AGENDA
Strategic Planning Committee Workshop
University Conference Center
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida
September 17, 2014
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
or
Upon Adjournment of Previous Meetings

Chair: Mr. Dean Colson; Vice Chair: Ms. Patricia Frost
Members: Beard, Doyle, Lautenbach, Morton, Robinson, Webster

Purpose of the Meeting

- **Review 2012-2025 Strategic Plan Metrics**
- **Receive recommendations from staff as to Strategic Plan metrics and associated goals**
- **Consider inclusion of Performance-based Funding metrics in Strategic Plan**

1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks	**Governor Dean Colson**
2. Review of 2012-2025 Strategic Plan Metrics and Associated Goals; Consider Inclusion of Performance-based Funding Metrics in Strategic Plan	**Governor Colson** **Dr. Jan Ignash,** *Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Board of Governors*
3. Closing Remarks and Adjournment	**Governor Colson**

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Strategic Planning Committee Workshop
September 17, 2014

SUBJECT: Strategic Plan Alignment: Review of 2012-2025 Strategic Plan Metrics and Associated Goals; Consider Inclusion of Performance-based Funding Metrics in Strategic Plan

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

For discussion.

AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF GOVERNORS ACTION

Article IX, Section 7, Florida Constitution

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Strategic Planning Committee will meet in a workshop venue to continue its discussion of alignment of its 2012-2025 Strategic Plan. The Committee will receive staff recommendations with respect to the inclusion or omission of specific current metrics in the Strategic Plan, the addition or substitution of new metrics, and recommendations for keeping or revising goals on a number of specific metrics. Discussions will also involve potentially moving metrics from one section to another in the Strategic Plan's current organization of metrics and goals to better reflect its emphasis on excellence, productivity, and strategic priorities.

Supporting Documentation Included: None

Facilitators / Presenters: Governor Colson, Jan Ignash

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM *of* FLORIDA
BOARD *of* GOVERNORS

2025 SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN

RE-ALIGNMENT

Strategic Planning Committee Workshop (Sept. 2014)

(DRAFT 9/08/2014)

Teaching and Learning

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
EXCELLENCE				
1) National Rankings for Universities ~~and Programs~~ PBF: NCF	Three universities ranked Top 50 for public undergraduate	1 in Top 10, 1 in Top 11-25, 1 in Top 50-75	Five universities ranked Top 50 for public undergraduate	2 in Top 10, 1 in Top 11-25, 2 in Top 25-50
2) Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class PBF: NCF	**33%[1]** **(Fall 2010)**	**37%** **(Fall 2013)**	**50%**	**50%**
3) Professional Licensure & Certification Exam Pass Rates Above Benchmarks	23 (of 28) Above Benchmarks (2009-10)	36 (of 46) Above Benchmarks (2012-13)	All Exams Above Benchmarks	All Exam Pass Rates Above Benchmarks

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Notes: (1)The 2011 actual 'Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class' was revised from 28% to 33% to correct an error in the previous methodology.

Teaching and Learning (continued)

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
PRODUCTIVITY				
4) Average Time To Degree (for FTIC in 120hr programs)	**4.0**[1] (2009-10)	**4.0** (2012-13)	**4.0**	**4.0**
5) Four-Year Graduation Rates (for Full- and Part-time FTIC)	**34%** (2004-08)	**41%** (2009-13)	**50%**	**50%**
6) Six-Year Graduation Rates (for Full- and Part-time FTIC) PBF: ALL	**60%** (2004-10)	**63%** (2007-13)	**70%**	**70%**
7) Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours PBF: ALL (except FSU,UF)	**n/a**[2]	**65%** (2012-13)	**80%**	**80%**
8) Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually PBF: UCF	**53,392** (2009-10)	**59,126** (2012-13)	**90,000**	**90,000**
9) Graduate Degrees Awarded Annually	**20,188** (2009-10)	**22,134** (2012-13)	**40,000**	**35,000**[3]

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Notes: (1)The 2011 actual Time-to-Degree has been revised to account for a methodology change that now uses the median rather than the mean. (2) The Excess Hours metric has undergone significant changes over the last few years in the definitions, data collection process and methodology used to calculate the metric, all of which prohibit providing historical data for this metric. (3) The goal for graduate degrees has been lowered in recognition of the recent declining enrollments at the graduate level – especially in Education programs.

