommend a level of funding for the performance fund, but recognises that in order to be effective, the nominal value of funding available need not be significant. Other institutions allocate as little as $500K through a performance funding pool, and the level of funding can be evaluated into the future.

Targets should be developed and monitored in FY 2024-25, and funds for achieving them should be allocated in FY 2025-26 through the annual budgeting process. This will avoid the issue of allocations or transfers made in-year that are not able to be spent, or a claw-back that may jeopardize unit budgets.

Appendix A - Expert Group Topics

Tuition revenue sharing

- How should domestic tuition revenue be shared across central services and faculties?
- How should tuition revenue that is allocated to faculties be shared across the teaching unit and program of enrollment faculty?
- How should international tuition revenue be shared across central services and faculties?
- Should targeted revenue sharing arrangements be used for non-traditional program types e.g. non-credit. If so, for which program types and which arrangements?

Central services and functional efficiency

- How do we determine the right level of base operating funding for central services?
- What mechanisms should we put in place to control costs and incentivize service efficiency?
- How should the budget model incentivize efficient use of space?

Strategic initiatives and subvention

- What share of operating revenues should be reserved for strategic initiatives fund (SIF)?
- What should the source(s) of strategic initiative funding be?
- How should the level of funding that a college is allocated from the Operating Support Grant to support costs of teaching, be determined?
- How should strategic subvention be funded and managed?

Research support and growth

- What level of base operating funding is required to cover indirect costs of research across the institution?
- How should indirect costs of research be shared across central services and colleges?
- How should revenues be treated to enable the allocation of this budget?
- Should a research growth fund be established, and at what scale and for what purposes?
- Should a research infrastructure fund be established to tackle growing costs of operating research facilities?

Multi-year budget mechanisms

- How many years of activity should be used to determine the allocation of budget?
- How should performance targets and metrics be determined?
- How should budget allocation be tied to performance?

Appendix B - Expert Group Meeting Schedule

Expert Group Meeting Schedule

Group	Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3
Tuition Revenue	January 25, 2023	February 27, 2023	March 16, 2023
Central Services & Functional Efficiency	January 27, 2023	February 24, 2023	March 13, 2023
Strategic Initiatives & Subvention	January 27, 2023	February 28, 2023	March 17, 2023
Research Support & Growth	January 24, 2023	February 27, 2023	March 20, 2023
Multi-Year Mechanisms	January 24, 2023	February 28, 2023	March 14, 2023
Community Information Sharing Session	February 22, 2023	March 9, 2023	April 12, 2023

Appendix C - Expert Group Membership

Tuition Revenue Sharing		
Chair	Provost	Dr. Verna Yiu
Vice Chair	Deputy Provost (Students & Enrolment)	Melissa Padfield
Member 1	AVP, Online & CPE	Jessica Butts Scott
Member 2	Director, Academic Budget & Planning	Edith Finczak
Member 3	College Dean	Joe Doucet
Member 4	Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar	Norma Rodenburg
Member 5	Faculty Dean	Robert Wood
Member 6	Faculty Dean	Barbara Billingsley
Member 7	Faculty Dean	Fred West
Member 8	Faculty Dean	Jason Carey
Member 9	College General Manager	Julie Naylor
Member 10	Manager, Institutional Research	Miao Zhen
Member 11	Resource Planning Representative	Steve Edge
Member 12	Chairs Representative	David Beck

Central Services & Functional Efficiency		
Chair	VP USF	Todd Gilchrist
Vice Chair	VP F&O	Andrew Sharman
Member 1	VP ER	Elan MacDonald
Member 2	AVP, Integrated Planning & Partnerships	Lara McClelland
Member 3	AVP, Shared Services	Ria Ames
Member 4	College Dean	Greta Cummings
Member 5	Faculty Dean	Tammy Hopper
Member 6	Faculty Dean	Demetres Tryphonopoulos
Member 7	College General Manager	Kerrie Johnston
Member 7	Faculty General Manager	Asha Rao
Member 8	Vice Dean	Marie-Eve Morin
Member 9	Vice-Provost (Library and Museums) & Chief Librarian	Dale Askey

Member 10	Associate Dean	Tracy Raivio
Member 11	AVP, PAIR	Deborah Williams
Member 12	Resource Planning Representative	Amy Gong
Member 13	Director, Resource Planning	Kemi Kufuor-Boakye
Member 14	Chairs Representative	Samer Adeeb

Strategic Initiatives and Subvention		
Chair	Provost	Dr. Verna Yiu
Vice Chair	VP USF	Todd Gilchrist
Member 1	College Dean	Matina Kalcounis-Rueppell
Member 2	Vice-Provost (EDI)	Carrie Smith
Member 3	Faculty Dean	Kyle Murray
Member 4	Faculty Dean	Nathalie Kermoal
Member 5	Faculty Dean	Brenda Hemmelgarn
Member 6	Faculty Dean	Christine Hughes
Member 7	Associate Vice-President (Finance, Procurement and Planning)	Martin Coutts
Member 8	Chief of Staff, Office of the President	Jeannie Smith
Member 9	College Associate Dean, Education	Karsten Mundel
Member 10	Finance Partner	Wendy Nickolson
Member 11	AVP Strategic Research & Performance	Andre McDonald
Member 12	Vice Dean, Education	Lynn McGarvey
Member 13	Senior Advisor, President's Office	Sheetal Mehta Walsh
Member 14	Director, Institutional Mgmt, Analytics and Data Warehouse	Jason Michael
Member 15	Resource Planning Representative	Kemi Kufuor-Boakye
Member 16	Chairs Representative	Nadir Erbilgin

Research Support & Growth		
Chair	Provost	Dr. Verna Yiu
Vice Chair	VP R&I	Dr. Aminah Robinson Fayek
Member 1	College Dean	Matina Kalcounis-Rueppell
Member 2	Faculty Dean	Stan Blade

Member 3	Faculty Dean	Brenda Hemmelgarn
Member 4	Faculty Dean	Shanthi Johnson
Member 5	Faculty Dean	Diane Kunyk
Member 6	AVP Strategic Research & Performance	Andre McDonald
Member 7	Associate College Dean, Research	Joanna Harrington
Member 8	Associate Dean, Research	Nancy Van Styvendale
Member 9	Director, Research Partners	Julie Stephens
Member 10	Director, Research Administration Services	Michael Walesiak
Member 11	AVP, Enterprise	Riya Ganguly
Member 12	Interim Vice-Provost and Dean, FGSR	Roger Epp
Member 13	Director, Strategic Analysis	Amy Gao
Member 14	Director, Resource Planning	Kemi Kufuor-Boakye
Member 15	Chairs Representative	Marguerite Wieler
Member 16	AVP Development	Kelly Spencer

Multi-Year Mechanisms		
Chair	VP USF	Todd Gilchrist
Vice Chair	Associate Vice-President (Finance, Procurement and Planning)	Martin Coutts
Member 1	AVP Development	Kelly Spencer
Member 2	AVP - Asset Management & Opera	James Allen
Member 3	Faculty Dean	Simaan Abourizk
Member 4	Faculty Dean (availability TBD, request a delegate)	Jennifer Tupper
Member 5	Faculty Dean	Dr. Kyra Pyke
Member 6	College Dean	Joe Doucet
Member 7	College General Manager	Susan Lynch
Member 8	Director, Academic Budget & Planning	Edith Finczak
Member 9	Faculty General Manager	Bill Bedard
Member 10	Faculty General Manager	Eva Glancy
Member 11	AVP, PAIR	Deborah Williams
Member 12	Director, Resource Planning	Kemi Kufuor-Boakye
Member 13	Director, Finance Partners	Sara Horseman
Member 14	Chairs Representative	Narmin Kassam