

MINUTES  
BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA  
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS/STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA  
TAMPA, FLORIDA  
SEPTEMBER 21, 2006

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Academic Programs/Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Governors at 10:25 a.m., in Traditions Hall, Gibbons Alumni Center, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, September 21, 2006, with the following members present: Jorgé Arrizurieta, Dr. Arlen Chase, Dr. Akshay Desai, Ann Duncan, Charles Edwards, Frank Harrison, Dr. Stanley Marshall, Frank Martin, Sheila McDevitt, Lynn Pappas, Ava Parker, Carolyn K. Roberts, John Temple, and Commissioner John Winn.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held June 22, 2006

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held June 22, 2006, as presented. Dr. Desai seconded the motion. Dr. Marshall said he wanted to correct a statement on p.4, which stated that "Dr. Marshall proposed that the Board consider establishing an entity whose primary purpose would be to promote the importance and the value of the teaching profession." He said he had not intended that this entity be established by this Board, but rather that this task be undertaken by the Council of 100 or some similar educational foundation. The members of the Committee concurred in the Minutes, as amended.

2. System Structure Project Update

Dr. Nancy McKee said the Board of Governors Foundation had hired a consultant, the Pappas Consulting Group, to help the Board analyze and understand the long-term growth of the State University System. She said they had asked for recommendations from the consultant on the future structure of the system and the policies and investments the State should have in place for these future needs. She said this would be a compact process as the consultants had extensive experience in higher education. She said the consultants would be presenting initial findings at the November Board meeting and would have their final report for the Board's consideration at the January 2007 meeting.

Dr. McKee said if there were suggestions for the consultants, she would forward them in her capacity as the "contract manager." Each Board member had received a project notebook, with the ITN and the consultants' resumés, to which they could add material developed by the consultants. She reported that interviews were underway and were scheduled, in person or by phone, with Legislators, University Presidents,

University Trustees, Board members, members of the State Board of Education, community college presidents, business leaders and private university leaders. She asked that she be advised if someone should be added for an interview.

Mr. Dasburg said the Strategic Plan adopted by this Board in 2005 left a place for this work, as the Board knew this information was needed to have a statewide strategy, about programs that should be duplicated and those which should not be duplicated.

### 3. Analysis of University Enrollment Plans

Dr. Nate Johnson said the Board had reviewed some enrollment information when it had reviewed and approved the Legislative Budget Request at the August Board meeting. He said he wanted to provide the Board further detail on the variables impacting the universities' enrollment planning process. He explained factors external to the universities, such as the economy, the pipeline of students from K-12 and the community colleges, disruptive events (hurricanes, 9/11), and competitors' strategy. This information was filtered through the universities' strategic planning process, including the level of students to admit, tuition, financial aid, and academic and support programs. He said the Board's enrollment plan was developed on the basis of the individual universities' plans. He said the universities planned for total growth of 19 percent over the next six years. He noted that based on their enrollment projections, four universities, FIU, UCF, UF and USF, estimated student populations of more than 50,000 students. He said that although the state was experiencing rapid population growth, with the children of baby boomers, the school districts had recently reported lower-than-expected enrollment, so the university growth might be lower than anticipated or distributed differently. He noted that the cost of property and property insurance might have an impact on the universities' planned enrollment growth of 56,000 new students. He commented that the Strategic Plan related to the size of the population, so lower population growth might not impact the System's ability to reach these goals. He added that SUS enrollments had kept pace with current growth estimates. He showed how the growth was distributed in the fastest growing counties of the state. He reviewed the numbers for the planned growth of the branch campuses.

Dr. Johnson explained that if the universities' plans were met, the System was on track to meet the degree goals set out in the Strategic Plan. He noted that the target for doctoral degrees was unrelated to population growth, but was related to continued research growth. He said about 25 percent of the high school graduates enroll in the universities immediately after graduation. He said over the past decade the universities were becoming more selective, admitting students with a higher average GPA. He also reviewed some of the trends in leading indicators of performance. Ms. Pappas inquired about the trends in SAT scores. Dr. Johnson said there were increasing numbers of students taking the SAT without a substantive decline in scores.

Dr. Johnson explained that “enrollment growth funding” was used by the universities to improve student retention and address financial aid. He commented that redistributing money to need-based financial aid might allow more students to attend college.

Mr. Temple said he wanted to make sure the System’s planning was based on realistic assumptions, and that there was the right kind of access in the right places. Mr. Dasburg said that the strategy work was predicated on a number of assumptions. An important assumption was the view of the demographics of this state. He said these sensitivities need to be made known to the Pappas Group. He asked, if the Board assumed a lower growth rate than that which, in fact, occurs, what is the burden from that assumption, or the outcome if the Board overshot on its assumptions?

Mr. Edwards said the Board had control over the numbers of students coming in to the universities. He said the outcome, a university degree, was such a great product that the universities turned away many students. Ms. McDevitt said she was interested in what the SUS would look like in terms of access. Commissioner Winn said he wondered how the Board would balance the universities’ aspirational goals with what the SUS would need to be prepared to handle student demand. He said the Board should develop a plan to accommodate the needs of the SUS, and to present this to the Legislature, describing where the SUS was going in the state.

Mr. Dasburg said the goals for the SUS were clear: to provide access, to have the capital to fund the System properly, and to have a quality output. If the Board planned correctly, then the funding needs would be obvious. He said the Legislature might not want to fund the System to that extent, but at least it would be obvious what needed to be done. Mrs. Roberts commented that growth might not be an identified university mission for every institution. Some universities should not be penalized for not growing. Dr. Desai said that as institutions grew, their needs changed. He wondered if the Board was also looking at efficiency and accountability. He said his concern continued to be prudent resource allocation.

Mr. Dasburg said he was thinking about outcomes. He said the wrestling about public policy questions would be around the Board table. There was a lot of work to be done prior to making any recommendations on future growth of the SUS. Ms. Pappas said she wanted to know about the production of degrees by other institutions, including private universities and the community colleges. Mr. Dasburg concurred.

#### 4. Branch Campuses, Joint Use Facilities, Instructional Centers

Mr. Dasburg said the Board had been advised of the growth at the university branch campuses. He said the Board needed a better process for the front-end long-term planning of branch campuses. He said the Board would hear today about USF’s

branch campus in Lakeland and in November about FGCU's plans for a branch campus in Charlotte County.

Mr. Richard Stevens, Board staff, reviewed the applicable statutes and regulations governing the establishment of branch campuses. He said that prior to 2002, the Board of Regents had the authority to acquire real property; that land acquisition authority was transferred to the Boards of Trustees in 2002. This transfer of authority eliminated the opportunity for a state-level board to participate in planning for institutional growth, to engage in site selection, to consider cost implications, or to evaluate the impact on other institutions. This process created an environment where universities were planning for growth and searching out properties for branches without involving this Board.

Mr. Dasburg clarified that the universities now had the authority to acquire property without approval by the Board of Governors, while the Board of Governors authorized the addition of a branch campus. He said if the university acquired property for a branch campus anticipating Board approval, and the Board turned down the request, the university already owned that property.

Ms. Parker inquired about the Board's authority. Mr. Stevens said that the current statutes were adopted in 2002, devolving land acquisition to the university boards. She said that if the Board were reviewing its delegated responsibilities, this might be an issue for reconsideration. Mr. Temple noted that land acquisition was included in the Board's Legislative Budget Request. Ms. Pappas noted that sizeable properties were often donated.

Mr. Edwards said he was also concerned about a timeline where the university boards have acquired property without this Board's approval. He said he knew that FGCU was seeking donations of land. He said there also could be land donations to the universities they chose not to make available for use by the Board of Governors. He said he believed the authority for land acquisition should reside with this Board.

Commissioner Winn said there should be another legislative review of the "disconnects." He said the Board of Governors was not contemplated when the statutes were revised in 2002. He said there was no limitation on the Board of Governors in the branch campus process. He said this was an issue to be addressed legislatively. Mrs. Roberts said that as the Board evolved, there was increasing recognition of its authority. She said she was optimistic that the Legislature would work with the Board to address this issue. Provost Hickey said UCF was not buying land; donors were offering properties to the university. He said that there needed to be close coordination in the purchase/acceptance of land, and the same process to apply to branch campuses.

Mr. Dasburg said that this Board retained the authority for branch campuses. Ms. McDevitt said that there were probably no institutions aspiring to be in the top 50

which had branch campuses. President Genshaft said that there were a number of these institutions, such as Ohio State University, which did have branch campuses. She said she would be happy to provide the information. Ms. Pappas said this might be a topic for the System Coordination Committee to discuss.

Mr. Stevens reviewed the types of branch campuses and the process for the establishment of branch campuses, as prescribed by the current Board regulation. He explained that the regulation did not provide the universities any guidance as to process. He said the Board should also have other expectations in this process, including a history of off-campus instruction in the area, projected community growth, the need for full academic program offerings and a business plan addressing potential funding sources and local support. He said a revised regulation should provide a clear pathway for planning and approval and clear guidelines for branch campus proposals. Ms. Pappas inquired whether there was a sense of the efficiencies of a branch campus.

Mr. Dasburg said these issues would shape the system, how large a university should grow, the need for branch campuses. He said the structure should be as efficient as possible, providing a quality education, for many students. Mr. Brogan said this needed a lot of discussion, as there were numerous misconceptions about branch campuses. He said there was no "free" land, and universities needed to be aware of local expectations of full academic offerings with football teams.

5. Presentation, University of South Florida Lakeland Campus Plan

President Genshaft said the University of South Florida had four regional/branch campuses: the Tampa campus offered doctoral degrees; the other three, St. Petersburg, Lakeland and Sarasota offered undergraduate and masters degrees. One member of the USF Board of Trustees sits on each of the regional Campus Boards. She introduced Ms. Sherrill Tomasino, member, USF Board of Trustees, who served as a member of the Lakeland Campus Board. She also introduced the President of Polk Community College, Dr. Eileen Holden.

Dr. Genshaft said the goals for each regional campus were to meet local needs. The program offerings differed at each regional campus. She said that the values for the branch campuses had changed. In 2000, students could take courses at the branches, but finished their degrees in Tampa. Now, it was important for students to be able to finish their undergraduate degree at the regional sites. She reviewed growth projections for Lakeland and Polk County.

She said USF-Tampa was now 50 years old. USF-St. Petersburg was the oldest regional campus at 40 years old; USF-Lakeland opened its doors, sharing space with Polk Community College, in January 1988. She reviewed the timeline of the Lakeland campus, noting that Chancellor Herbert proposed a donation of land for a new Lakeland campus in Fall 2000. In July 2002, the Legislature appropriated \$1 million in

planning funds for the “new Lakeland campus;” August 2003, the USF Lakeland Campus Board accepted the recommendation of the Land Acquisition Committee to accept the Williams property as the site for the new campus; June 2004, the Lakeland campus submitted its enrollment plan to the USF Board of Trustees. She said there had been a series of public hearings in Fall 2005 regarding the Campus Master Plan.

President Genshaft introduced Dr. Marshall Goodman, Vice President and Campus Executive Officer, who described the dynamic strategic plan for USF-Lakeland. He also answered three strategic questions for the USF-Lakeland campus, i.e., about what are you deeply passionate; at what can you be the best in the world; and what drives your resource engine. He said the USF-Lakeland campus provided access and an opportunity to acquire 21<sup>st</sup> century skills; the campus is highly student-centered; and it is relevant to the community.

He said that he had come to Florida from California which was a state also experiencing transition. He said that California in the 1960s was a state known for agriculture and tourism. Today, California was the fourth leading economy in the world. In 1960, California adopted a master plan for higher education to build deep, develop niches, build quality, and regionalize, and that the universities were tied to developing the economic needs of the state. He said USF-Lakeland was inspired by the Chancellor’s remarks in January 2006, that the universities needed to be the drivers of the state’s knowledge economy. He said the curriculum focus for the campus was Information Technology, Applied Health and Biotechnology, Manufacturing Technology with a focus on agriculture and food, Business and Education.

Dr. Goodman said the campus had a “stellar” relationship with Polk Community College, and would continue the seamless delivery of courses as the USF-Lakeland campus moved to its new location. He said the Board staff would visit the campus the next day and tour the new PCC-USF Joint-use Technology Building.

President Genshaft said she was proud of the USF campuses. She said it was important for this Board to understand that USF spoke with one voice, under one Board of Trustees and with one President.

Mrs. Roberts said she supported this branch campus, as she was aware of the need in Polk County. She said she was concerned about the location of this branch and its distance from certain parts of the county. President Genshaft said the property was located on the High Tech Corridor, 75 miles from the Orlando airport, and 75 miles from the Tampa airport. Mr. Dasburg said the location could not now be undone.

Mr. Edwards inquired who actually owned the property. He said this was germane to the Committee’s earlier comments that the Board of Governors should be in charge of site-determination.

Ms. McDevitt inquired about the number of degree programs offered. Dr. Goodman said there were about eight to ten programs at the outset, with the expectation for the eventual offering of 30 programs. Commissioner Winn said he would be interested in a post-audit of enrollment, both for the community college and the branch campus, reviewing both the projected enrollment and the actual enrollment numbers.

6. Community College Bachelor Degree Update

Mr. Dasburg said Board discussion of the community college offering of bachelor degrees was premature.

7. Cost, Quality, Capacity and Efficiency Working Group Update

Dr. Johnson said the working group had decided to focus on mechanical engineering, elementary education, and nursing. The final report would include the cost of the credit hours required for degrees in each of those three areas at each institution, with an explanation of factors affecting variability in costs. The report will also include an analysis of the cost of increasing capacity by 10% in each degree area, on the assumption that overall enrollment growth is funded and that there is sufficient student demand for the programs. At Mr. Dasburg's request, the committee gave its approval to the direction the working group proposed.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m., September 21, 2006. Mr. Dasburg encouraged Board members to work with the Pappas Consulting Group on the structure project.

---

John Dasburg, Chairman

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary