

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STRATEGIC PLANNING & ACADEMIC & SYSTEM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
WORKSHOP
1703 TURLINGTON BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
AUGUST 6, 2009

Mr. Martin convened the Workshop of the Strategic Planning and Academic and System Oversight Committee of the Board of Governors at 10:45 a.m., in Room 1703, Turlington Building, Tallahassee, Florida, August 6, 2009, with the following members present: John Barnes, Sheila McDevitt, Carolyn Roberts, Commissioner Eric Smith, Dr. Judith Solano, and Gus Stavros. Dr. Stanley Marshall participated by telephone.

1. Introductory Comments

Mr. Martin welcomed all the participants to this strategic planning workshop. He said this would be the first of several that would be scheduled in efforts to align State, System and individual university strategic planning and performance monitoring endeavors. He said that he had a planning background and that he was excited with the strategic planning process. He said the Board had already engaged in several strategic planning efforts, including the Strategic Plan developed under John Dasburg's leadership and the Pappas Report of 2007. He said these had been left hanging and it was time to bring all this work together. He said staff had been working with university colleagues throughout the System; this was an opportunity for a dialogue as they worked collectively to make the System better.

Mr. Martin explained that the focus of the workshop would be the review of various planning and performance expectations already in place for the universities and whether it was possible to design a more meaningful and less redundant approach for ensuring that Board members would have some of the key data they needed to inform strategic planning, budgeting and other policy decisions for the State University System.

He said he wanted to recognize how well the universities were already performing. He said Board members had received notice of a new report written by Patrick J. Kelly as part of the Delta Cost Project, "The Dreaded "P" Word: An Examination of Productivity in Public Postsecondary Education." He said several items in the report were worth noting. It found that Florida's top ranking reflected the overall success of its public postsecondary systems, including the articulation mechanisms that existed between the Florida College System and the State University System. It also found that Florida was ranked first in productivity as measured by total funding per credential (degrees and certificates) for all public postsecondary education. It found that Florida was ranked eighth in productivity as measured by total funding per

credential for public bachelor's and master's granting institutions, and that Florida was ranked fifth in degrees (and certificates) awarded per 100 FTE students for public postsecondary education (weighted by the value of degrees and certificates in the state employment market – median earnings by award type and level).

Mr. Martin said the report suggested that a good course of action for states like Florida whose postsecondary institutions were already achieving high productivity with relatively few resources would be to focus on where to target resources in order to increase degrees in high-demand fields and increase levels of degree completion. He noted that even though the SUS was above average on these particular productivity measures, it was important not to become complacent. He said the Board needed to be able to demonstrate to its governmental partners and the greater public that it continued to be good stewards of public funds and that the Board was seeking opportunities and support to improve and contribute to the citizens' educational attainment and the State's economic development.

2. Review of Current Performance Expectations and Related Indicators

Mr. Martin asked Dr. Minear to review current performance expectations and related indicators. Dr. Minear commented on the handout, "State University System of Florida Strategic Planning, Tuition Differential, "University Compact," and Accountability Measures." She said that since its inception in 2003, the Board had looked at a variety of measures to monitor the performance of the State University System and of individual institutions. In June 2005, the Board had adopted the SUS Strategic Plan 2005-2013. Subsequently, under the leadership of Mr. Uhlfelder, as Chair of the Performance and Accountability Committee, an SUS Accountability System was designed. In addition, as the Board implemented the Forward by Design strategic action initiatives, the Board had asked a presidential workgroup to design a "university compact" template. Dr. Minear noted that a number of new reporting expectations had been put into place as a part of the tuition differential process at the undergraduate level.

She said that at the June Board meeting, Chair McDevitt had asked staff to review the array of performance monitoring expectations currently in place for the universities. She said staff had worked with university colleagues to identify duplicates and potential gaps in the information. She said that as a starting point, they had tried to capture the measures that Board members had identified as areas of significant interest, as well as the tuition differential measures included in the statute. She said she hoped to identify the indicators that would be most useful to highlight.

3. Proposed University Work Plan and Annual Reporting Process

Mr. Martin said the goal would be to link university work plans with an annual reporting process. He said the goal was that these would be seamless, minimize duplication and use existing databases.

Dr. Minear read the following provision from the Board's Regulation on UBOT Powers and Duties: "Each board of trustees shall prepare a multi-year work plan/report for the Board of Governors that outlines its university's top priorities, strategic directions, and specific actions and financial plans for achieving those priorities, as well as performance expectations and outcomes on institutional and systemwide goals. The work plan/report shall reflect the university's distinctive mission and focus on core institutional strengths within the context of State University System goals and regional and statewide needs."

She said the Committee was considering the possibility of using this University Work Plan and Annual Report format to consolidate many of the prior planning and performance reporting requirements into a meaningful and useful process with a few documents that met multiple needs. She proposed that the Board ask the UBOTs to submit University Work Plan/Proposal for consideration during the May/June timeframe. The Work Plan would capture information usually requested for enrollment planning, academic program planning, and tuition differential proposals, as well as the information discussed to be included in the "university compacts," including information needed for LBR discussions. She said the Board would ask each UBOT to submit a University Annual Report for review during December/January. The Annual Report would include information usually requested/compiled for the SUS accountability report, updates on the Board's Strategic Plan, the tuition differential annual report, the "university compacts," Centers of Excellence and Commercialization Assistance Grants annual reports, and university updates on shared services and efficiency efforts. Once implemented, she said the Board would have the Annual Report for the prior year available as reference as the Board reviewed the new Work Plans for the next year.

She said that as staff had discussions with university staff, it became clear that it was critical to consider how the information would be presented in an Annual Report. She said the Board members had seen a document, with many pages of data tables, which would contain the underlying data that could be used to build a short executive summary that would be readable, and using graphics and narratives, capture a number of key performance indicators.

Dr. Minear proposed that each fall, Board staff would provide the universities with all of the detailed foundational data needed to build the report and that were available from the State University Data System and from national sources. Each university would add supplemental data and then draft a short narrative report with appropriate charts and graphs to highlight and explain key data and progress on key indicators. She said that a University Annual Report would need to focus at a level that

would be useful and meaningful for this Board. Additional detail could be included as Appendices.

Dr. Minear said that information from the institutional annual reports, as well as other SUS data, could be rolled into a State University System Annual Report to be shared with the Legislature and the Governor's Office. She said that eventually, the information would be available in an easily accessible on-line format, with links to additional detail.

Mr. Martin said there had been two conference calls with university representatives to hear their concerns. He said they had discussed whether this was the right way to proceed. He noted that through this process, they might be able to eliminate some reports. He said it was important to show the State of Florida that the Board was a good steward of the resources provided to the State University System.

Mr. Brogan said this represented a concerted effort to align the cyclical efforts of the UBOTs with the Board of Governors. He said this provided a clear forecast of the information and when it was needed. He lauded the alignment of calendars.

Ms. McDevitt noted that FSU had raised the issue that there were some definitions still to be clarified. Dr. Glover said he understood the process that Board staff, through available data in the database, would populate the data cells, and that the universities were to provide context for the data.

Ms. McDevitt said the Board was also looking at mission alignment. She said the universities needed to be consistent with their vision and mission. She said they needed to be mindful of how institutional goals and System goals aligned.

4. Example Annual Report

Mr. Martin said staff at the University of South Florida had agreed to work through the templates and the process to develop an example for the Committee to review. Provost Wilcox said they had developed an example of the annual report and the work plan using the template thus far negotiated. He said the materials included more distilled products which were useful to USF's trustees. He explained that they had considered the purpose for this reporting, i.e., accountability; the consolidation of the growing reporting requirements to this Board, state and federal agencies; and the expectation of information from the UBOTs. He said this represented an effort to bring a semblance of consistency of definition and of metrics. He said this could be used to inform enrollment decisions as well as address policy and budget matters.

Provost Wilcox described the material documented, page by page. He explained that the Mission Statement was short, with embedded links to allow the reader to obtain more extensive information. He said the citation of the Carnegie Classification differentiated the universities. He said USF also produced a report as a part of the

Voluntary System of Accountability College Portrait of Undergraduate Education. He said the report included fundamental cells of budget data, across the institution, as well as for separately funded centers, such as the Health Science Center.

Dr. Wilcox said the report included information the universities would need to show how they had spent federal stimulus dollars for the two years the funds would be provided. The report included detail on enrollment and funding, by level, for all units. He explained that the report allowed the universities to elaborate on undergraduate education, and to describe success stories and challenges presented. He said the university could highlight the results of institutional investments, such as improved graduation rates and increases in undergraduate research opportunities. He said there was extensive information provided regarding baccalaureate degree productivity; the distribution of degrees to underrepresented students; the percentage of degrees awarded within 110 percent of hours required. He noted that there were still discussions about how to define the metrics to be used to count faculty teaching undergraduate courses and undergraduate faculty compensation. He said the data for student/faculty ratios were showing improvement, but this seemed to be the result of a change in the way these numbers were defined.

Ms. McDevitt said the information regarding student/faculty ratios was very important. She said there might need to be additional clarification in the way these numbers were presented. Dr. Glover inquired about intent, whether this figure would be used to compare institutions or whether it was for making a case to the Legislature. Ms. McDevitt noted that the reports would be used for multiple purposes.

Dr. Wilcox explained the page describing the collection of the differential tuition and some of the outcomes from that additional revenue. He said the report allowed the universities to report on progress made on university goals and metrics identified in the university's last annual work plan. He said this allowed the universities to address their focus areas. He said he had highlighted elements which defined undergraduate education at USF, including undergraduate student selectivity, service learning, USF Exchange Programs, and undergraduate research activity. In response to a question about enrollment, Dr. Wilcox said there were about 35,000 undergraduate students at USF. He said the report continued with information about graduate education and graduate degree productivity, and the opportunity to provide narrative about the institution's goals regarding graduate education. He said the report continued with information regarding the university's performance in research and economic development and data on research and development expenditures. He said the universities were then asked to report information about their Centers of Excellence, Commercialization Assistance Grants, and last, any additional pertinent information the university might want to report, e.g., highlighting shared services or increased efficiencies.

Ms. McDevitt inquired where the universities reported on retention. Dr. Wilcox said this information was captured in the undergraduate education data on pages 9-10. Shortcomings were described in the narrative.

Dr. Wilcox said the report captured a great deal of information. He said they had tried providing their trustees this level of detail when the trustees were first appointed in 2001, but the trustees preferred a higher level of reporting. He said USF staff had then devised a more distilled report capturing key performance indicators.

Ms. McDevitt said the work plan should be broadened to carry the targets and goals to be reported annually. She said the report should also include aspirational goals, to what the university seeks to become and what the university would do to achieve its annual vision. Dr. Wilcox replied that it was a challenge to plan “in the dark” when the university was unsure about future resources. He said much of this information was already provided annually. This new process was being developed in an attempt to achieve consistent definitions for providing the information. He said a university portfolio could be done for every college and every department, and select items could help guide administrative decisions.

Dr. Wilcox described other documents provided, including the USF University Compact, USF Strategic Plan Metrics, USF peer institutions, the USF Enrollment Profile and the USF InfoCenter.

Mr. Martin thanked Provost Wilcox and his USF colleagues. He said this was excellent information, and it would be of value for the Board to have similar information from each university.

Ms. McDevitt inquired whether USF had targeted goals without contemplating new resources. Dr. Wilcox said their business plan had not held up, but that the University had met its goals despite declining revenues.

President Hitt said that all but two of the SUS institutions were already reporting through the Voluntary System of Accountability. Provost Glover said he was not sure that all the elements were summative to the System level, and may not necessarily show how the System was moving forward. President Rosenberg said he was not sure whether this was a governance or a management tool. He said it was important to sort this out in order for it to be meaningful.

Mr. Martin said the goal was to present work plans and annual reports from all the universities to inform Board decision making. He encouraged the university representatives to continue to work with Board staff in refining the details.

5. Next Steps and Concluding Remarks

Dr. Minear inquired whether the Committee was comfortable with the proposed two-step process. She said staff would begin to draft a Board regulation that would

codify the expectations for using the University Work Plan and Annual Report processes to monitor university performance on key indicators. She said the work group needed to continue to work on definition issues and several other pieces. She inquired whether there were any elements missing from the reports. She suggested that at the September meeting, staff would bring to the Committee a proposed template for the executive summary.

Ms. McDevitt said USF had presented good examples. Mr. Martin concurred with Dr. Minear's suggestions.

Dr. Solano inquired about the presentation of university goals, the extent to which the universities would have certain goals, and for which indicators would there need to be goals. Ms. McDevitt said the universities would certainly have enrollment goals. She said the universities should show that they were doing what they said they would do using other people's money. Dr. Solano cautioned about an indicator regarding quality faculty and being careful about showing the citations of faculty for publications. Ms. McDevitt said she was especially interested in having the data which would assist the Board in getting the funding to the universities that would result in improving them in national standings.

Mrs. Roberts thanked Provost Wilcox and his staff for the impressive presentation of data. She cautioned that it was not really possible to separate the information into governance or management tools. The information was valid for both purposes.

There were no further comments. Mr. Martin extended his thanks to all the members of the work group, and particularly to Provost Wilcox.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m., August 6, 2009.

Frank T. Martin, Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary