

MINUTES  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
BALLROOM, GRAHAM CENTER  
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY  
MIAMI, FLORIDA  
SEPTEMBER 14-15, 2011

Mr. Martin convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Governors at 3:10 p.m., in the Ballroom, Graham Center, Florida International University, Miami, September 14, 2011, with the following members present: John Rood, Vice Chair; Dean Colson; Pat Frost; Mori Hosseini; Tico Perez; and Dr. Rick Yost. Other Board members present were Dick Beard, Ann Duncan, Michael Long, Ava Parker, Commissioner Gerard Robinson, Gus Stavros, John Temple, and Norm Tripp.

Mr. Martin thanked the members of the Committee and the other members of the Board for their attendance. He said the Committee had a full agenda, which would be divided over the two days of the meeting.

1. Information: New Dental School and Dental School Expansion Proposals

Mr. Martin said the Committee would hear presentations on the several dental school proposals. He noted that at the Committee's June meeting, the Committee had heard from Board staff and from the Department of Health about dental education and the provision of dental health care in Florida. He said there had been considerable discussion about the proposals over the past months. He encouraged Committee members to ask questions of the presenters.

A. Florida A & M University

Mr. Martin welcomed President Ammons, who introduced a number of guests with him, including Tallahassee Mayor John Marks; Representative Alan Williams; FAMU Trustees: Dr. Solomon Badger, Chair, Mr. Torey Alston, Ms. Belinda Shannon, Mr. Kelvin Lawson, Mrs. Marjorie Turnbull, and Mr. Bryon Love; Ms. Sue Dick, Tallahassee Chamber of Commerce; Ms. Paula Fortunas, Tallahassee Memorial Regional Hospital Foundation; Mr. Randy Hanna, former trustee; and numerous FAMU Alumni. He said Dr. Howard L. Bailit, lead consultant, and Mr. Kenneth Tomlinson, Executive Director of Business and Finance at the School of Dental Medicine, East Carolina University, were also available to respond to questions.

Dr. Ammons said three years ago, FAMU had begun exploring access disparities to dental health care. He said they were discussing how to extend the expertise of FAMU to rural and underserved communities in Florida, especially in the Panhandle. He said that while there may not be a shortage of dentists, few practiced in dental public health settings, and there were also few dental specialists. He noted that there were a limited number of county health department clinics available to serve the poor in the underserved and rural parts of the state.

Dr. Ammons said FAMU's proposal was for a different and innovative program to provide care to the underserved. He said he was proposing a community-based patient care system. He said the program would have an impact on the economic development of rural communities and would create new jobs. He said the program would be built on a collaborative model with area universities, clinics and university hospitals. These collaborations would include the FSU College of Medicine, the UF College of Dentistry, and the Sacred Heart Health System. He said they had received commitments of monetary support from both the City of Tallahassee and Leon County.

Dr. Ammons said they expected to develop a more diverse student body, which would also include diversity in family income. In order to educate dentists for rural communities, the University would recruit students from these underserved areas. He said their clinics would require less in state subsidy than other dental schools. He said FAMU's proposal deserved the Board's support because of FAMU's experience in working with community-based programs, its strong historic tie to disadvantaged communities, and its preparation to enter new areas of health education.

Dr. Ammons introduced Dr. Howard Bailit. He said Dr. Bailit had experience in several states and with several different universities, including Columbia University and the University of Connecticut. He said he had received his dental degree from Tufts and his Ph.D. from Harvard. Dr. Bailit said he was privileged to be at the meeting. He said he wanted to highlight several issues, funding and strategy. He said he agreed that there were an adequate number of dentists for the middle and upper classes, but not enough for the underserved population. He noted the disparity in access to dental health care for low-income families, who had less than 10 percent access to dental care annually. He said there were also few African-American dentists. He noted that a large percentage of the poor were not eligible for Florida Medicaid and there were limited adult benefits. He said that treatment reached only about 12

percent of the poor and that reimbursement rates were a problem for dentists.

Dr. Bailit explained the traditional model for dental education, a large central facility with a primary goal of education, not of providing care. He noted that students had limited clinical experiences, and required huge subsidies. He noted that states were providing vastly reduced state subsidies for dental education and as a result, tuition had increased. He said FAMU proposed a community model with a goal of providing efficient community clinical care by both faculty and students. He noted that other universities were moving to the new model of offering community services. He said that it was FAMU's mission to provide outstanding education, to reduce access disparities, to recruit disadvantaged students and to collaborate and build on resources in the community. He said that to recruit disadvantaged students, the University would work with honors programs, summer enrichment and post-baccalaureate programs.

Dr. Bailit said the basic science faculty for the dental program would come from FAMU and from FSU's College of Medicine. He said the college would grow to 60 full-time clinical faculty who would concentrate on primary care. He said the faculty would practice as they taught, and that students would do rotations through their community practice. He said through this community practice, the faculty and students would develop relationships with practicing dentists.