Teaching and Learning (continued)

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
PRODUCTIVITY (continued)				
10) Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to African-American & Hispanic Students PBF: FAU, FGCU, FIU	**16,207** (30%) (2009-10)	**20,500** (35%) (2012-13)	**31,500** (35%)	**36,000** (40%)
11) Number of Adult *(Aged 25+)* Undergraduates Enrolled PBF: UWF	**46,725** (19%) (Fall 2009)	**51,102** (19%) (Fall 2012)	**75,000** (21%)	**75,000** (21%)
12) Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance-Learning and Hybrid-Learning PBF: UNF	**n/a[1]**	**14%** (2012-13) (based on new definitions)	**30%**	**30%**
NEW 13) Number of Institutions with at least 30% of Fall Undergraduates Receiving a Pell Grant (Related to University Access Rate) PBF: ALL	**n/a**	**10 of 11[2]** (Fall 2012)	**n/a**	**All Above 30%**
NEW 14) Academic Progress Rate (2nd Fall Retention with GPA>=2) PBF: ALL	**n/a**	**83%** (2012-13)	**n/a**	**90%**

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Notes: (1) The definitions used to describe distance learning were revised in 2010, so the 2008-09 data point (of 18%) used during the 2011 strategic planning process should not be compared to the 2014 data that is based on the revised definition. (2) Florida Polytechnic University did not have any enrollments in Fall 2012.

Teaching and Learning (continued)

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES				
15) Bachelor's Degrees in Programs of Strategic Emphasis (Categories Include: STEM, Health, Education, Global, and Gap Analysis) PBF: ALL	**19,832** (37%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**28,934** (47%) (2012-13 revised list)	**45,000** (50%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**45,000** (50%) (after 2012-13 revision)
~~Bachelor's Degrees in STEM~~ (Percent of Bachelor's Total)	**9,605** (18%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**n/a**	**22,500** (25%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**REMOVE METRIC**
NEW 16) Bachelor's Degrees in STEM & Health (Percent of Bachelor's Total)	**n/a**	**17,550** (28%) (after 2012-13 revision)	**n/a**	**30,000** (35%) (after 2012-13 revision)
17) Graduate Degrees in Programs of Strategic Emphasis (Categories Include: STEM, Health, Education, Global, and Gap Analysis) PBF: ALL (except NCF)	**9,170** (45%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**12,654** (57%) (after 2012-13 revision)	**20,000** (50%) (before 2012-13 revision)	**18,200** (60%) (after 2012-13 revision)
~~Graduate Degrees in STEM~~ (Percent of Graduate Total)	**4,330** (21%)	**n/a**	**14,000** (35%)	**REMOVE METRIC**
NEW 18) Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health (Percent of Graduate Total)	**n/a**	**9,131** (41%) (after 2012-13 revision)	**n/a**	**15,200** (50%) (after 2012-13 revision)

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
EXCELLENCE				
19) Faculty Membership in National Academies	**38** (2009)	**38** (2011)	**75** (based on 2009)	**75** (based on 2011)
~~Number of Faculty Designated a Highly Cited Scholar~~	46	n/a [Metric has been significantly revised]	**100**	**REMOVE METRIC**
NEW 20) Faculty Awards PBF: FSU, UF	**n/a**	**56** (2011)	**n/a**	**75** (based on 2011 data)
21) Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Assisting in Faculty Research --- or --- Percent of Undergraduates Engaged in Research PBF: NCF	This metric is not reported at the System level.	There is not yet a standard definition for this metric across the System.	**50%**	**IN PROGRESS:** Board staff will work to develop a standard definition for this metric across the System.

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation (continued)

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
PRODUCTIVITY				
22) Total R&D Expenditures PBF: UF	**$1.68B** (2009-10)	**$1.78B** (2012-13)	**$3.25B** (based on 2009-10)	**$2.29B** (based on 2012-13)
23) Percent of R&D Expenditures funded from External Sources [previously a Strategic Priority metric] PBF: FAMU	**59%** (2008-09)	**59%** (2012-13)	**67%** (based on 2008-09)	**71%** (based on 2011-12)
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES				
24) Highly Regarded National Programs	**n/a**	Program reputations not currently tracked.	**n/a**	Each university will have a program that is highly regarded in its field.
NEW 25) Number of Patents Awarded Annually	**n/a**	**303** (2013)	**n/a**	**410** (based on 2013)
26) Number of Licenses and Options Executed Annually [Previously a Productivity Metric]	**159** (2008-09)	**208** (2011-12)	**250** (based on 2008-09)	**270** (based on 2011-12)
27) Number of Start-Up Companies Created [Previously a Productivity Metric]	**18** (2008-09)	**30** (2011-12)	**40**	**40**

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Community and Business Engagement

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	ACTUAL		2025 GOALS	
	2011	2014	ORIGINAL 2011	REVISED 2014
EXCELLENCE				
28) Number of Universities with the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification	**7**	**7**	All	All
PRODUCTIVITY				
~~Percentage of Students Participating in Identified Community & Business Engagement Activities~~	This data is not currently tracked.	This data is not currently tracked.	**Establish a Goal**	**REMOVE METRIC**
~~Enrollment in Professional Training and Continuing Education Courses~~	This data is not currently tracked.	This data is not currently tracked.	**Establish a Goal**	**REMOVE METRIC**
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES				
29) Percentage of Baccalaureate Graduates Continuing Education or Employed PBF: ALL	**81%**[1] (2009-10 graduates)	**66%**[1] (2011-12 graduates)	**90%**	**90%**

Detailed definitions for each metric are provided in the back of the document – starting on page 10.

Notes: (1) In 2012-13, the methodology for this post-graduation metric has changed from the original 81% estimate (which incorrectly double-counted graduates who were employed and enrolled) that was based only on FETPIP data, and was expanded to include non-Florida enrollment data from the National Student Clearinghouse. In 2014, Board staff have continued to work on adding non-Florida employment data to capture a greater proportion of the State University System graduating class.

Teaching and Learning

EXCELLENCE

1.National Rankings for Universities

RATIONALE: Excellence is a difficult thing to quantify and measure which is why university rankings are controversial. Institutions that do well try to benefit from the enhanced prestige with better student recruitment, increased alumni donations and government support. Others challenge the methodology by arguing the complex business of educating students, enabling cutting-edge research, and the many community and business engagement efforts cannot be boiled down into a single number -- Einstein's dictum that not everything that counts can be measured. Despite the arguments against any one ranking publication, the purpose of the Board's decision to consider multiple ranking publications was to better understand the national landscape that the System's universities live within, and to have an external evaluation of how well the universities have carried out their academic responsibilities.
SOURCE: Board staff analysis of various publications.

2.Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class

RATIONALE: The Top 10% of the high school graduating class provides an indicator of the quality of the incoming First-Time-in-College class. This metric enables universities to consider applications from a wide range of schools so they can have a diverse, yet excellent, student body. It is important to note that not every high school in Florida provides a class rank, so this data is missing for about one-quarter of the System's incoming class. The goal (of 50%) was based on the average of the top tier institutions (n=108) listed in the 2011 US News and World Reports National University rankings that cited 2009-10 Common Data Set data.

Is the 50% goal attainable? Yes. The SUS admits about 35,000 FTICs every Fall, so about 17,500 would need to have graduated in the top 10% of their high school class. Florida's public schools produced 154,000 standard diplomas in 2012-13. So, there were roughly 15,000 students in the top 10% from Florida public high schools alone. This does not even consider the students from Florida's private schools or the out of state students.

SOURCE: University submissions to the Common Data Set.

Teaching and Learning (continued)

3.Professional Licensure & Certification Exam Pass Rates Above Benchmarks

RATIONALE: Licensure & certification exam pass rates are one of the few indicators the measure how well universities are preparing students to enter professional occupations relative. This metric is based on the first-time pass rate, rather than the ultimate pass rate, to get a better sense of how well the program prepared students for their profession. For better context, the university pass rates are compared to the state and national averages for first-time pass rates.
SOURCE: Annual Accountability Reports.

PRODUCTIVITY

4. Average Time To Degree

RATIONALE: Traditionally, a bachelor's program required 120 credit hours and was expected to be completed in four calendar years for students enrolled full-time. This metric is similar to graduation rate because both are measuring completion based on time; however time-to-degree is a complement to graduation rates because it approaches the issue from the other-side. Time-to-degree looks backwards from the graduating class to see when the FTIC students first entered the university.

It is important to note that this methodology for this metric has changed since the original goal was set. In 2011, the data and goal were based on the mean average with a start date of the most recent admission. In 2014, this was changed to the median average (to reduce the effect of outliers) with a start date based on the date of first entry. This methodology change lowered the System's time to 4.0 years – or, 48 months. Historical data was re-calculated using the new method, and the System median average has been 48 months for the last six years.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

5 & 6. Four- and Six- Year Graduation Rates (for Full- and Part-time FTIC)

RATIONALE: Graduation rates are one of the key accountability measures that demonstrate how well an institution is serving its First-Time-in-College students. Cohorts are based on undergraduate FTIC students who enter the institution in the Fall term (or Summer term and continue into the Fall term) with fewer than 12 hours earned since high school graduation. Students of degree programs longer than four years (eg, PharmD) are included in the cohorts. The initial cohorts are revised to remove students, who have allowable exclusions as defined by IPEDS, from the cohort.

For purposes of making national comparisons, this metric is based only on the FTICs who graduate from the same institution where they started. For the 2008-12 FTIC cohort, the State University System of Florida was ranked 14th among states' public four-year universities with 41% graduating from the same institution that they started.

For the 2006-12 FTIC cohort, the State University System of Florida was ranked 10th among states' public four-year universities with 63% graduating from the same institution that they started. *It is important to note that this metric is based on graduation rates from the same university – another 5% transfer to another SUS institution and graduate from within the System.*

The goals (of 50% and 70% respectively) are based on reaching the highest rates among the states based on the most recently available cohorts.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

7. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

RATIONALE: In 2009, the Florida Legislature established an "Excess Credit Hour Surcharge" to encourage students to complete their baccalaureate degrees as quickly as possible. It is important to note that the statutory provisions of the "Excess Hour Surcharge" have been modified several times by the Florida Legislature, resulting in a phased-in approach that has created three different cohorts of students with different requirements. This Strategic Plan metric is based on the latest statutory requirement that mandates 110% of required hours as the threshold. This metric does not attempt to report how many students have actually paid the actual surcharge during the phase-in years, but over time this metric will come to reflect these students more closely.

Due to recent changes in how the excess hour data has been collected, trend data is not available for this metric. The 2025 goal (of 80%) was set to reflect considerable growth from the current level. In 2012-13, 65% of bachelor's recipients did not earn excess hours.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

8. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually

RATIONALE: In Fall 2012, the State University System had the second largest undergraduate enrollment in the country, and it is also remains one of the fastest growing over the last five years. Based on continued enrollment growth (for both FTICs and AA Transfers) and improvements in university graduation rates, the number of bachelor's degrees awarded annually was projected to increase to 90,000. It should be noted that the System is still on pace to reach 90,000 degrees awarded (based on 2012-13 data); however, the degree projections in 2014-15 University Work Plans projected a 2016-17 degree total that was behind the 90,000 goal pace.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

9. Graduate Degrees Awarded Annually

RATIONALE: In 2012-13, the Florida ranked 3rd in the number of graduate degrees awarded by public four-year universities. The 2025 goal (of 30,500) has been lowered from an aspirational goal (of 40,000) to reflect changes in five-year historical growth rates due to declining enrollments at the graduate level.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

10. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to African-Americans and Hispanic Students

RATIONALE: This metric provides a sense of student diversity based on the race/ethnicity of the students. This metric is important to the State University System because increasing the educational attainment across all of Florida's demographics is a key to the State's future workforce. This metric is based on the number of bachelor's degrees awarded annually to African-American and Hispanic/Latino students. The 2010 Census for 18-24 year olds shows that Florida's African-American and Hispanic/Latino populations comprise 46% of the State's population. Because of the uncertainties regarding projected enrollments so far into the future, this metric has a dual goal for the overall number of degrees awarded to minorities (20,500 to 35,000) as well as increasing the proportion of degrees awarded to minorities (from 34% to 40%).

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

11. Number of Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled

RATIONALE: This metric provides a sense of student diversity based on the age of the student at the time of enrollment (not upon entry). This metric is important to the State University System because Florida's adult educational attainment level is lower than many of the other ten most populous states, which has a negative impact on the economy. Including this metric within the System Strategic Plan recognizes the important role that non-traditional students play in the current and future landscape of postsecondary education.

In Fall 2012, Florida was ranked 4th in the country among public four-year institutions in the number of adult undergraduates enrolled. However, Florida was only 14th in terms of the percentage of adult undergraduates (at 19%). In addition, the SUS has many adults who never completed the bachelor's degree that they attempted - despite many folks who dropped out yet were near completion. The 2025 goal (of 75,000) was based on a trend line that projects 69,000 adult undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2025. Because of the uncertainties regarding projected enrollments so far into the future, this metric has a dual goal of also increasing the proportion of adult undergraduates from 19% to 21%.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

12. Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance & Hybrid Learning

RATIONALE: Distance learning has rapidly evolved to become a major player in the higher education world. This metric is based on the percentage of course sections in which the course delivery method is either 'Distance' or 'Blended'. Distance Learning is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.). Hybrid is a course where 50% to 79% of the instruction is delivered using some form of technology, when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per SUDS data element 2052). Course sections were chosen as the 'unit of analysis' instead of FTE enrollment because the university has more direct control over how many distance learning course sections are offered than they do with how many students are enrolling in distance learning courses. The goal (of 30%) is an ambitious target that reflects the Board of Governors recognition that distance learning has become viable alternative to traditional classrooms in an effort to provide students with ever greater flexibility. Currently, there is not national data available to use in setting the goal; and, there is limited trend data (back to 2010) within the State University System due to recent changes in definitions. *Note: The 2011 Strategic Plan was based on the old definition which used technology indicators instead of the delivery method element.*

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

13. University Access Rate (Percent of Pell Students Enrolled in Fall)

RATIONALE: The Federal Pell grant program provides financial aid to students from poor and working-class families who want to better themselves by earning a college degree. This metric is based on the percent of undergraduates enrolled in the Fall term who received a Pell grant (excludes unclassified and post-baccalaureate undergraduate students not coded as unclassified). The purpose for this metric within the System Strategic Plan is to serve as an 'access' measure - to ensure that the State University System continues to provide opportunities to all levels of the socio-economic strata. The goal is to have every university have at least 30%of their undergraduate students receiving a Pell grant. This goal serves as an 'access' baseline for the State University System in this new era of Performance-Based Funding.
SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

14. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Fall Retention with GPA>=2)

RATIONALE: This metric is based on the percent of FTICs who started their first Fall semester with a full load (12+ credit hours) and who were found retained in the same university the following Fall term with at least a 2.0 Grade Point Average (at the end of their first year) .
This is an alternative metric, to the standard second-year retention rate, and is a much better 'leading indicator' of student success – in fact, FTICs who return for their 2nd fall with a GPA above 2.0 are *eight times more likely to graduate* within six years than students who begin their second Fall with a GPA less than 2. This is one reason why the Board of Governors decided to include this metric into the new Performance Funding Model. The trend line for this metric fairly flat, so the Board has set a goal (of 90%) based on expected improvements resulting from university efforts to respond to the Board's Performance-Based Funding model.
SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Teaching and Learning (continued)

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

15 & 17.Bachelor's and Graduate Degrees in Programs of Strategic Emphasis

RATIONALE: This metric is designed to promote the alignment of the State University System degree program offerings and the economic development and workforce needs of the State. The Board of Governors maintains a list of Programs of Strategic Emphasis that were revised in November 2013. This list is comprised of the following four areas: STEM, Health, Education, Global and Gap Analysis. The list of Programs of Strategic Emphasis applies to both bachelor's and graduate degrees.

Because of the uncertainties regarding projections so far into the future, these metrics have a dual goal for both the overall number of degrees awarded as well as the proportion of degrees awarded. The table below provides the 2025 values for both the trend and the goal, the amount of 'stretch' is apparent.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

	2025 BASED ON HISTORICAL TREND (2007-08 to 2012-13)		**2025 GOAL**	
LEVEL	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
BACHELOR'S	41,700	48%	45,000	50%
GRADUATE	18,200	60%	18,200	60%

Teaching and Learning (continued)

16 & 18. Bachelor's and Graduate Degrees in STEM and Health

(a subset of the larger Programs of Strategic Emphasis)

RATIONALE: This metric is a subset of the larger Programs of Strategic Emphasis, and was included in the 2011 System Strategic Plan as a separate breakout because it is widely believed that education in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) are vital to future of both the nation and the planet. In this 2014 revision of the plan, Health has been added in recognition that healthcare is an especially key component of Florida's current and future workforce. The Board of Governors has decided to combine these two programmatic areas in the revised System Strategic Plan, and have established an aspirational goal in an effort to ramp up the Florida's STEM- and Health-related workforce.

Because of the uncertainties regarding projections so far into the future, this metric has a dual goal for both the overall number of STEM & Health degrees awarded as well as the proportion of STEM & Health degrees awarded. The table below provides the 2025 values for both the trend and the goal, the amount of 'stretch' is apparent.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

	2025 BASED ON HISTORICAL TREND (2007-08 to 2012-13)		**2025 GOALS**	
LEVEL	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
BACHELOR'S	28,600	33%	30,000	35%
STEM	*19,700*	*23%*		
HEALTH	*8,900*	*10%*		
GRADUATE	14,500	48%	15,200	50%
STEM	*7,900*	*26%*		
HEALTH	*6,600*	*22%*		

Scholarship, Research and Innovation

EXCELLENCE

19. Faculty Membership in National Academies

RATIONALE: One of the highest honors that academic faculty can receive is membership in the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the National Academy of Engineering (NAE), or the Institute of Medicine (IOM). In 2011, the State University System was ranked 17th among states' public universities - with 38 faculty as members of the National Academies. Based on 10 year historical trends, the SUS is projected to have 49 members in 2023, which is projected to be ranked 15th. The goal (of 75) is to be ranked 5th in the country, which is a considerable improvement that is one of the prime objectives for the preeminent universities. *Note: there is a two-year reporting lag for this data, so 2023 data will be the latest available in 2025.*

SOURCE: Center for Measuring University Performance, Top American Research Universities report.

Number of National Academy Members (Publics only)

	YEAR	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1	CALIFORNIA	501	517	533	554	587	619	629	629	651	660	688	697
2	TEXAS	107	111	115	121	128	141	143	145	147	148	153	152
3	WASHINGTON	78	84	85	85	86	93	95	98	110	110	111	113
4	MICHIGAN	70	73	83	88	91	86	89	89	89	94	95	100
5	WISCONSIN	68	69	69	70	71	71	71	73	74	72	72	68
6	ILLINOIS	58	60	57	60	58	59	60	62	62	59	64	63
7	PENN	43	44	46	51	52	54	55	53	51	52	53	54
8	COLORADO	41	43	46	47	50	49	52	49	50	51	53	50
9	N. CAROLINA	48	54	54	55	54	52	51	49	49	49	48	49
10	VIRGINIA	34	32	34	37	39	43	44	49	48	49	48	48
17	FLORIDA	28	29	29	26	25	32	32	35	36	38	38	38

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of Center for Measuring University Performance annual 'Top American Research Universities' report.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation (continued)

20. Faculty Awards

RATIONALE: Faculty Awards in the Arts, Humanities, Science, Engineering, and Health provide a more dynamic and current look at faculty honors than the National Academy members that reflect senior faculty with distinguished careers. In 2011, the SUS was ranked 4th among states' public universities. Based on 10 year historical trends, SUS faculty are projected to receive 75 awards in 2023*, which is projected to be ranked 3rd (assumes other state trends remain stable). The 2025 goal is to maintain the current trend. Note: there is a two-year reporting lag for this data, so 2023 data will be the latest available in 2025.

SOURCE: Center for Measuring University Performance, Top American Research Universities report.

Number of Faculty Awards (Publics only)

	YEAR	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1	CALIFORNIA	244	232	151	228	247	259	265	257	258	275	253	232
2	TEXAS	101	98	84	87	101	87	96	117	114	107	97	85
3	MICHIGAN	55	75	67	59	67	65	72	74	76	75	73	75
4	FLORIDA	47	40	38	44	44	43	55	49	62	53	58	56
5	PENN	38	56	54	55	53	61	59	52	63	65	50	55

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of Center for Measuring University Performance annual 'Top American Research Universities' report.

21. Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Assisting in Faculty Research or Percent of Undergraduates Engaged in Research

RATIONALE: This is a new metric that addresses the emerging role that research plays in the undergraduate curriculum. This is aligned with the NSF's goal of integrating research and education. Many institutions use a variation of the broad definition provided by the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR). The University of California System reports undergraduate research data based on their senior exit survey.

SOURCE: This data is not currently quantified at the System-level or nationally -- Board of Governors staff are investigating what data is available that can address this goal.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation (continued)

PRODUCTIVITY

22. Total Research & Development (R&D) Expenditures

RATIONALE: R&D expenditures are the primary source of information on academic research and development (R&D) expenditures in the United States. In FY2011-12, the SUS was ranked 5th among states' public universities. The global economic downturn has slowed the historical trends that were previously used to set the initial 2025 goal. However, Florida's recent annual growth rate (of $31M) is much lower than the top ten state average annual growth (of $98M). Therefore, the 2025 goal intends to reverse the State University System recent decline and project an annual growth rate of $40M. The 2014-15 University Work Plans projected a $24M annual growth rate for the next five years (or, $2.07B in 2024-25).

	NATIONAL TRENDS (2009-12)			STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM TRENDS			
	TOP 5 STATES	TOP 10 STATES	50 STATES	ORIGINAL GOAL 2001-09 TREND	RECENT TREND 2009-13	2014-15 WORK PLANS PROJECTIONS	REVISED GOAL
ANNUAL GROWTH	$115M	$98.5M	$32.5M	$100M	$31M	$24M	$40M
2025 GOAL	$3.26B	$3.05B	$2.17B	$3.25B	$2.16B	$2.07B	$2.29B

The Board's goal is slightly higher than the System's recent annual growth rate (of $31M) in recognition of the following issues: (1) new joint effort among SUS Vice Presidents of Research to engage in collaborative research that should be more competitive for Federal grants; (2) the tragic 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has caused an increase in the funds available to universities to research impacts on the Gulf and its restoration; (3) the on-going maturation of three new medical schools.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Annual Higher Education Research and Development Survey.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation (continued)

23. Percent of R&D Expenditures funded from External Sources

RATIONALE: This metric reflects the ability of SUS institutions to win competitive grant funding from external sources (defined by NSF as from Federal, Private Industry and Other). The Board of Governors included this metric in the System Strategic Plan, because in FY2008-09, Florida was last among the Top 10 states (for public universities) in the percentage of R&D expenditures that were funded externally (with 59%). In FY2012-13, Florida still only received 59% of funding from external sources, while the top 10 average was 71% (up from the 67% in FY2008-09). The Board has decided to revise the 2025 goal so that it equals the top 10 average of 71% in FY2011-12.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Annual Higher Education Research and Development Survey.

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

24. Highly Regarded National Programs

RATIONALE: In addition to overall university excellence, the Board of Governors wants each university to focus its resources so each university has at least one program that is highly regarded in its field in the nation.
SOURCE: Annual Accountability Reports.

25. Number of Patents Awarded Annually

RATIONALE: An important aspect of university research is protecting any new Intellectual Property (IP) that results from the research. The overall number of patents awarded annually is a general, but valuable, measure of the amount of IP that a university produces and chooses to protect. It is worth noting that when the Florida Legislature created the Preeminence metrics, they only included utility patents in their patent metric definition. The SUS has annually increased the number of patents awarded annually by 35 for the past five years; however, Board staff have used a more conservative growth factor (of 10) based on the 2012 to 2017 projections made in the 2014-15 Work Plans. The System goal is to produce 410 patents during the 2024 calendar year.
SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of US Patent Office data.

Scholarship, Research and Innovation (continued)

26. Number of Licenses and Options Executed

RATIONALE: Another important measure of university research tracks the movement of IP from the lab to the marketplace. Universities make money from patents primarily by licensing them to outside companies, which turn them into commercial products. The overall number of licenses (and options) that have been executed annually provides a measure of the entrepreneurial nature of the university. Based on the historical trend (from 2004 to 2012), the SUS has annually increased the number of new licenses executed by 20 every year; however, given the annual volatility in this metric, Board staff have used a more conservative growth factor (of 5) and project that the System will produce 270 licenses during the 2024-25 year.
SOURCE: Annual Accountability reports.

27. Number of Start-Up Companies Created

RATIONALE: In addition to licensing Intellectual Property, sometimes it is more effective to commercialize research via a small, start-up company that is founded by, or has a close relationship, with university faculty. Many universities foster this entrepreneurial path of research commercialization with the creation of business incubators. In 2011-12, the State University System created a record 30 new start-up companies, which is 12 more than created in 2008-09. There is really no trend line that can support a reasonable prediction for this metric, so Board staff have set the goal to essentially grow one additional startup per year - this would result in about 40 by 2024-25.

SOURCE: Annual Accountability Reports

Community and Business Engagement

EXCELLENCE

28. Number of Universities with the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification

RATIONALE: Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

The classification for Community Engagement is an elective classification, meaning that it is based on voluntary participation by institutions. The elective classification involves data collection and documentation of important aspects of institutional mission, identity and commitments, and requires substantial effort invested by participating institutions. It is an institutional classification; it is not for systems of multiple campuses or for part of an individual campus. The classification is not an award. It is an evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement. The documentation is reviewed to determine whether the institution qualifies for recognition as a community engaged institution.

The Community Engagement Classification takes place on a five-year cycle. The last time institutions received the classification was in 2010. 2015 is the next opportunity for classification. Because the classification requires gathering and providing evidence of community engagement by a campus through an application, the process begins two years prior to the classification date. For example, for the 2020 classification cycle (classified campuses announced in January of 2020) the applications will be available in the spring of 2018.

SOURCE: Annual Accountability Reports and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Community and Business Engagement (continued)

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

29. Percentage of Baccalaureate Graduates Continuing their Education or Employed

RATIONALE: It has always been difficult to quantify the journey of higher education graduates as they transition into the workforce. The Board of Governors included this metric in this 2011-2025 Strategic Plan to focus the System's efforts in better understanding this period of transition. Specifically, the intent of including this metric was to increase the percentage of graduates who continue their education or are found employed. In addition, it was expected that this effort would serve to better inform students about how previous graduating classes faired when they entered the workforce. In 2013 and 2014, this metric gained further importance to policymakers due to its inclusion in the new Performance Funding Models that were created by the Legislature, Governor's Office and the Board of Governors.

The metric used in Performance Based Funding in 2014 was defined as the percentage of recent baccalaureate graduates who are either employed full-time in Florida (based on the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program [FETPIP] data) or continuing their education in the U.S. (based on the National Student Clearinghouse data). Board staff are working with FETPIP to also include non-Florida employment data for this metric in future years.

The goal (of 90%) reflects the Board's dedication to improving the employment and educational outcomes for the State University System students.

Note: The apparent drop in actual data is due to a correction in the methodology. The original data incorrectly double-counted graduates who were found both employed and enrolled.

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analyses of data from: Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), the Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2), and the Federal Employment Data Exchange System (FEDES) - which includes the US Office of Personnel Management (OPM); the Department of Defense, Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC).

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM *of* FLORIDA

Board of Governors

325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1614
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
Phone (850) 245-0466
Fax (850) 245-9685

www.flbog.edu