



### **Objectives for Revision of Current Debt Policy**

Modernize the policy in recognition of rating agency and accounting changes

• For example, Moody's typically includes the capital raise for a P3 (debt and equity) as total adjusted debt of the host institution regardless of balance sheet treatment

Update the key ratios and to be more in line with current rating trends

 For example, leverage ratios should be comprehensive in including P3s should not have separate % targets in comparison to Direct Debt

Reassess the importance of maintaining a rating in the "AA+" category

Be more specific about the criteria for approving a capital project

- Demand for project
- Operating impact (self-support)
- Following identification of need for project then focus on what is best way to fund
  - System resources
  - Direct debt
  - P3



# **Sources of Funding**

Projects can be financed with a variety of sources as outlined by the chart below

Regardless of how a project is financed (wheth0 -443 -74 c-441 -71 -436 -425-712.925 0S. (aC20 1 Tf0 Tc 0 T )-5 (v)-1 (ar)-3



## **Credit Impact of Alternative Delivery Projects on Host Institutions**















## Cost of 30-Year Debt at Different Points in Time

	Aa1 (2021)	Aa1 (2022)	Aa1 (Current)	Aa2 (Current)	Baa2 (Current)
тіс	2.86%	3.26%	4.22%	4.32%	5.01%
Avg Annual Debt Service	\$5,091,461	\$5,351,748	\$6,010,194	\$6,081,414	\$6,577,247



# **Definitions of Key Terms**

Moody's Definitions for Key Ratios and Metrics				
Annual Debt Service Coverage	Measures the ability of a university to make debt service payments from annual operations			
EBIDA Margin	Measures net income (before non-cash expenses) relative to operating revenue to indicate the amount of cash a university generates to support its strategic and capital investments			
Operating Revenue	Indicates the scope of a university's operations			
Total Adjusted Debt	Measure of overall debt, including capitalized operating leases and unfunded pension liabilities			
Total Cash & Investments				





# Moody's Key Ratios – USM & Aa1 Peers (from 2019-2022)

EBIDA Margin (%)	2019	2020	2021	2022
Median	E108(Edii)+r	16.2 (an) <b>]</b> [J19.90	9 001 28 r1 173.	0anM3(Av3



# 2020-2022 Higher Education Sector Outlook





# **FitchRatings**

		1/100D13	Sar Gibbai	ritchitatings
	Pre- COVID	<b>Stable</b> (12/10/2019)	Negative (1/16/2020)	Negative (12/10/2019)
2020	COVID-19 Impacts	Negative (3/18/2020)  Outlook revised to Negative  Coronavirus response has immediately impacted revenue and increased expenses  Disrupted enrollment, state support, research grants, endowment income	Negative (4/30/2020)  Financial and economic challenges exacerbated existing pressures  Loss of auxiliary revenue biggest near-term impact Institutions with limited liquidity and flexibility are faced with greater operating pressures	Negative (3/12/2020)  Decline in housing, dining, and parking revenues negatively affected margins Operating risks from campus closures Financial markets negatively impacted endowments Strained state support
	2021 Outlook	Negative (12/8/2020)  Operating revenues and auxiliary services continue to decline; athletic programs unable to offset fixed costs  State support expected to decrease	Negative (1/20/2021)  Successful vaccination critical for in-person resumption; competition for students increasing  Material state funding cuts could challenge operations  Credit quality split between higher rated institutions	Negative (12/8/2020)  Enrollment declines will persist for international students and incoming freshman  Ongoing expense reductions expected to continue into 2022, some will utilize large endowment draws
2021	Outlook Revisions	Stable (3/22/2021)  Outlook revised to Stable  Likelihood of a return to campus operations will bolster gritistraste toxidistrystev(35.9)291s-639.6 (s)Neug7tBs-1.5r  Fediarde@046wipBodyBMCIZLB6tly84vIZD(2148gBsdc6v)rith  Likelihood of a2return to campus operationswill bolster	and those in the 'BBB' category continues  Market position and value proposition matter more  Privatized (off-balance sheet) student housing subsector faces significant pressure  Linears 2-648 (1976) 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10	/lt (iJ )23.7 ( w12/77 .046 T<(i)-3.5 (l)7/7/212 (ta)-2.4 (bl)-2.2 (c By2 <b>4.80Bi3-2:2</b> 2t <b>Bj2.2:25sbc2ok6toewe</b> swi rue and e eD 251 BD (ge endow)7.7 C 0 Twct aln(at)2.>BD1CID 237 > -1.892 -1.20



### Strategies to Leverage the Private Sector

 Higher Education institutions have leveraged the private sector to accomplish a variety of goals and objectives

#### Finance

- Manage balance sheet / credit impact of the development of non-core assets
  - Debt covenants, internal debt policies
- Monetize non-core assets with commercial value
   Transfer demand risk

#### Design / Delivery

- Manage project delivery risk for on-time, on-budget project completion
  - o Private sector expertise / efficiency for technically complicated development projects
  - Bundling of assets

#### Operations

- Transfer operating risks for noncore and/or technically complex assets
- Alignment of interests with private partner for asset life cycle responsibility and risk
- Private sector efficiency

### Governance

- Statutory limitations
- Ability to manage procurement or existing labor requirements
- Disposition on non-core assets



# **Examples of Alternative Delivery Capital Projects in Higher Education**





pfm