Dr. Bailit said FAMU envisioned building a College of Dental Medicine on campus with 112 patient chairs, and five regional clinics, each with 18 patient chairs. He said they expected to treat 100,000 low-income patients per year. He said that increasing the number of patient-chairs increased management efficiency. He said the goals for the FAMU dental school were to increase diversity in the dental workforce, improve the economy in the Panhandle, provide jobs, and strengthen the research programs at FAMU. He also described the local partnerships FAMU was developing for the program, including the Bond Clinic and Tallahassee Memorial Regional Hospital. He said President Ammons had received commitments for financial support from the City of Tallahassee and from Leon County, and was working to secure similar support from other Panhandle communities.

Mayor Marks said the City of Tallahassee and Leon County had each been asked to make commitments of \$5 million. He said he believed this program would enhance the community and would be a model to help underserved individuals.

Dr. Bailit explained the capital and the operational budgets for the dental program. He said that almost half of operational revenue would come from patient care. Tuition and fees would raise about \$9.6 million and \$10.3 million would come from state appropriations. Dr. Ammons concluded that this FAMU dental program would put Florida on the cutting edge of dental education.

Rep. Alan Williams, a member of the House Higher Education Appropriations Committee, said he was here to support the FAMU proposal for a dental program. He said this program would improve the health of rural Floridians. He noted that members of the local delegation, including Senators Montford and Dean, and Representatives Coley and Rehwinkel-Vasilinda, agreed that this was an investment which was needed in Florida. He said that Florida had not done enough to meet the needs for dental education.

Mr. Temple inquired about costs. He said he understood the request from FAMU for \$40 - \$60 million to build the facility. He said he did not believe the state had the money to build these new facilities. Mr. Temple said it appeared that the school would need \$30 - \$40 million in start-up costs and annually, another \$10 million in operating costs.

Ms. Duncan complimented President Ammons. She inquired whether the University had explored a loan forgiveness program to bring dentists into the Panhandle. Dr. Ammons said there were Federal loan forgiveness programs, but that dentists then stayed only three to four years to work off their debts. He said his proposal was to recruit students from disadvantaged communities who would want to return to those communities to practice.

Ms. Duncan also inquired about funding the dental school faculty, since the school might not have the needed funds to hire competitive faculty. Dr. Ammons said the faculty members would have to produce half of their salary from their own practice; faculty members would not be on a tenure track, but rather on a clinical track. He said he was confident that the proposed dental school model would work.

Mr. Tripp said he had not seen anything that would convince him about the ability of the school to place people in the Panhandle. He said FAMU had not addressed how it would help people establish a dental practice in the Panhandle. He said he had not heard enough about partnerships, which could be difficult.

Dr. Bailit said that regardless of where the students went, there would be 100,000 more patients seen. He said he was confident that 25 -30 percent would practice in the area if they were trained in community clinics. He said students would share time between private and community clinics. Dr. Bailit said the Dean and the Associate Dean would be working with the communities to establish partnerships.

B. University of Central Florida

Mr. Martin recognized Dr. John Hitt, President, UCF; Dr. Deborah German, Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine; and Mr. William F. Merck, II, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Dr. Hitt said that there was a need and a demand for a new dental school. He said that across the nation, universities were being encouraged to look beyond the state for financial support. He said UCF had a donor who had pledged \$10 million toward a dental school. He said the UCF Board of Trustees had supported the proposal which would be offered at no cost to the state. He noted that five years earlier, he had presented to this Board UCF's vision for the Lake Nona Green Field, a UCF Health Sciences Campus as a catalyst for a Medical City. He said the College of Medicine had opened there the previous spring. At present, there were many partners located at the site, including Sanford Burnham, a VA Hospital, Nemours Children's Hospital, UF Pharmacy and M.D. Anderson Cancer Institute. He said that through these partnerships, the University projected a significant economic impact by the year 2017, \$460 million in annual tax revenue, annual wages of \$2.8 billion, and 30,260 jobs.

Dean German said UCF had a vision for building a model for research and education in its UCF Health Sciences Campus and the co-location of many facilities. She explained that the new dental education building would be 120,000 square feet, and would include a 200-chair primary dental care clinic. She said they would be able to leverage facilities in the Medical Education Building, where labs were already in place.

She responded to the issue of need for more dentists. She said UCF noted that the 2008 FDOH report had stated that "the number of dentists is decreasing as more dentists retire than graduate." She said one of the analyses had not considered population growth rate and that a growing population required more dentists. She noted that Central Florida had the fastest growing population in the state. She said UCF's proposed clinical

outreach programs would address some of the need for dental care in Central Florida.

Dean German said that nationally, about 58 percent of applicants to dental schools were not accepted. She noted that dental applicants in Florida to UF and Nova presented DAT and GPA scores above the national average. She showed a scatter graph of non-resident tuition at all dental schools to demonstrate that the proposed tuition at UCF was comparable with UF and Nova. She argued that there was a need for more dental education and that there were students who could pay the proposed tuition.

Dean German explained the proposed curriculum and the four primary themes. She also presented the proposed timeline for approval of the program by this Board in November 2011 to full accreditation by Fall 2017. She reviewed the operating budget assumptions, including market rate tuition, operating lease of a facility, initial student enrollment of 60 and no state support. She said that by the year 2018-2019, the program would be self-sustaining.

Vice President Merck said that there were some auxiliary university operations which could advance funding for the program. He said the University would issue an RFP for a short-term lease. He said the University planned to develop a strong financial plan with which both the Board and the Division of Bond Finance would be comfortable.

President Hitt said UCF had received strong support from the community, from local leaders and economic development professionals, as well as from medical professionals and medical partners. He explained that UCF anchored the Central Florida city-state and that contributing to the region was central to the University's mission. He said UCF was of, as well as in, Central Florida.

President Hitt said that UCF was recognized by the Carnegie Foundation as a university with "very high research activity" and had nationally and internationally recognized patents and research. He said the University was the anchor of a regional \$5 billion simulation and training industry. He said the dental program was critical to UCF's medical city vision. He added that a private dental program would be developed if UCF did not begin this program.

Mr. Temple inquired about the private dental program. President Hitt said it would not be integrated with medical education and would not have the same research impact. He said there would be a lesser

benefit for the investment. Mr. Temple remarked on the opportunity to venture with a private entity to provide dental education.

Mr. Temple said he had cost questions. Mr. Merck responded that the University was exploring a five-year lease and would bring back to the Board a partner plan. He said they had a possible donor for the first \$10 million and the University would get the other start-up costs from auxiliary enterprises, such as housing, parking and other revenue streams which had cash balances. He said as they collected tuition, they would return the balances due. He noted that these cash balances were earning very little.

Mr. Tripp said he was leery of using other university revenues. He said his question was always when the University would reduce costs to the students. He asked why UCF had not partnered with UF. He said he remained unconvinced about the need. President Hitt said he was still having discussions with UF.

Mr. Colson said he was concerned about borrowing from the auxiliaries, and about the proposed business plan. He said this proposal should be more than a business plan.

Mr. Hosseini said he was impressed with the Lake Nona complex and its partnerships. He said he was attracted by the request for no state support. He said he was concerned, however, about the difficult economy. He said he would be interested in a tighter program.

President Hitt said that he would bring back a clearer definition of a possible partnership with UF. He said he did not agree with the position that auxiliaries were state monies. He said he was confident that UCF could succeed with this proposed model.

Mr. Hosseini inquired about a lease deal with a construction company. Mr. Merck said he had responses from companies who were willing to take the risk on the building even if they ended up without UCF as a tenant. He said UCF would bring a proposal in compliance with the Board's Debt Guidelines and show that University funds were not at risk.

Ms. Duncan commended UCF's entrepreneurial spirit. She said she was concerned about charging market rate tuition without considering any specialty dental programs. Dean German responded that Nemours was interested in specialty practices.

Dr. Yost said that in looking at the 10 dental schools with the highest tuition, UCF's tuition would be among the most expensive. He said this list also overlapped with the dental schools which were the easiest in gaining admission. He said he was concerned about this relationship for a state public school. President Hitt said the Board had adopted a regulation authorizing market rate tuition.

Mr. Tripp stated his concern about the use of auxiliary funds which were paid by students. He said he was not sure that auxiliaries were there to serve as funding sources for other areas of the universities.

Mr. Martin suggested that UCF also consider a partnership with FAMU.

C. University of Florida

Provost Glover introduced Dr. Teresa Dolan, Dean, UF College of Dentistry. Dean Dolan said UF was also interested in enhancing the size and diversity of the dentist workforce through an increase in dental enrollment phased-in over five years. She said in addition to expanding the dental class size and increasing the diversity of the student body, the College of Dentistry planned to expand its research and provide improved access to dental services. She explained the budget request for this expanded enrollment. Dr. Dolan also explained that the College's building was aging, and the budget request included \$3,150,000 for renovation costs.

Dr. Dolan said that the UF College of Dentistry had a statewide network for community oral health with college-owned clinics and affiliate clinics. She noted that the clinic in Naples was a public/private partnership combining state dollars and private philanthropy. She commented that it took about seven years to get such a community clinic up and running.

Dr. Dolan reviewed U.S. dental school applicant and first-year enrollment trends, noting that applications had spiked in 1975 and were very flat in 1990. She said the rising number of applications in the early 2000's were the result of increasing numbers of seats at new private dental schools. She noted that these were cyclical trends.

Dr. Dolan said she was concerned with the debt load of graduating dentists and the impact of this debt on the ability of new dentists to serve an underserved population.

She justified UF's proposal on the basis of the quality of the existing program at UF, the economies of scale related to the expansion of an existing program and the ability to adjust to program need and demand, and the economic impact of UF's College of Dentistry. She said UF had an excellent faculty. She noted that it took 10 to 15 years to establish a new dental program.

Dr. Dolan commented that the Board had heard three proposals which presented different strategies to address dental education opportunities in Florida. She said the Board had to decide the problems to be solved. She said the Board should consider whether the issue to be addressed was access to care or new job creation. She asked whether building a new dental school was the best way to address the needs.

Mr. Tripp noted that UF's program was housed in an antiquated building, but the costs and resources for the program were known. He inquired whether the discussions with UCF were real, and commented on the opportunity to combine the two proposals. Ms. Parker said these discussions should include FAMU. President Ammons said he had spoken with UF and FSU.

Ms. Duncan inquired if UF could charge a higher tuition and attract more students. Dr. Dolan said she had a strong commitment to the state's subsidy and public professional education. She inquired whether the Board would endorse the state subsidy for one program and not for the others.

Mr. Hosseini inquired about specialty programs. Dr. Dolan said UF had specialty programs. She said the College had begun with the basic DMD program and now offered a full complement of programs. Mr. Hosseini expressed his concern for the mal-distribution of specialty dentists in the state.

Mr. Martin noted that these proposals were presented for information. He said Committee members still had a number of issues, concerns and additional questions about the presentations. He said the Committee needed to assess whether it was now appropriate for the Board to approve two new, and one expanded, dental programs. He inquired whether the Committee should encourage further collaboration and discussion, or whether the Committee had enough information to vote on these proposals. He noted that the Committee could choose to make a recommendation on the proposals for action by the Board or ask the universities to collaborate and bring forward better proposals. He

noted that FAMU said it was having discussions with UF and FSU; UCF was working with UF. He asked for the sense of the Committee members.

Mr. Perez suggested that the universities come back to the Committee. He said it was premature to make a decision. He said this was a meeting for presentations, and the Committee members had not had enough time to understand all the materials. Mr. Hosseini concurred.

Mr. Temple suggested that the Committee could discuss the issues further during the second day of the Committee meeting, the following morning.

Mr. Rood said he did not have enough information. He expressed a number of concerns, including scarce financial resources. He said he was concerned about the impact on the current state supported program.

Mr. Hosseini suggested that the issue come back to this Committee at the November 2011 meeting and that the universities develop revised proposals. Ms. Parker recommended a time certain for this decision. She noted that the universities were spending money while the Committee and the Board continued the deliberations.

Mr. Perez noted that November might be too soon. He noted that any decision had an impact on other universities in the System.

Mr. Tripp said he was not satisfied that there was a need. He noted the findings of the staff White Paper, the FDOH study and the Florida Dental Association. He said he did not understand the connection between a new dental school and serving underserved populations.

Mr. Beard commented that he did not see the economy improving and that additional time now did not make a difference. He said he would prefer that the Board take action at its regular meeting the following day. Mr. Temple concurred.

Chancellor Brogan said that generally, the studies had found there were enough dentists in Florida. He said there was a public health issue relating to an underserved population. He said this was not a SUS issue, but a public health issue for the State of Florida. He said dentists were not serving this population because of Medicaid reimbursement rates. He said if these proposals were to be considered further, there should be collaboration, and the proposals should address the issues of the underserved populations and the need for additional minority dentists.

President Hitt said he did not agree with assumptions which did not consider mortality rates or population growth in the state. He said UCF was not continuing to spend money. He said he was uncertain how to respond.

President Ammons said the FAMU program had been developed to address the dental care needs of rural, underserved populations. He said that FAMU's proposed model located students and faculty where they were needed. He said he had been discussing collaborations with various companies and local governments. He said it was important to bring to Florida cost-effective health care where it was needed. He said he did need time to conclude the conversations with FAMU's collaborators.

Provost Glover said UF was in service to the students of the state. He said that of the three proposals, UF offered a well-established dental program. He said UF would be available for continuing discussions; he extended an invitation to all to discuss partnership possibilities.

- Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m., September 14, 2011.
- Meeting continued at 9:15 a.m., September 15, 2011.

Mr. Martin said the Committee had heard the three university presentations. He charged the members of the Committee to think about the presentations and the issues. He said several members had expressed concerns about the timing of Board action. He said these proposals had been placed on the agenda for information only. He inquired about logical next steps. He said the goal for this meeting would be to review the options.

Mr. Rood said he came away from the presentations concerned about the fiscal challenges facing the state. He said he was confused on the issue of need for new dentists as conflicting information had been presented. He said he needed a better understanding of the material. He said he also did not understand how each of the three proposals would work; there had not been enough time to get to the underlying structure of the proposals. He said he was not comfortable taking action on the proposals at this meeting. He said additional time would allow members, individually, time to meet with the universities to understand their presentations, or time for the Committee to reconvene for a session for further explanation.

Mr. Colson said that if the Board were to take action, he was inclined to vote no. He said he could agree to wait to take action and

allow further time for the universities to educate or convince Board members.

Mr. Perez concurred with Mr. Rood. He suggested that members arrive for the next Board meeting on Tuesday to allow for a lengthy Committee session. He said he did not want to rush the decision at this meeting.

Mrs. Frost agreed that the Committee should meet again before making this decision. She said the proposals contained a lot of information and they should have a thorough review. She said members had received various letters and statistical information. She said there had been discussions of collaboration between several universities and these proposals had not yet been presented. She concurred on waiting on the decision, but noted that the Committee should consider the budget situation and aging facilities. She said the University System was not a social agency. She said that if the Committee voted today, she would vote no on all three proposals. She said there was no money for these programs.

Dr. Yost agreed that the conversations should continue, but that he was not sure that he would vote any differently. He said with additional information, it was appropriate to defer the decision.

Mr. Temple said that taking some extra time was fair to the universities which had spent a great deal of time preparing these proposals. He said the members needed to provide their reactions to the universities.

Mr. Beard said that if asked to vote, he would vote no.

Ms. Parker indicated that she also wanted to hear from the Board members who were not members of this Committee. She asked that they comment on whether there was a need for additional discussion by the Committee or whether the Board should take action at this meeting.

Ms. Duncan said the members had received a lot of information. She said she was fine with a delay. She suggested that if members had complicated questions that they provide these to the universities beforehand. Dr. Yost said he would also like to see a staff analysis of the proposals.

Chancellor Brogan added that members should provide their questions to members of the staff, so they could help orchestrate the conversations with the universities.

Mr. Stavros said he would be interested in information about specialty training.

Mr. Temple said that if asked today, he would vote no. He said the members had received good information from the staff and had received input from professional organizations. He said there were enough dentists, but they were not in the right places. He agreed that these programs could add to economic development. He noted that there was a huge risk involved in leveraging the \$10 million donation with the lease/sale of a building. He said as a developer, he would not do this project. He said he was also bothered about leveraging auxiliary funds, which might be needed by the auxiliaries themselves. He said he felt this was a public health problem, not a SUS problem.

Mr. Temple said he did not have a problem charging market rate tuition. He said he believed that professional schools should not be in the subsidy business. He said he would recommend higher tuition with scholarship awards to students with financial need. He said UF had a great school and its plant should be repaired. He said he wanted to see full cost estimates for all the proposals. He noted that FAMU was requesting significant public funding which was not presently available. He said that he was willing to delay final action on the proposals, and he encouraged collaboration between the universities.

Commissioner Robinson recognized the need to diversify the profession and the need for dentists in rural areas. He said it was a challenge to encourage professionals to return to rural areas. He noted that it was difficult to attract K-12 teachers to rural communities and to tough inner-city schools. He said there should be further dialogue.

Mr. Tripp noted that some of the comments about private schools were negative. He said the Board should be encouraging the private schools to partner with the public sector, not pushing them away. He commented that UCF had numerous private partners at Lake Nona.

President Ammons said he looked forward to further discussions about partnerships. He said that FAMU's approach was a cost-effective model to impact the lives of people, especially in rural and underserved areas. President Machen said he was not sure what information the Board was requesting. He said the members had mentioned the public health

issue and partnerships; it was not clear how the universities should focus. President Hitt said he appreciated the opportunity to continue the discussion.

Mr. Rood said he was still struggling with the concepts. He said the Board owed it to the universities to understand the proposals before taking action.

Ms. Parker said Mr. Martin would present this Committee's report to the full Board. She said she did not plan to entertain a motion to defeat the proposals at this Board meeting.

Mr. Hosseini said the Board was providing the universities additional time to bring back proposals for a program that would benefit the state and students.

Mrs. Frost said she had a number of questions. She said she would like to know how much it would cost to upgrade UF's dental school. She said she also needed information about residency programs. She said she was concerned about the quality of training with private dentists; this might be uneven. She said if asked to vote, she would likely vote no.

Chancellor Brogan said he appreciated President Machen's comments. He noted that these proposals were not in response to any RFP from the Board, but were proposals addressing need and solutions to fill that need. He said what he had heard was that the universities had not made the case on need or on the proposed solution. He suggested that in the next discussion, the universities should clearly address the need and who was responsible to address that need. He said he would continue to work with those who did own this problem, including the Department of Health and the Legislature. He continued to note that this was not a SUS problem, but that the SUS was a partner.

Mr. Beard said he did not believe that there was anything new to be discussed. He said that he did not think additional details would improve the proposals. He said the Facilities Committee had heard that there would be no PECO dollars. He said the state did not have the financial resources to start new programs.

Mr. Tripp said that he was satisfied there was no need for the SUS or the Legislature to put a high priority on expensive dental schools. He said he agreed that this would be a good fit with UCF's Medical City, but the timing was not right. He said this was a System. He said if there were a need for more dentists or more minority dentists, the System should

recommend that the University of Florida's existing College of Dentistry address that need. He said he understood FAMU's proposal and its excellent intentions, but that he did not agree that its teaching model was the best proposal.

Mr. Temple said that he was willing to let the universities discuss their proposals further, but that he had not been convinced there was a need for these programs. He said UF might pursue raising tuition, and use scholarship funds to help students who needed additional financial assistance. He recommended closure on this issue at the November meeting.

Ms. Parker said she would work with Mr. Martin to calendar the issue. She said staff should provide some direction to the universities which would be presenting additional material. This should include the questions still to be answered. She noted that market rate tuition was a new concept for this Board; UCF's proposal was the first major proposal for market rate tuition. She said market rate tuition seemed to drive UCF's proposal. She said the Board needed to be ready to move forward with the UCF proposal based on market rate tuition. She said the Board needed to be prepared for this risk.

Ms. Parker commented that working with an existing program was a good idea. She said that FAMU needed to present additional information regarding the funding of rural clinics and whether its model would produce dental health care in underserved areas and more dentists in rural areas.

Mr. Rood moved that the Committee defer action to the next meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee. Mr. Hosseini seconded the motion. Mr. Hosseini said he was interested in the growth of certain specialties. He recommended that the universities reach out to members of the Board to clarify issues of cost and collaboration.

There were no further comments, and members of the Committee concurred.

## 2. State University System Strategic Planning

Mr. Martin said the Committee had discussed Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles at the meeting held August 26, 2011. He said the Committee had now developed the overall framework and he expected to have a draft document for review at the November meeting.

Dr. Minear said the Committee had previously discussed three framing concepts: Preeminence, Competitiveness and Strategic Priorities. She said that putting these three concepts against the traditional university activities of teaching, research and public service, resulted in nine directional goals which would be used to draft the Strategic Plan document.

Dr. Minear noted that other Board committees were also discussing issues relevant to the Strategic Plan. She said the Legislative Affairs Committee was discussing New Florida and a focus on driving the knowledge-based economy and increasing the proportion of degrees awarded in STEM and other areas of strategic emphasis. The Facilities Committee was discussing how to build the facilities necessary to accommodate growing student enrollments. She said the priorities of the Legislative Budget Request from the Budget Committee were funding for the New Florida Initiative, and large overarching requests to fund STEM initiatives and improving retention and graduation rates. She said the Academic and Student Affairs Committee was spending committee time discussing adult degree completion and academic program coordination across the System. She said this Strategic Planning Committee continued to discuss preeminence, university rankings, and program quality. She noted that running through all the discussions was the discussion of most effective and cost-efficient use of resources.

Ms. Duncan noted that this was Dr. Minear's last meeting as a member of the Board staff. She said Dottie was leaving the Board office for a position at the University of West Florida. Ms. Duncan thanked Dottie for her guidance and support and for all the work she had done for the Board on many issues. Mr. Martin concurred, and thanked Dottie for being a tremendous resource.

Dr. Minear said the Board members had been interested in STEM baccalaureate degree production for the top ten university systems. She noted that some states have more than one system. She said that in terms of the actual number of degrees produced, the SUS was third on the list. In comparison with other states, Florida was fourth. In the proportion of STEM baccalaureate degrees, the SUS was ninth in comparison with other large university systems.

Mr. Hosseini said he was interested in looking at jobs for STEM graduates. Dr. Minear urged some caution in looking at jobs vis-à-vis degrees. She urged the same caution in looking at salaries.

Mr. Colson said there was pressure on the universities to produce a greater number of baccalaureate degrees. He said the Board needed to work with the Florida College System with regard to the number of baccalaureate degrees they were producing. He said this Board also needed to focus on quality.

Mr. Hosseini said it was important to look at where the state spent its dollars more effectively. He said the SUS should focus on STEM areas which are the areas bringing more jobs to the state.

Mr. Martin said this continued to be a fluid process and the discussions would continue.

3. Presentation, University of South Florida Polytechnic

President Genshaft introduced Dr. Marshall Goodman, Regional Chancellor, USF Polytechnic. She said that there were several members of the USF Board of Trustees in the audience, including Mr. John Ramil, Chair; Mr. Hal Mullis; Mr. Stephen Mitchell; and Mr. Gene Engle. She said that Senator J.D. Alexander, Rep. Seth McKeel and Rep. Kelli Stargel were also in the audience, as well as many business and community leaders.

Dr. Goodman recognized Senator Alexander, the Chair of the local legislative delegation, and thanked him for his passion and love for higher education. Dr. Goodman said there was a great deal of discussion about New Florida and he said New Florida was happening at USF Polytechnic.

He described the vision for USF Polytechnic. He said that as a 21<sup>st</sup> century university, USF Polytechnic would change the region. He said the campus was well-positioned between USF and UCF and in the center of growth of a college-aged population. He noted that the US ranked tenth among developed countries in the percentage of young adults with college degrees; Florida ranked 33<sup>rd</sup> in the U.S. for STEM jobs. He quoted Gov. Scott who had said that Florida's universities should be graduating people in the majors where there were jobs. He said the model for USF Polytechnic was based on Virginia Tech, Cal Poly and Georgia Tech, all of which had a high percentage rate of students who had jobs or were entering graduate school upon graduation.

Dr. Goodman said the USF Polytechnic model would follow a different learning model. He said that in place of the "sage on the stage," students would learn with a "guide on the side." The model included project-based learning in a team-based environment. There would be internships and service learning in all disciplines. He said there would not be 260 distinct programs, but an interconnected curriculum.

Dr. Goodman also addressed the potential and the future of the Polytechnic within the State University System. He said that USF Polytechnic was the first and only Polytechnic in the System. He said that while they enjoyed the benefits of USF and President Genshaft, which were supportive of all the regional campuses, USF Polytechnic would focus on the high-tech fields of the future and help the System continue to meet the growing demand for access. He said USF Polytechnic wanted to

transition from a branch campus to a destination university with a goal of quadrupling its enrollment. He said in order to achieve its goal, USF Polytechnic needed to grow many new programs. As a part of USF, it could only add a limited number of programs each year. He said USF Polytechnic also wanted to offer doctoral programs and hire high quality faculty; branch campuses were not authorized to offer doctoral programs. He said as a free-standing campus, USF Polytechnic would develop in areas of student life and athletics. He said they also hoped to accelerate time-to-degree from 5.4 years to 3.5 years. He noted that there was precedent for this proposal. In 1992, the Board of Regents had laid out a 10-year development plan for the new university in Southwest Florida.

Mr. Mark Kaylor, a lawyer and businessman, and interested citizen, said it was a pleasure to address the Board about the future of USF Polytechnic. He said he had been captured by Dr. Goodman's remarks. He said the proposal was to build a polytechnic model that would be studied around the country. He said the development of a research triangle was not new. He said the Lakeland site was well-situated between Tampa and Orlando, with two major universities in USF and UCF. He said the Board had the model for the development of a new university with FGCU and could see how that university had bettered the region and the state.

Mr. Kaylor said the Polytechnic should have its own board. He said the Polytechnic would be an immediate success as the twelfth institution in the SUS. He said it would have greater success with standing, perception and name branding. He said that as a stand-alone campus, it would be empowered to grow into a national polytechnic model. He said this development would proceed through a safety-net concept whereby USF would lead Polytechnic through an accreditation process. He said as a small institution, Polytechnic could collaborate with its large neighbors, USF and UCF, as it grew. He said there were 11 other university presidents to protect this new twelfth institution as unique and special.

Mr. Kaylor said it was time to get to work on this twelfth university, as the first university to achieve the New Florida Initiative. He said it would be appropriate for the Board to direct its staff to perform the due diligence to "unscrew the cap of lightning" in the form of the new Polytechnic. He quoted George Jenkins, "Begin, the rest is easy."

Sen. Alexander thanked members of the Board for their commitment to the education of students in Florida. He commented that education was the key to opportunity for Florida's citizens. He said this Polytechnic campus had begun 12 years earlier when Dr. Adam Herbert had been Chancellor. He said this campus had begun as a branch campus. He said the model for a stand-alone polytechnic university could become a reality. He said this new model was a challenge. He noted that of the 15 new degree programs for which USF Polytechnic sought approval the past year, the USF Board had only approved three. He noted that this new alternative approach was at

odds with USF's goals. He said this new institution provided a unique opportunity to Florida.

Rep. Kelli Stargel, a member of the House Innovation Subcommittee, said she was at the meeting to support this independent institution. She said she was focused on accountable and innovative education methods here which were not found in any other institution. She said this institution proposed to direct students to be successful in life. She said she believed they had proved the need for autonomy.

Rep. Seth McKeel, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, said he had worked with Chancellor Brogan to resolve the governance litigation. He acknowledged the role of the universities as economic engines. He said his family had been in Lakeland for five generations, and during all these years, people left Polk County for jobs elsewhere. He said he would like to transform that culture. He said that having a Polytechnic University would transform the knowledge base of the community and bring jobs to the community. He said that it was not possible to create the idea of this institution to transform the knowledge base of the community under the current branch campus structure.

Rep. McKeel read a statement from Rep. Denise Grimsley, Chair of the House Budget Committee, in support of the independent Polytechnic University.

Mr. Colson moved that the Committee direct staff to perform its due diligence in this request to establish an independent university in the State University System. Mr. Rood seconded the motion.

Mr. Colson thanked Sen. Alexander and Reps. Stargel and McKeel for their remarks. He said that the Committee needed financial information as well as information about the proposed transition to independent status. He said the Committee needed to hear from President Genshaft and the USF Board of Trustees. He noted that in recent weeks, Governor Scott had expressed some ideas about faculty and tenure, and these were worthy of consideration as a part of the discussions of a new university.

Mr. Rood said there was a lot to learn. He said he needed to understand better the transition to an independent school in the System. He said he looked forward to further discussions at the Board's November meeting.

Mr. Hosseini inquired how much had already been funded around this campus. Dr. Goodman estimated that almost \$200 million had been spent in building a road through the property, an exit ramp off the Parkway, and roads around the campus. He said \$60 million had been appropriated for the construction of the Science and Technology Building, approximately 160,000 gross square feet. Dr. Goodman said that

the funds for a residence hall and a Wellness Center were coming from private donors and public funds.

Mr. Perez said he was concerned about the timeline and whether all the information could be gathered in time for the November meeting. Chancellor Brogan said that adding a twelfth university was complex. He noted that Polytechnic was not new, that it had now been in place for ten years. He said they were obligated, however, to consider whether this should become the twelfth institution in the System. He said that relevant questions would be examined, relating to a business plan and an academic plan, and this information would be brought back to the Board in November.

Mr. Perez inquired that if they gathered all the information, whether there was a timetable for legislative action. Chancellor Brogan said that if the Board approved independent status in November, the issue would go to the Legislature for funding. He said the Board might have to amend its Legislative Budget Request.

Mr. Stavros thanked all the presenters. He noted that he had previously worked with Sen. Alexander's mother to raise funds for USF. He inquired how a twelfth university would affect the other eleven. He inquired how the base budget would be expanded to achieve additional funding for the existing eleven. He said he had not heard an answer to that issue. He agreed that a Polytechnic school was an asset, but that the Board needed more information on its funding.

Chancellor Brogan said that the Board needed to examine the issues surrounding Polytechnic, but noted that the other branch campuses could also make a case for independence and for the ability to offer lower-level courses. He said the state could be looking at 25 more institutions. He said this campus was unique, but he cautioned the Board about unintentionally creating a domino effect. He said Polytechnic was being held to a very high standard in order not to create a land rush. He said it was easy to change the signs, but the Board needed to consider carefully the structure of higher education in Florida.

Ms. Duncan said she had participated in the site selection for this campus. She said the Board needed to understand the cost issues. She said it might be possible to better leverage costs for this campus, e.g., all the infrastructure costs need not necessarily be independent.

Sen. Alexander said that the base budget for the campus was \$28 million. He commented that the incremental costs of independent administration seemed manageable. He said there were not as many cost differentials as members might imagine. He said the Board was being asked to consider programs that could change lives or change and grow the economy. He said this was a fundamentally different discussion about how the state was going to invest its resources and how Florida's interests would be advanced.

Mr. Long commented on the student perspective. He said that students on the Lakeland campus had responded to a survey and 85 percent of the student respondents indicated that they wanted to stay a part of USF. He said they felt that a new university did not have the recognition of USF. He said they were concerned about whether they would get a job with a degree from an unknown school. He said the students wanted to be sure there was administrative dedication to a seamless transition.

Mr. Temple said there was some disconnect. He noted that there were many land opportunities in the state. He said it was not clear to him how the Polytechnic helped the State of Florida. He inquired whether it would be like California Polytechnic. He said the Board needed a great deal of background information on this campus. He said Board members had heard about dwindling PECO revenues and the deteriorating building that housed the UF College of Dentistry. He suggested that Legislators should be considering a new revenue source for basic maintenance.

Mrs. Frost commented that the curriculum proposed was unique. She said it was important that Board members hear and discuss all the relevant issues at the November meeting.

Committee members concurred in the motion to hear the issues relevant to the independence of USF Polytechnic at the November meeting.

Mr. Hosseini commented that Dr. Goodman had presented a new university model, one that had students taking coursework leading to jobs.

Ms. Parker said the question was whether it was best for a branch campus to become a stand-alone institution. She said that as the staff reviewed the issues, they should keep in mind that this was not just for Polk County, but what was best for the State of Florida. She said this was a question of making sense and providing a unique benefit, and whether this type of school could offer something different from what the other schools in the System were offering. She said she was not interested in hearing about a twelfth institution, but in a laser approach and unique offerings not provided by any others.

Mr. Beard said that as a graduate of Georgia Tech, he understood what a Polytechnic did. He said this System was now addressing the students who would be entering the SUS in 20 years. He said the Board did need to understand the plan. He said he understood it could not fulfill its vision unless it was a separate institution. He said he hoped President Genshaft could develop the plan which would work for the students in making the conversion to the next university.

4. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p. m., September 15, 2011.

---

Frank T. Martin, Chair

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary