

MINUTES
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
SEPTEMBER 24, 2003

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 11:00 a.m., in the WFSU Broadcast Center, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, September 24, 2003, with the following members present: Pam Bilbrey, Dr. Castell Bryant; Commissioner Jim Horne; John W. Temple; and Dr. Zachariah P. Zachariah.

Commissioner Horne noted that the Council for Educational Policy, Research and Improvement; the State Board of Education, and previously adopted university plans all addressed the topic of goals for the University System. Mr. Dasburg said he had asked the Chancellor to design a matrix showing the key missions, goals, and strategies adopted by the universities. This information had been distributed. He said this Committee had a major task, to establish the mission for the Board of Governors. He said he had previously used the term, Charter, which apparently carried negative connotations. He now suggested temporarily calling this a "work plan."

He said the Committee had begun work on a document that divided the Board's categories of responsibilities between duties for the State University System and the duties and responsibilities of governance of the University Boards of Trustees. The draft now before the members, Draft 3, reflected his work with the Chancellor.

He said it was important to have a Preamble outlining the source of the Board's authority and an enumeration of the duties for which the Board is responsible. He sought comments on the Preamble, noting that this document was a "work in progress," and that the Board would be seeking comments from the University Boards of Trustees and the Presidents. The Preamble states that the Board is subject to the appropriation powers of the Legislature, and is responsible for achieving excellence. The Preamble quotes from the Constitution in the description of the Board's responsibilities and the Board's membership. Ms. Bilbrey and Dr. Bryant said these were good statements.

Mr. Dasburg said the Preamble captured the appropriate foundation. He described the structure of the document. Part I describes the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Governors; Part II describes the Board's duties and responsibilities with respect to the colleges and universities; Part III describes those duties and responsibilities devolved to the University Boards of Trustees; Part IV describes how the Board will operate. He said this was a common structure.

He asked Board members for their thoughts on Part I with its 10 enumerated duties. Dr. Rock inquired about the change in 4 and the addition of "an element of financial strategy" being a policy on tuition and fees. He said the addition might weaken the initial statement. Mr. Dasburg said the statement about "determining financial needs" had been discussed. Mrs. Roberts said her sense was that this was being

respectful of the role of the Legislature and that discussions of tuition would be done with them. Commissioner Horne said the statement of a policy is a good one, and leaves room for differing interpretations. It recognizes that another entity does the appropriating of funds. Mr. Uhlfelder inquired whether this gave the Board the authority to set the range for presidential salaries. He said it was important that the Board control the salary range, without putting a limit on the range. Mr. Dasburg said this was not the intent, pointing out the Trustees' duties enumerated in Part II.6. Mr. Temple said as a member of the FAU Board, he had felt it to be their duty to determine presidential salary; the intent in Part I is broader.

Dr. Rock said this Board should be the entity to appoint its Chancellor. Mr. Temple concurred. Dr. Bryant inquired whether the Chancellor was also responsible for the independent colleges. Dr. Austin said she did not have that responsibility. Dr. Bryant inquired about the effect on the concept of a K-20 system if this Board appointed its Chancellor. The Commissioner said this did present a challenge, as the Board had no budget authority. He said the goal was to preserve the K-20 system; the Department was acting as one common agency. He said it would be fine for the Board to appoint the Chancellor, as a part of the K-20 system. He said he would vigorously resist the appointment outside the K-20 system, but would concur with giving the Board more authority in the selection of the Chancellor. He noted that Mr. Petway had participated in Dr. Austin's selection.

Dr. Zachariah inquired whether the Board of Regents had selected its Chancellor. Mrs. Roberts said it had. Commissioner Horne noted that there had previously not been a Division of Colleges and Universities. The Board of Regents had 165 positions and a \$12 million budget. It had been a separate entity. Since its abolition, the Department now included all the educational delivery sectors. Mr. Rummell said he was interested in the Board having a voice. He agreed that this created an unusual situation. Mr. Dasburg inquired whether it would be consistent with Dr. Rock's thinking to include "advise and consent" language. Dr. Rock said it was important that the Board have a role. Commissioner Horne said he was concerned about building a separate staff; there should be a cooperative and consensual selection process, one where the Chancellor works with the Commissioner. Mrs. Roberts added that this Board should do the Chancellor's evaluation with the Commissioner. Ms. Bilbrey added that the Board should be active in the interview process and confirm the recommendation of the Chancellor's selection. Mr. Woodring reminded the Board that at the January meeting of the Board, the Board had delegated to the Commissioner the selection of the staff. Mr. Dasburg said the Board should establish its jurisdiction and make certain delegations; there should be some statement about the Board's role in the selection process.

Mrs. Roberts inquired about the language regarding the evaluation. Mr. Dasburg said the Board should participate, it was not an either/or situation. The Commissioner had expectations of working together. This Board should perform an evaluation; the Commissioner also does his evaluation.

Mr. Dasburg inquired whether the statement should be the Board of Governors chooses the Chancellor and provides the evaluation, subject to the advice and consent

of the Commissioner, or the opposite statement, with the Commissioner doing the selection, subject to the advice and consent of the Board. The Commissioner said he would prefer doing the choosing, but agreed that the decision should rest with the Board, with the Commissioner's advice and consent. The Committee members agreed that the statement should be the Board of Governors selects and provides the annual evaluation of the Chancellor, with the advice and consent of the Commissioner.

Mr. Temple inquired who would conduct a search for the Chancellor, should Dr. Austin leave. Mr. Dasburg said the Commissioner would conduct the search. Mr. Temple said the Board should be involved in the search. Dr. Zachariah said it was the responsibility of this Board to select its Chancellor. Mr. Temple asked who would actually do the work for the search. Dr. Bryant suggested substituting language "in collaboration with" rather than "advice and consent" and define the role of the Commissioner as providing the technical assistance to conduct a search, recognizing that the Chancellor will also work with the Board of Governors and with the Commissioner. Mr. Woodring clarified that in the K-20 context, the Chancellor worked for the Commissioner, the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors. He commented that the Board would have to conduct searches in the "sunshine." The Commissioner could recruit and do the search out of the public eye, more effectively than a committee of the Board. He suggested that the Board could ask the Commissioner to initiate a search in the event of an opening, and bring back recommendations for the Board's selection. Mrs. Roberts said the Board clearly did not want to receive the call at the end of the process, advising of the Chancellor's selection. Commissioner Horne said he liked "advice and consent," as he viewed this as a coequal relationship. Mr. Dasburg agreed. The recruiting and the process remains with the Commissioner. Dr. Bryant inquired whether "advice and consent" included technical assistance. Mr. Woodring said roles could change in a search. If a search were needed, this Board could ask the Commissioner to undertake the search, identify qualified candidates and bring candidates back for the Board's final approval. For the evaluation, Mr. Woodring suggested "the Board of Governors will provide the annual evaluation of the Chancellor.

Mr. Dasburg said Part I, new 11 would deal with the appointment of the Chancellor, as discussed. Part 1, new 12 would deal with the evaluation of the Chancellor.

Mr. Dasburg asked for comments on Part II, as presented. Dr. Rock expressed concern about Part II, item 6, dealing with presidential selection. He inquired whether this Board would review the criteria prior to the initiation of a search. Mr. Dasburg said it was his view that this Board should be comfortable that the process works, but not for this Board to specify any particular process. Commissioner Horne said that before this Board had been established, the role of the State Board in the process had been to assure that criteria had been established, that the process specified had been followed in the presidential selection. Mrs. Roberts said the University Boards set the criteria for the search, this Board ensured the integrity of the process.

Mr. Uhlfelder said he felt it important that this Board have some say in approving the range of the presidential salaries. He said he was concerned about some of the

recent salary decisions. Mrs. Roberts said this Board would soon develop a statewide Strategic Plan. She said she was uncomfortable providing salary limits to the University Boards. Mr. Temple said this Board was to ratify the selection; salary decisions were devolved to the University Boards.

Mr. Dasburg thanked the members for their comments. He said a draft of the "Work Plan" would ultimately be distributed to the universities, to the Presidents, and to the Chairs of the University Boards, seeking their feedback. This document would also serve as a foundation for the "work plan" for each of the Board committees.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m., September 24, 2003.

John Dasburg
Chairman

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary