

MINUTES
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
June 17-18, 2014

*Video or audio archives of the meetings of the Board of Governors
and its Committees are accessible at <http://www.flbog.edu/>.*

1. Call to Order on June 17, 2014

Governor Colson convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee at 12:59 p.m. on June 17, 2014 with the following members present: Dick Beard, Dr. Manoj Chopra, Ed Morton, Dan Doyle, and Patricia Frost. A quorum was established. Other Board members present were Governors Hosseini, Carter, Cavallaro, Huizenga, Kuntz, Levine, Link (joining at 1:09 p.m.) and Tripp (joining at 1:07 p.m.).

2. Approval of Minutes from Committee Meeting March 19, 2014

Mr. Morton moved that the Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on March 19 2014, as presented. Ms. Frost seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

3. Revision of Florida Gulf Coast University's Accountability Metrics

Mr. Colson explained that this item is a technical change to FGCU's excess hour rate for its 2012-13 graduating class to fix an error with the reporting of dual enrolled credit hours. The change would revise FGCU's 2012-13 excess hours rate from 62% to 74% and would increase the points earned under the Board's Performance Based Funding model (from 28 to 30 points); however, there would be no change in the funds allocated to the universities. This change was approved by the FGCU Board of Trustees on April 15th 2014 and has already been incorporated into the performance-based funding model data. Ms. Frost moved that the change be approved. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Consideration of University 2014-2015 Work Plans

Mr. Colson said that University Work Plans, along with the Board's annual Accountability Report and its 2012-2025 Strategic Plan, constitute the Board's three main strategic planning documents. He said that in June of every year the Board looked

at annual Work Plans to consider institutional initiatives, opportunities and challenges, performance on key indicators, enrollment growth expectations, and indications of new degree programs that will be explored. He said that the University Work Plans are the critical connecting documents between where the System is heading and how far it has come, and that the Work Plans illustrate how each university contributes to the overall system goals, where good progress is being made, and where the System needs to improve.

Mr. Colson said that, as in years past, the Board's dialogue would take the form of brief presentations by each of the institutions, followed by questions from the Board and responses by the universities. He said, further, that in September, the Committee would circle back and take a system-wide look as to how the information contained in the individual Work Plans moves the Board along in achieving its system-wide Strategic Plan goals.

Mr. Colson explained that, as part of this year's Work Plan presentations, three institutions that did not score at least 26 points on the performance-based funding metrics would also be presenting Performance Improvement Plans. He said that the Strategic Planning Committee would be considering for approval the Performance Improvement Plans in separate motions from the approval of the Work Plans themselves.

Mr. Colson reminded the Committee--as well as the universities--that the Board's approval of a Work Plan does not constitute approval of any particular component, nor does it supersede any necessary approval processes that may be required for each component. He said, further, that he was asking Board staff to record any of the Committee's further direction and recommendations to each university for future follow-up, as well as asking Board staff to report back to the Committee at the September Board meeting with a summary of system-wide trends and issues arising from the Work Plans.

A. University of Central Florida

After the University of Central Florida presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Key issues and specific discussion included the number of medical residencies in Florida and the extent to which Florida graduates were find in-state matches for their residencies, and UCF's longer-term plans for institutional growth. With respect to the performance-based funding model, UCF indicated that the model was good and generally workable. Dr. Chopra moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the UCF Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or

Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Mr. Morton seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

B. University of West Florida

After the University of West Florida presented its Work Plan and its Performance Improvement Plan, members questioned the university. Key issues and specific discussion included the distance learning enrollments at UWF on into the out-years, and the apparent correlation between excess hours and student debt. With respect to the performance-based funding model, UWF indicated that the model might be enhanced if it were to include the numbers of jobs and the salaries of graduates in the military and federal government. Mr. Beard moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the UWF Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously. Mr. Beard moved approval of the UWF Performance Improvement Plan, Mr. Doyle seconded the motion, and the members concurred unanimously.

C. Florida International University

After Florida International University presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Specific discussion included the growth of the FIU endowment, and FIU's proximity to having top-tier engineering programs. FIU expressed its concerns about the potential impact of higher standards for Bright Futures scholarships, projecting that 2,400 FIU students could lose Bright Future scholarships. With respect to the performance-based funding model, FIU indicated that it believed that the benchmark for the university access metric is too low and needs to be raised. Ms. Frost moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the FIU Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

D. New College of Florida

After New College of Florida presented its Work Plan and Performance Improvement Plan, members questioned the institution. Specific discussion included the nature and amount of career planning and placement, and the provision of on-line coursework for NCF students. With respect to the performance-based funding model, NCF indicated concerns with regard to the metric involving average wages one year

after graduation. New College indicated that a good portion of its graduating class takes a year off before beginning to look for jobs. In addition, New College would like to see employment data factored in for students who graduate and leave Florida. Dr. Chopra moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the NCF Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Mr. Morton seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously. Dr. Chopra moved approval of the NCF Performance Improvement Plan, Mr. Morton seconded the motion, and the members concurred unanimously.

E. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University

After Florida A&M University presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Specific discussion included the timetable for seeing that licensure examination passage rates were expected to reach appropriate benchmarks, and concerns that graduation rate goals were not high enough. With respect to the performance-based funding model, FAMU indicated that it would like to have more consideration given for mission differentiation, particularly as it reflects a student body's socioeconomic status. Dr. Chopra moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the FAMU Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Mr. Morton seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

F. University of North Florida

After the University of North Florida presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Specific discussion included the provision of more on-line offerings for UNF students. With respect to the performance-based funding model, UNF indicated that for certain metrics it made more sense to look at peer institutions as opposed to other SUS institutions. Mr. Morton moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the UNF Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. on June 17, 2014.

5. Call to Order on June 18, 2014

Chair Colson convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee at 8:19 a.m. on June 18, 2014 with the following members present: Dick Beard, Dr. Manoj Chopra, Dan Doyle, Ed Morton, and Patricia Frost. A quorum was established. Also present were Board members Hosseini, Cavallaro, Huizenga, Kuntz, Levine (entering at 8:31 a.m.), Link, Stewart, and Tripp.

6. Consideration of University 2014-2015 Work Plans

A. Florida Polytechnic University

The Florida Polytechnic University portion of the meeting was conducted as a joint meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Select Committee on Florida Polytechnic University. Governor Kuntz, Chair of the Select Committee on Florida Polytechnic University, called his committee to order with all members – Ms. Link and Mr. Morton – present. After Florida Polytechnic University presented its Work Plan, members questioned the institution. Specific discussion included the timeline for SACS accreditation and ensuring transferability of students from Florida Polytechnic to other institutions. Questions were also raised as to what Florida Polytechnic was doing in the area of electronic textbooks. A question was also raised with regard to plans for student services and student government representation. Mr. Morton moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the Florida Polytechnic Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously. The Select Committee on Florida Polytechnic University was then adjourned at 9:29 a.m.

B. Florida Atlantic University

After Florida Atlantic University presented its Work Plan and Performance Improvement Plan, members of the Strategic Planning Committee questioned the university. Specific discussion included the relationship of the FAU College of Medicine, the Max Planck Institute, and Scripps. With respect to the performance-based funding model, FAU was generally positive about the model. FAU indicated that the model was allowing it to deal with critical issues on campus with regard to productivity. FAU indicated that the benchmark for the university access rate is inappropriately low. Mr. Morton moved that the committee recommend that the full

Board approve that portion of the FAU Work Plan associated with the 2014–2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously. Dr. Chopra moved approval of the FAU Performance Improvement Plan, Ms. Frost seconded the motion, and the members concurred unanimously.

C. University of South Florida

After the University of South Florida presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. A concern was expressed that the average debt of medical school students was keeping them away from primary care careers. A question was raised as to whether USF tracked employer satisfaction. Another question raised was whether USF was going to make more of an investment in career advising. With respect to the performance-based funding model, USF indicated that it was happy with the model and supportive of the metrics. USF indicated further that it may be worthwhile to explore why certain students, such as veterans, might be taking longer to graduate than regular students. Mr. Beard moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the University of South Florida’s Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

D. Florida Gulf Coast University

After Florida Gulf Coast University presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Key issues and specific discussion included FGCU’s growth rate, as well as FGCU’s timeliness in submitting its Work Plan. Mr. Beard moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the FGCU Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

E. Florida State University Work Plan

After Florida State University presented its Work Plan, members of the committee questioned the university. Specific discussion included a concern as to the amount of on-line coursework being provided by FSU, FSU’s ranking in terms of

research dollars, and the status of the FAMU/FSU College of Engineering. With respect to the performance-based funding model, FSU reported that the model had created an increased appreciation of FSU's strengths in the arts and sciences. After the discussion, Dr. Chopra moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the FSU Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Mr. Doyle seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

F. University of Florida

After the University of Florida presented its Work Plan, members questioned the university. Key issues and specific discussion included the transfer of on-line capabilities from UF to other institutions in the SUS. With respect to the performance-based funding model, UF indicated that it liked the metrics this year as compared to last year's metrics. Ms. Frost moved that the committee recommend that the full Board approve that portion of the UF Work Plan associated with the 2014-2015 academic year, excluding those sections of the Work Plan that require any additional regulatory or procedural review or approval pursuant to law or Board regulations and accept the out-year portions of the Work Plan. Dr. Chopra seconded the motion, and the members of the committee concurred unanimously.

7. Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned on June 18, 2014 at 12:40 p.m.

Dean Colson, Chair

R.E. LeMon, Associate Vice Chancellor