

INDEX OF MINUTES
 BOARD OF GOVERNORS
 STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
 FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
 PREMIER CLUB LEVEL, FAU STADIUM
 BOCA RATON, FLORIDA
 NOVEMBER 9-10, 2011

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks.....	1
2. University of South Florida Polytechnic Business Plan for Becoming an Independent Institution.....	2
3. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors held September 15, 2011.....	18
4. Chancellor’s Report.....	18
5. Higher Education Strategies Workgroup.....	19
6. Welcome, Senator Maria Sachs.....	25
7. Continuation, Chair’s Comments.....	25
8. Election of Officers, Chair and Vice Chair, Board of Governors, 2012-13.....	26
9. Academic and Student Affairs Committee Report	
A. Public Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 6.018, Substitution or Modification of Requirements for Program Admission, Undergraduate Transfer, and for Graduation by Students with Disabilities.....	27
B. Public Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 8.016, Academic Learning Compacts.....	28
10. Budget and Finance Committee Report	
A. 2011 New Fees Report to the Legislature.....	28
B. 2012 Market Rate Tuition Proposals.....	28
11. Strategic Planning Committee Report	
A. Dental Education Proposals.....	29
B. Board of Governors’ Strategic Plan for the State University System of Florida: 2012-2025.....	30
C. Final Action, Promulgate Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination.....	30
D. Final Action, Amended Board Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites.....	31

- 12. Facilities Committee Report
 - A. Amended 2012-13 SUS Fixed Capital Outlay
Legislative Budget Request..... 31
 - B. 2011 Higher Education Classroom Utilization Study..... 32
 - C. Resolution Requesting the Division of Bond Finance of the
State Board of Administration of Florida to Issue Revenue
Refunding Bonds on Behalf of the Florida State
University Research Foundation, Inc..... 32
- 13. Trustee Nominating Committee Report..... 32
- 14. Adjournment..... 33

Appendix

- 1. Senator Mike Fasano, Letter to Chancellor Brogan,
November 8, 2011
- 2. Senator Paula Dockery, Letter to Chairwoman Parker, Board of
Governors members and Chancellor Brogan, November 9, 2011

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
PREMIER CLUB LEVEL, FAU STADIUM
BOCA RATON, FLORIDA
NOVEMBER 9-10, 2011

The Chair, Ava L. Parker, convened the meeting of the Board of Governors, State University System of Florida, in the Premier Club Level, FAU Stadium, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, November 9, 2011, at 3:30 p.m., with the following members present: Dean Colson, Vice Chair; Dick Beard; Chris Corr; Ann Duncan; Pat Frost; Mori Hosseini; Michael Long; Frank Martin; Tico Perez; John Rood; Gus Stavros; John Temple; Norman Tripp; and Dr. Rick Yost. Commissioner Gerard Robinson participated by telephone conference call.

1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

Ms. Parker expressed her special thanks to President Saunders and her staff for hosting this Board meeting. She said it was special to meet in the stadium the Board had approved several years earlier.

President Saunders welcomed members of the Board and all her university colleagues. She said she was pleased for them to experience the new stadium. She said she was pleased to report that earlier in the day, she had signed a consortium agreement with five area hospitals creating 200-300 new residencies. She said she had also signed a pipeline agreement for FAMU students to be admitted to FAU's medical school. She noted that this was also a celebratory year for FAU which had been established 50 years ago.

Mr. Hosseini thanked and congratulated President Saunders and Mr. Bob Stilley, Chair of the FAU Board of Trustees. He said they had advised the Board that they would be successful in adding medical residencies in area hospitals, at the time the Board had approved the FAU College of Medicine. He said they had delivered on that promise to keep medical graduates in Florida through additional area residencies.

Ms. Parker welcomed Mr. Chris Corr to the Board. She noted that he was a successful businessman in Jacksonville in real estate development and a former member of the Legislature. She also recognized Mr. Randy Hanna, who had just been named as the next Chancellor of the Florida College System. Mr. Tripp commented that he had worked with Mr. Hanna when both had served as members of the State Board of Community Colleges. Ms. Parker also welcomed university trustees who were

attending the meeting, including trustees from FAU, USF and UF. She said she hoped the trustees benefited from the commitment of this Board to work collaboratively with them.

2. University of South Florida Polytechnic Business Plan for Becoming an Independent Institution

Ms. Parker said that the Strategic Planning Committee had forwarded consideration of the USF Polytechnic Business Plan to the full Board. She said that before the Board began this discussion, they needed to address a prior Board action taken in 2007.

Mr. Tripp said that in 2007, the Board had voted to limit any new institution that might be approved to offer baccalaureate degrees only. He moved that the Board amend the prior action to allow the Board to consider the Polytechnic Business Plan based on the fact that it currently offered graduate degree programs and intended, if approved, to implement additional STEM graduate degree programs, as outlined in the Business Plan. He added that this was in line with the specific goal in the new Strategic Plan to increase the number of STEM degrees awarded. He said that prior to considering any other proposed institution, the Board should continue to refine the process used in evaluating further expansion of the System. Mr. Colson seconded the motion.

Mr. Temple said he was opposed. He said the Board had spent years developing its Strategic Plan, including spending members' personal funds. He said this was the wrong time to address this issue. He requested that the Board defer this action until he had offered his comments

There were no further comments. The motion carried, with Mr. Temple voting no.

Ms. Parker explained the order of the presentations on the Polytechnic Business Plan, as follows: President Genshaft; John Ramil, Chair, USF Board of Trustees; Dr. Marshall Goodman, Chancellor, USF Polytechnic; elected officials, including Senator Don Gaetz and Senator J.D. Alexander; Board members, Dr. Rick Yost and Michael Long, to report on faculty and student opinion. She asked members to hold their questions until after all the presentations.

President Genshaft said that seated in the audience were students from all USF campuses. She said that the USF System was performing remarkably well. She reported that the four institutions were working together to respond to area and state needs for economic development and to offer a first class education. She said that students, faculty and alumni had a strong interest in keeping the USF System intact.

She said this was not the right time for this drastic change, economically, educationally or practically. She said that USF had a proven record as a national leader in building and operating regional campuses. She noted that USF's regional campuses offered students access to a first-rate degree from a top tier institution. She said the System was able to leverage costs through cost-sharing across the System. She said the USF System had a top Moody's bond rating, which would not be the case for a stand-alone campus. She said she wanted each campus to be the best it could be with the authority to create degree programs locally which could best meet the needs of its host community. She said the USF System was working well.

Dr. Genshaft said USF Polytechnic was created by a statute passed in 2008, which established that the Lakeland Campus of USF would be known as USF Polytechnic. She said that before 2008 and in the years since, USF had set out to build and support the youngest regional campus in the USF System, as it had done with the other regional campuses. She said she had read with interest and concern the comments insinuating that the USF Board of Trustees had failed to properly prioritize the development of USF Polytechnic within the USF System. She said she wanted to set the record straight that USF had developed the polytechnic concept for this campus with the generosity of the state and the ability to hire the faculty to create the polytechnic programs. She said the campus had its own search processes for new faculty. She said the mission was to be a campus of USF to focus primarily on the unique STEM disciplines and technologies. She said the campus mission was to best fit the needs of the area in which it was located. She said her personal mantra was that the regional campuses should meet the economic and educational needs of the region and the state. She reported that the USF Board had submitted to this Board in June 2010, at the request of USF Polytechnic, the campus intent to offer 14 new degree programs. She said there was a request in October 2011 for three additional new degree programs to be submitted to the Board of Governors. She said the USF Board had not acted as a barrier, and had passed those programs to this Board. She said she would like to see action on the degree programs already approved for USF Polytechnic. She said she would attribute the delays in implementation to growing pains, not to barriers by USF.

President Genshaft said that USF had shown its commitment to USF Polytechnic in the early 2000's in its request for funding for the joint-use facility with Polk Community College, a facility which had been built at USF Lakeland. She noted that USF had guided the open bid process for the land donation for a new USF Polytechnic campus. She said that the University had included PECO funding requests for the past seven years for construction of the first facility at the USF Polytechnic campus. She said that during these same years, the USF System had been funded for only one other new facility. She said USF's commitment to the development of this campus was beyond a doubt and that USF could not reasonably be accused of holding back its growth.

She said the Business Plan was a plan for a new state university which would include a full complement of programs, undergraduate through doctoral, and 20 planned facilities to be constructed. She said the plan also envisioned a full NCAA athletics program as well as the full cohort of university administrative services. She said it took time to develop such a robust university. She spoke about the development of the campuses USF Polytechnic had identified as its peers. Arizona State had opened its Poly campus in 1966 with 1000 students and eight degree programs. In July 2005, its name was changed to ASU Polytechnic to reflect better its mission. In Fall 2011, there were almost 10,000 students in a variety of degree programs. She said that Cal Polytechnic Pomona opened in 1938 with 110 students; it achieved university status in 1972. There were currently 21,000 students enrolled. She said that Cal State Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo opened in 1937. She said that in 2010, it had 18,000 students.

Dr. Genshaft said that the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was established in 1824. She noted that the Georgia Institute of Technology was accredited after four years as a college in 1970, and separated from Georgia State as Georgia Tech, a separate university, in 1980. In Wisconsin, she said that Wisconsin Stout began in 1955; it became Stout State in 1964; and was designated as the Polytechnic campus in 2007. Dr. Genshaft said she provided this as background, and noted that USF Polytechnic had only carried this name for three years.

President Genshaft asked that the Board reaffirm the mission of this campus as the USF Polytechnic campus of USF. She said that as a part of the present USF System, the campus would continue to address regional needs, with programs rooted in the STEM disciplines and applied technology, serving the niche needs of the community. She said she had every intention to create a successful institution. She said that most important, USF needed final resolution of the issue; further delays would only divide the University. She requested that the Board not leave this in doubt. She reported that Polk County business people, community leaders, and elected officials had asked USF to stay in the community. She said promises had been made to the region and to the regional students, and she was confident that USF could deliver the STEM degrees to Polk County and the area.

Mr. Ramil said that the USF Board of Trustees supported President Genshaft's remarks. He said the issue of USF Polytechnic separation had been thoroughly and actively discussed at the last USF Board of Trustees meeting. He said the USF Board agreed that students and faculty of the region and citizens of Florida would be best served by USF Polytechnic remaining a part of the USF System. He noted that USF was the only university whose regional campuses had separate budget autonomy. He said this had worked well until the past several months. He said the current environment of uncertainty was not sustainable, with the unclear direction whether as a part of the USF System or a stand-alone institution. He noted that the USF Board looked forward to

continuing to develop USF Polytechnic as a part of the USF System and that this Board should make this decision firmly. He said that if the Board made another decision, that should be firm as well. He said that it had only been three years since USF Polytechnic had aggressively proposed the polytechnic mission. He said he hoped the campus would blossom as the other regional campuses had. He said it was admirable that Polk County officials wanted their own state university, but this should not be the determining factor as to what should happen. He said his Board was frustrated that USF Polytechnic felt it should be a separate campus to be all it could be. He said that the USF Board was concerned about the reality of the proposal, its vision for student and faculty recruitment, and that it viewed the vision as a stretch, even a risk. He said the USF Board asked this Board to keep the USF System intact. He said the USF Board remained committed to develop the Polytechnic campus with the same success as the Sarasota-Manatee campus. He suggested that the Board develop a series of strategies and options and decide the best course of action.

Dr. Goodman said he appreciated the opportunity to address the Board. He reiterated the importance of the STEM programs for the state to be developed at USF Polytechnic. He advised the Board that he had held three half-day retreats on the campus to inform the campus about the process. He said he had also held a number of open forums with students, faculty and staff. He said he had also met with outside groups. He said he had asked current and former university presidents to review the Plan, people who had experience running this type of university. He said that Dr. Warren Baker, who had served 31 years as President of California Polytechnic at San Luis Obispo, had said USF Polytechnic's focused approach was a cost-effective model, with a curriculum tailored to social and technology issues, and a grasp of getting students jobs upon graduation. He had commented that the comprehensive range of courses captured the essential elements to be addressed by a polytechnic institution.

Dr. Goodman said that USF Polytechnic had sufficient funding to start and grow this university. He said they had been appropriated \$32.9 million for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, of which \$11.4 million was for program not moving forward until they had SACS accreditation. He said they also had \$14.9 million in carry-forward cash balances, a total of \$26.3 million to develop academic programs for Phase 1 and beyond. He said the bottom line continued to improve over the following five years, 2012-2016, revenues, expenses and cash balances.

Dr. Goodman also explained the expected growth in FTE. He said that as the Polytechnic added programs, there were conservative growth projections, until 2020 when the proposed curriculum was fully in place. He noted that nationwide, there were estimates that 100,000 students were looking for seats in STEM programs. He also explained the facilities needed to start this unique and focused program. The campus would not need new buildings until 2017-2018. He noted that to build a new campus site required development of the infrastructure, roads, toll ways, highway ramps, side

roads, and sewer systems; it had taken a whole region to get to the present point. He said the first Science and Technology building was fully funded. He said they had \$20 million in private funding; \$30 million had been raised in and out of the region. He said that \$11.5 million had been raised for the Wellness Building. He said they had requested funding for residence halls. In Phase 1, students would be housed in modular units, or in permanent housing acquired through a private-public partnership. He said they currently used modular units, which could be moved to the new campus site. He said USF Polytechnic wanted to become a destination campus.

Dr. Goodman said the accreditation model was grounded in creating a seamless transition for students, faculty and staff. He said they would continue the application for separate SACS accreditation within the USF System during the transition. He said once they had this separate accreditation, they planned to submit a separate application for accreditation with the substantive changes of an independent campus.

Senator Alexander thanked members of the Board. He said these had been difficult discussions. He noted that it had been a long time since the Board had developed a new university. He said that when he ran for office in 1998, he wanted to help improve the region and the state and improve education. He said his top priority in his legislative career had been to create opportunities for students. He said funding for the joint-use facility for USF and Polk Community College had been requested 12 years earlier. He said that only in the past few years had the USF administration hired somebody to develop the Lakeland campus. He said this had been a torturous process at every step. He said funding requests for USF Polytechnic were not a priority for USF. He said he did not believe the statements made by USF officials.

Senator Alexander said there was a demand for the types of programs proposed for USF Polytechnic. He said that with the right leadership and stewardship, USF Polytechnic would develop and grow. He said he did not anticipate 50,000 students, but a school with between 15,000 and 18,000 students, similar to Georgia Tech, focused on STEM and STEM-related programs, which would help change the economy of the state. He recommended that the Board grant independence to the campus; this campus would be focused on opportunities for students.

Senator Gaetz said Board members were dealing with a tough issue. He said that no member of the Florida Legislature in the last decade, other than Senator Alexander, had his name on more appropriations for higher education. He commented that in the SUS, there had been an 18 percent increase in baccalaureate STEM degrees, and a 31 percent increase in STEM graduate degrees since 2005, and similar increases in research and development grants in STEM fields. He noted that there were currently over 100 STEM degree programs in the SUS. He commented that despite the gains in STEM programs in the SUS, Florida and Florida's SUS were still at a competitive disadvantage without some breakthrough initiative in this area.

Senator Gaetz noted that the single most prolific degree awarded in the SUS was in psychology; 35 percent of psychology graduates in the most recent reporting period had full-time jobs in any field, with a starting salary of \$28,000. He noted that 30 percent of political science graduates from the SUS had jobs with starting salaries of \$30,000. He said that in the next 10 years, 60 percent of jobs in growth areas would require STEM degrees and 50 percent of the 400,000 STEM jobs expected by the year 2018 would be computer-related occupations requiring computer or technology skills. He said the percent of graduates with these skills had dropped 50 percent. He said that 35,000 STEM jobs had been advertised by Florida businesses for which there were no qualified graduates in the polytechnic fields. He said Florida was being lapped by the competition from other states and outside the U.S.

Senator Gaetz said an independent polytechnic was not necessarily the answer. Students, however, would gain skills from the tax dollars invested to encourage STEM graduates prepared to enter the new competitive marketplace. He said that a polytechnic was part of the answer with a laser focus on degrees giving students the skills Florida's economy needed now. He noted that three-quarters of all STEM graduates had jobs and at salaries higher than those earned by psychology or political science graduates.

Senator Gaetz said he did not know if this was the right plan or the right time, but he noted that the community had one million people. He said that this was not a new university, but a university already in place that wanted to be allowed to flourish as an independent institution. He said he believed that USF Polytechnic had a chance for success. He said he understood the cost pressures, but that this plan addressed the needs of graduates for jobs. He said when the competition was lapping you, the best investment was in higher education.

Chair Parker requested that the Corporate Secretary read into the record the letters from Senator Mike Fasano and from Senator Paula Dockery. These letters are attached to the Minutes, as an Appendix.

Dr. Rick Yost reported that the USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate had held a special meeting and had voted to request that this Board at this time deny the request for separation from the USF System. He added that they were strong supporters of USF and USF Polytechnic and were opposed to the speed of the decision and the lack of objective analysis. He said that the USF System Faculty Council had stated that under the principles of shared governance and the role of the faculty in decision-making on academic issues, there should be no major restructuring of the university without "full and adequate consultation with the appropriate academic governance bodies." He said there had been no consultation with the faculty on the separation of this campus and they felt left out in the discussion.

Dr. Yost said the USF Polytechnic faculty union had taken a survey of the faculty and reported that 80 percent did not support the current initiative for independence and 50 percent said they would take advantage of an option to transfer to another USF campus. He reported that all but two faculty members said they had not been consulted regarding independence. He reported on individual faculty comments reflecting that the faculty had not been consulted, that morale had plummeted, that the campus had become sad and dysfunctional, and that faculty felt a fear of retaliation if they articulated a concern about campus direction. He said faculty had also expressed concerns about the loss of shared resources and services from the USF System, as well as worries about the loss of SACS accreditation during the transition. He said the faculty did not think the campus was ready, and felt it needed time to develop an identity as a Polytechnic. He said a previous Regional Chancellor had encouraged this Board to slow the pace of the project, allowing time for rebranding as a Polytechnic, accreditation, system integration and campus infrastructure building.

Mr. Michael Long reported that he had met with everyone who wanted to speak with him. He said he was deeply disappointed by the level of politics in this decision. He reported on his meeting with Senator Alexander and that he did not feel well-represented by the Senator. He said the students had spoken loudly; every USF student senate had voted against independence for USF Polytechnic; the students sought to be "united as one." He reported on survey results. To the question of agreeing with independence, 62 percent had voted no, 14 percent had voted "not now." To the question of attending an independent USF Polytechnic, 47 percent voted no. He said students had commented that they were concerned about attending a school with no recognition, without a valued degree, and were concerned about future employment. He said he had also spoken with a number of high school students who said they would not attend a university without a "name." He reported that the Student Body President of the USF Tampa campus had sent a letter on behalf of 47,000 students who believed in the USF System, and in USF Polytechnic as a vital member of the USF System. He noted that the students in the audience expressing their position had driven over four hours to attend this meeting.

Mr. Temple said he had written two letters to Chancellor Brogan expressing his opposition to the proposed separation. He said it was clear in the Board's Strategic Plan that there should not be a new university at this time. He cited the January 2007 Minutes of this Board and the report from the Pappas Consulting Group, for which members had paid personally. He said he felt the whole process was out of control. He said the capital costs had changed four times over the past two years. He said from his review of the documents, Building 1 had started at 85,000 square feet, and was now a 160,000 square foot building, with costs that had more than doubled from \$48 million to just under \$100 million. He said the Business Plan estimated that by 2014-15, there would be 2200 students, up from the current 800 students. From the figures provided, he said it would cost the state \$8 million per student to build the campus. He said this

decision amounted to an eventual \$1 billion decision to the state. He said he had no confidence in the proposed Business Plan.

Mr. Temple also discussed the site plan. He said he was a large scale community developer, and had built shopping centers and 10,000 acre communities. He commented that in one of his early jobs, a mixed use community anchored around a regional mall, the developer had hired I.M. Pei as the architect and the project went way over budget. He noted that he had respect for the architect who had been hired by USF Polytechnic, Santiago Calatrava, who had built beautiful structures, but who had no experience with developing a master plan for a university campus. He said that Mr. Calatrava had a reputation for going over budget on his projects; on one project he had gone 50 percent over the budget.

Mr. Temple noted that many groups and individuals had offered opinions on the independence of USF Polytechnic, including the Council of 100, the USF Board of Trustees, alumni, faculty, students, letters, editorials and state senators, and they had all said this was not the way to proceed. He complimented the news reporters on their coverage of this story, commenting that they had not been as thorough as he would have hoped.

Mr. Temple said there were too many risks with this independence. He said the state had no money; the Board had heard earlier in the meeting that the SUS would not be receiving any PECO money. He said he was particularly concerned about the long term costs to the state of approximately \$1 billion. He said the gifts identified in the Business Plan were either pending or on hold. He said by the language of the Constitution, this Board was charged to "operate, regulate, control, and be fully responsible for the management of the whole university system."

Mr. Temple said the Legislature had avoided this Board in running this university. He said the USF Board had no control over the operation of USF Polytechnic. He said they could not perform an audit nor require any accountability. He said the USF Board needed to get back in charge of this situation and report back to this Board. He said this Board needed to assert its Constitutional responsibilities. He said he had spoken with Former Senator Bob Graham who had helped pass the Constitutional Amendment. He said that Senator Graham had said they had established the Constitutional Board of Governors as a strong shield and that the Board's responsibility under the Constitution trumped a statutory provision. He had added that if it did not, the Board should address that issue with the Legislature.

Mr. Temple said he had also looked into accreditation issues. He noted that there was a specific provision inquiring about any undue influence in being told how a university was to be operated. He said this was a standard question in the process.

Mr. Temple noted that it took the former Board of Regents a full year of careful study to spin off a campus that was 140 miles from the main campus; this campus was 30 miles away from the main campus. He said that if this Board had lump sum funding, it could allocate funds to the universities. He said if independence were approved, the money spent on this campus would come from existing universities. He said he did not want to destroy what was already in place

Mr. Colson said he appreciated the drama surrounding the creation of a polytechnic university. He said it was good to have discussions about STEM programs and jobs and higher education. He said he viewed the question differently. He said Mr. Temple was incorrect about the \$1 billion cost. He said he viewed this as building a great polytechnic campus, whether as a part of USF or as an independent institution. He said today was a start of the process. He said that nobody was in favor of making USF Polytechnic independent today.

Mr. Colson said he was not a believer in branch campuses; branch campuses got second shrift and were never a priority. He said he felt the Polytechnic was in a good central location, but community buy-in was necessary to make this a success. He said that Lakeland would need to raise hundreds of millions of dollars. He said he would allow the process to begin and establish specific milestones long-term, rather than establishing the Polytechnic as a branch of any university. He said he was disturbed by the cost figures, but he viewed these as fixable. He suggested that the Board should craft a motion to start the process. He said that they needed to get buy-in from the faculty and students. He said he believed it would be a better institution if it were independent.

Mr. Rood said in this environment of uncertainty, it was important for the Board to provide some direction. He said that in building a campus, there should be local board involvement. He said that he hoped any benchmarks adopted by this Board would be embraced by the local board, who would become involved and committed to the university.

Mr. Hosseini said he appreciated Mr. Temple's remarks. He agreed that there was a problem with the proposed building and the cost of construction. He said the campus needed an architect familiar with building classrooms. He said he was disheartened by the lack of faculty support, as faculty were the lifeblood of the institution. He agreed that Florida had a problem with the production of STEM degrees, as the fourth lowest in the country. He noted that of its total degrees, UF produced about 27 percent with STEM degrees. He said that the SUS should take advantage of the opportunity to create STEM programs. He noted that whether building this as a branch or as a stand-alone institution would entail costs. He said these should be the right costs. He suggested that the Board consider this as an opportunity to have a campus with a laser focus on STEM programs, and he would take

Chancellor Goodman at his word that USF Polytechnic would produce 90 percent STEM degrees.

Mr. Hosseini said the Business Plan addressed STEM programs. He was interested to know if USF Poly could deliver the STEM programs the state wanted and deserved. He said the Board should give USF Poly the opportunity for independence if it met the criteria the Board put in place. He said rather than creating an independent institution today, the Board should give the leadership of the school the opportunity to get with faculty and students and develop the curriculum. He said students should be able to decide if they preferred USF degrees. He said he would give the university the opportunity to try to deliver on their proposal. He noted that FAU had promised 300 medical residencies when the FAU College of Medicine became a stand-alone medical school. He said FAU had delivered, and he wanted to give USF Polytechnic the same opportunity. He said the Board needed to give USF Polytechnic the chance.

Mr. Beard noted that on the Sarasota campus, Reynolds Smith and Hills had built a 100,000 square foot space for \$30 million, \$230 per square foot. In this case, USF Polytechnic was proposing an 85,000 square foot building for \$97 million, over \$1000 per square foot. He inquired about the decision process in hiring the architect and how much costs were considered. Dr. Goodman said the campus had the collaboration of two architectural firms, Calatrava and Alfonso. He said that nothing had changed in the development of the building with the independence movement. He said there was huge support for the move to independence. He said it was critical to have a vision. Dr. Goodman said there had been a lengthy process to obtain the services of an architect, which had included community and university representatives; there had been 24 respondents to the RFQ process. He said the firms of Calatrava and Alfonso, as partners, were the overwhelming selection. He clarified that \$90 million was the cost for the buildings and all the site infrastructure, noting that the site was raw property and needed the development of the infrastructure. He said the Phase 1 building had 150,000 square feet, and that the contractor would have a guaranteed maximum price contract.

Mr. Beard said he thought the idea of a polytechnic campus was a great idea. He said the state needed this type of campus. He said the SUS, all the universities would have to contribute to this campus, as there was much to do to reach the goal, including accreditation, buildings, enrollment. Mr. Beard added that he was concerned about costs of \$225 million to achieve the goal of 15,000 to 16,000 students. He said USF could not write that check. He said time was needed to prove the Plan's projections. He said he worried about accreditation in the transition from USF Polytechnic to independence. He said if the Board allowed the process to begin, this Board would have a final vote that the campus had achieved the Board's proposed benchmarks.

Ms. Duncan said the Pappas Report had raised the issue of branch campuses in the SUS, a subject about which she had thought a great deal. She said she was interested in the difference in costs of a polytechnic school or the System's twelfth university. She said she was a proponent of shared services and the proposal did not go very far with that. She said the idea of a focused institution could be powerful, noting that New College with its focus on its honors program was regularly included as a "best value" in higher education. She said that students had to be protected, but that at the end of the process, she was sure they would be happy and enthusiastic about this institution. She said the USF Strategic Plan focused on its research mission. She asked how critical the branches were to the total USF mission. She said she supported moving along to independence as the right thing for USF Polytechnic and for the USF System. She commented that the USF Board appointed the members of the regional campus boards.

Mr. Corr said that as a new Board member, he was new to this discussion. He said his interest was in the best outcome for the state and for the University System. He said that as to governance, the Board should be cautious about moving in any direction. He said the STEM focus was compelling. He said it appeared that there was still work to be done before USF Polytechnic could stand on its own, and there was a risk of getting off track. He said it was important to focus on the end goal which was creating more opportunities for students and increasing numbers of STEM graduates. He noted that this goal was not just institutional, but rather a System goal. He said he could support starting the process toward independence; the Board should be thoughtful as to what that should entail.

Mr. Martin said he had joined this Board six years ago when the Board was dealing with the proposals for new medical schools. He said he was concerned about the drama surrounding this issue. He said he favored the concept of a polytechnic school which the state needed. He commented that USF thought it was important to develop a branch with this focus. He said he was concerned about governance and that USF had the proper control. He said this needed to be a deliberate and thoughtful process. He said that putting politics aside, the issue was whether it made sense to have a polytechnic university in the state. He said that they had been told there were 120,000 applicants for the 20,000 polytechnic seats nationally, not enough to accommodate the demand. He said the SUS as a System should be working together to make this happen, as had been done with the I-4 Corridor, with UCF, USF and UF coming together to grow the technology corridor. He said he was in favor of getting a start through a deliberate and rational process, without the politics.

Mrs. Frost said she had been involved in education all her life. She said the idea of this as a "center" was a good one, but she did not think that this was akin to Rensselaer Polytechnic, California Polytechnic, Georgia Tech or MIT. She said at this point, this was a dream. She said she was puzzled that neither the faculty nor the

students were in support of independence. She said she was also puzzled by the economics; she said the costs were outrageous for what was there. She said she also did not understand the curriculum. She suggested that the "mother institution," USF, should work with this "center" and focus on what it wanted to be. She suggested that President Genshaft could work to get the faculty and students involved and develop a five to ten year plan. She said she was also concerned about the accreditation timeline.

Mrs. Frost said that FIU had started as an upper-level institution and that it had taken more than 20 years to reach its present research scope and status. She said she saw potential, but not now. She said she would charge USF with the responsibility to put together more focus for this branch with the involvement of the USF Board and the local campus board, and come back in two or three years with a plan, rather than hopes and promises.

Commissioner Robinson said he had listened to the comments and had received letters and opinions from many people. He said he had no comments.

Mr. Long questioned the timing. He said nobody had explained why the USF System could not operate USF Polytechnic. He said the Board should consider the possibility of a school within USF focused on the STEM disciplines, growing into a polytechnic. He said that with one engineering graduate from this campus, it was not appropriate to act in haste.

Mr. Tripp said he had great respect for Mr. Temple, but that he respectfully disagreed with him. He said plans changed over time. He said he remembered that Chancellor Brogan's first vision for the FAU stadium was a 60,000 seat domed stadium; that evolved. He said he lived in Ft. Lauderdale, which had a branch campus of FAU. He said Ft. Lauderdale had missed out on the great economic engine that was a state university. He said he understood well that branches were not the main campus. He said the Board had the opportunity here to talk about a new campus; timing was everything. He said his law partner, Former Senate President Jim Scott, had told him about the early discussions of the Moffitt Cancer Center, and that it would never be successful. He said Senator Scott had also reminded him that there had been a great outcry about the location of the 5th DCA Courthouse in Daytona, which was now functioning quite well. He said what now seemed like a dream idea could grow. He said Lakeland was an area on the cusp of future growth. He said there was never a perfect time. He said there would be a time when faculty could say they were there at the beginning; current students would earn USF degrees and future students will know what degree they will earn and will want to attend. He said Board members were all political appointees and all were a part of the political process.

Mr. Tripp moved that the Board approve the concept of USF Polytechnic becoming a freestanding institution contingent upon meeting the following criteria:

1. Achieve separate accreditation pursuant to s. 1004.345, F.S. During the period that Polytechnic is seeking separate accreditation from SACS, Polytechnic shall initiate planning activities for the development of the new programs identified in Phase 1 of the Business Plan.
2. After separate accreditation is achieved, Polytechnic shall implement the programs identified in Phase 1 of the Business Plan upon approval of the programs by SACS. Highest priority for program development and implementation shall be focused on programs in STEM fields, and appropriate discipline-specific accreditation shall be sought.
3. Polytechnic must attain a minimum FTE of 1,244 as calculated in the Business Plan, with a minimum 50 percent of that FTE in STEM and 20 percent in STEM-related programs.
4. The following facilities and infrastructure shall be in place: the Science and Technology Building, Phase 1 of the Wellness Center, the modular resident hall (70 beds), and the residence hall (120 beds).
5. Polytechnic shall have a full complement of the following services or functions, provided either directly or where feasible through a shared services model: financial aid, admissions, student support, information technology, and finance and accounting with an internal audit function.
6. Students enrolled at USF Polytechnic shall be given an option to graduate with a diploma from USF, subject to university criteria.
7. During the transition period to independent status, the Board of Governors shall monitor the development of the campus and its operations, working in collaboration with the appropriate boards, on a semi-annual basis.
8. The Board shall be consulted of any significant change to the Business Plan prior to any action being taken on such change.

Mr. Martin seconded the motion.

Mr. Perez said he was still undecided. He inquired of Dr. Goodman why the Polytechnic campus could not work as a part of USF. He said he was not confident in the proposed Business Plan. He said he was always interested in the student view. He said he was concerned about the accreditation process. He said there were many issues still to be resolved. He said he had found the discussion to be healthy. He said he was confident the Board would do the right thing. He said the challenge was moving forward, as the status quo would not work. He said there needed to be an endpoint. He said there should be on-going supervision of the process. He said he was not averse to the motion, but suggested that the Board, through a Task Force, would be involved to be certain that the Board's process was met and was being followed. He said this should be a part of the process as long as this plan would come back to this Board for final review. He said as described, the bullets identified in the motion seemed open-ended. He said he was not sure when these were "finished." He said the Board needed to be involved in the building, in the planning, in the enrollment, as final approval

would come from this Board. He suggested that the motion be further amended to provide for the ongoing involvement of this Board, as to accreditation, curriculum, budget, enrollment, and the final determination of this Board that they have achieved all the stated goals.

Mr. Temple inquired who would be in charge of this project. He said the projections in the Plan were not realistic. He noted that there was a campus Chancellor and a local board. He said that as he had no confidence in the Plan from the campus, the USF President needed to exercise her control and authority and get the project under control.

Mr. Ramil explained that the legislation creating this campus should be clarified that the campus chancellor should report to the USF President and to the USF Board.

Mr. Hosseini suggested a friendly amendment that the motion should also include that this Board would not consider any suggestion for independence from any other branch campus.

Mr. Tripp said he would not accept Mr. Hosseini's addition to his motion. He said that during the accreditation process, they could not change the status of USF Polytechnic. He said the motion was to put everyone on notice that the Board was okay with the concept of independence but first there were a number of targets to be achieved, including SACS accreditation. He said the issue was whether USF Poly could work within the USF System and the people in the area to create a wonderful product. He said that in the motion, during the transition period, this Board would monitor developments on campus as it had no hiring or firing authority. He said they would work in collaboration with the appropriate boards. He said this Board should be consulted about any significant changes to the Business Plan before action was taken. He said the motion included that provision. He said the motion has the authority the Board needed for this process.

Mr. Hosseini agreed to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Colson said he supported the motion, with its clear milestones. He said if the campus met these milestones, there was a high expectation that this campus would become the twelfth university. He said he hoped they could achieve the support of the community, especially with fundraising.

Dr. Yost said he hoped that the administrators would pursue appropriate shared governance with the faculty. He said he wanted to be sure they would have sufficient library resources and on-line data bases and a sponsored research organization to support research.

Mrs. Frost asked that the campus work closely with USF. She said she was concerned about the USF Polytechnic faculty and how the campus could bring in the right faculty for these programs. She said she felt this was not the right way to go at this time. She said she preferred that the President come back to this Board with a plan in three or four years.

Mr. Temple said he understood that Chancellor Goodman reported to President Genshaft. He said he was not pleased to hear that Chancellor Goodman seemed to ignore President Genshaft and the USF Board and not provide them with regular reports. President Genshaft said that the accreditation process would assess the governance structure and if there were not clear lines of authority, she needed to clarify this or it could put the accreditation of the whole institution at risk. She said she had the authority and needed to be sure that the governance structure was in place and working properly.

Mr. Corr said that as he understood the motion, USF Polytechnic continued its current status as it pursued the proposed milestones. Mr. Tripp explained that the institution must meet the criteria set forth in the Business Plan, as stated in the motion. If USF Polytechnic satisfied the criteria, it could achieve independence. He added that this Board would monitor the process, and if successful, USF Polytechnic could then apply for stand-alone accreditation.

Chancellor Brogan explained that there were two accreditation issues. He said that USF Polytechnic was statutorily required to continue to seek separate accreditation status as a branch of USF. Once the institution met the additional threshold criteria, it could then re-petition SACS for accreditation as an independent university.

Senator Alexander said the statutory provision regarding accreditation mirrored the statute regarding USF-St. Petersburg. He said the goals were achievable, with the right leadership.

Mr. Perez suggested an amendment to the motion, that the final review and recognition of independence be done by this Board. He said this was to be sure that the body to say that USF Polytechnic was an independent institution was this Board. He suggested that the Chair appoint a committee to work with USF and USF Polytechnic to address Mr. Temple's concerns. Mr. Temple seconded the addition to the motion.

Mr. Tripp said that if USF Polytechnic met the criteria, it would come back to this Board to find that it had met the criteria and was then independent. He said he would accept the amendment, as did the maker of the second.

Ms. Parker asked the General Counsel to read the amendment. Ms. Shirley stated the amendment: "Once the foregoing criteria have been met, USF Polytechnic

should notify the Board and the Board should conduct a final review to confirm that the criteria have been satisfied.”

Mr. Tripp called the question. The following Board members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Beard, Mr. Corr, Ms. Duncan, Mr. Hosseini, Mr. Martin, Mr. Perez, Commissioner Robinson, Mr. Rood, Mr. Stavros, Mr. Tripp, Dr. Yost, Vice Chair Colson, and Chair Parker. The following members voted against: Mrs. Frost, Mr. Long, and Mr. Temple. The motion passed.

Mr. Hosseini also moved that until the matters pertaining to USF Polytechnic were resolved, that the Board not accept any applications from any other branch campus for independent status, until this case for independence was achieved or for a period of five years. Mr. Beard seconded the motion.

Ms. Duncan objected. She said this was a complicated issue. She suggested that the process for USF Polytechnic should first get underway.

Mr. Tripp said this issue could be addressed within the continuing discussions of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Hosseini commented that USF needed to have this in order to plan properly. President Genshaft said she supported this motion and that USF needed this clarity. Over the past month, USF administrators on the Tampa campus had spent at least 1000 hours working on the USF Polytechnic proposal. She said the proposed moratorium would be very important. She said it was difficult to move forward in this state of turmoil.

Dr. Yost said he would not tie the hands of the Board in this manner. Mr. Colson said he had no interest in additional universities on the Gulf Coast of Florida.

Members of the Board concurred in the motion, with Dr. Yost and Ms. Duncan voting no.

The Board broke for the evening at 7:40 p.m., November 9, 2011.

Chair Parker reconvened the meeting of the Board of Governors at 8:55 a.m., November 10, 2011, with the following members present: Dean Colson, Vice Chair; Dick Beard; Chris Corr; Ann Duncan; Pat Frost; Mori Hosseini; Michael Long; Frank Martin; Tico Perez; John Rood; Gus Stavros; John Temple; Norman Tripp; and Dr. Rick Yost.

Chair Parker thanked the members and others in the audience for their willingness to stay for the lengthy meeting the previous evening. She thanked President Saunders and again complimented her on this beautiful new facility.

President Saunders said the Boca Raton campus was one of FAU's seven campuses. She said they felt that building a more traditional campus would help attract and retain students and improve graduation rates. She said she was pleased to report that the College of Medicine had received 1500 applications for the 64 seats. She said she was also pleased to announce the agreement with five Palm Beach County hospitals to form a Graduate Medical Education Consortium for additional residency positions in the County and the agreement with Florida A & M University creating a pipeline honors program for FAMU students, with conditional acceptance to FAU's College of Medicine. She said the University was spending this year celebrating its fiftieth anniversary, so the discussions the previous day about a new university had been interesting. She said she had given Board members a copy of the FAU history. She presented a short video showing FAU over the decades.

Mr. Bob Stilley said he hoped Board members had enjoyed their visit to this campus. He said there was a great sense of pride in FAU, and the trustees were working to reach out to the community. He said they were also focused on the research budget.

3. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors held September 15, 2011

Mr. Colson moved that the Board approve the Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors held September 15, 2011, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

4. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Brogan thanked President Saunders and the staff at FAU for hosting this Board meeting. He said these meetings involved the time and effort of many staff members.

Chancellor Brogan said the Higher Education Coordinating Council was becoming an important part of his job. He said the Council met regularly and was beginning to complete its recommendations regarding each one of the delivery systems. He said they sought a more seamless approach for K-12 through higher education for all students. He said there were four areas they were to report back to the Legislature. He noted that the HECC was a way to require the heads of all the delivery systems to speak with each other. He said this had not happened previously on a regular basis. He said they now spoke and agreed that now they must plan to articulate better all the delivery systems. He said the report would be issued in December.

Chancellor Brogan advised the Board that Mr. Rick Maxey had accepted a new position. He said that Rick had developed great relationships in the Legislature and

with the Executive Branch. He said his credibility and professionalism had helped this Board earn respect with the Members. He said he was becoming the Director of Governmental Relations with Florida LambdaRail, which was critical to the research capabilities of the State University System. He said that with Rick's departure, Ms. Janet Owen would once again be helping with the Board's legislative agenda. He noted that she had previously assisted the Board when President Delaney had served as Interim Chancellor.

Chancellor Brogan thanked Board members for their commitment to getting the details and the information to make the right decision. He said the meeting the previous day had run long into the evening hours.

5. Higher Education Strategies Workgroup

Chancellor Brogan said there were a great many conversations about higher education going on all around the country. It was important to consider the direction for higher education in Florida. He said that President Barron had written a "white paper" responding to comments made by Governor Scott. He said the Board had discussed a number of ideas at the September meeting. He said he had assembled a workgroup of Presidents and Dr. Yost to discuss these ideas and bring them back to the Board for further discussion. He thanked President Delaney for serving as Chair of the workgroup.

President Delaney said that Governor Scott had begun the conversation with suggestions for higher education that had come from a Texas "think tank." He said the Governor wanted to see the universities demonstrate efficiency, productivity and responsiveness. He said there were a number of perceptions about the universities, issues that the Governor and legislative leaders focused their interest: that universities were wasteful and not efficient; that they offered obsolete and arcane majors, and classes irrelevant to employment needs; that students were not aware of employment and salary opportunities after graduation; that there were not enough STEM graduates; that graduation rates were not high enough; and concerns about job placement and salaries post-graduation.

He said the workgroup had identified certain objectives. The Board should use basic, transparent, and easy to understand metrics, eight to ten, to measure efficiency, productivity, and responsiveness, with a limited number of sub-measures. The Board should then set goals for improvement on these measures Systemwide as a part of its Strategic Plan over time, and then allow the universities wide discretion in how to improve those metrics. He said they suggested that the Board not regulate or legislate universities' processes to meet the goals, but set expectations for these goals. He said they had suggested freeing existing funding internally to allow the universities to improve key metrics and increase STEM degree production.

President Delaney discussed state subsidies for education and Florida's ranking in relation to other states and the national average. He said Florida spent \$3600 less than the national average per student, in combined state subsidies and student tuition revenue. He said UNF would have a total of \$40 million in additional revenue if Florida were at the national average. He commented that while all the universities had suffered ten to twelve percent budget cuts over the past few years, the universities have shown increases in all the metrics, i.e., enrollment, baccalaureate degrees awarded, STEM baccalaureate degrees awarded, six-year FTIC graduation rates, research and development funding. He said that if these measures were improving as the budgets were cut, the universities were being more efficient. He also said that while the conversation about STEM degrees was about increasing certain targeted degrees, this did not intend to disparage the non-targeted degrees. He noted that the revenue generated by the liberal arts programs were the sources of funds for the more expensive STEM programs. He said the Board could address duplication at the graduate level; students, however, selected the degree programs they wanted to pursue.

He noted that a "one size fits all" approach was counter-productive, as each university was different. He said the boards of trustees were providing tighter management and were taking action to reduce or eliminate the less productive programs, centers, and institutes. He said universities were aware and responsive to market demand, as were students. He noted that critical thinking skills were developed in the liberal arts. He noted that technology and technology tools could be integrated into every degree program.

President Delaney identified eight understandable metrics. He commented that every institution would not move on all the metrics, but the Board should expect movement on them as a System. These would include graduation rates, degree production, retention rates, professional licensure passage rates, economic development impact, external research grants and contracts, medical breakthroughs and job placement outcomes. He said the universities needed strategies to increase employability and the starting salaries of new graduates. He commented that the universities needed to better articulate the data they collected, what was measured and the information they could report concerning the success of graduates out in the world. He said they needed to provide relevant information to students throughout their academic career and increase opportunities for students and faculty to interact with potential employers. He suggested that the universities use job placement and salaries as a metric, recognizing the importance of this information to the Legislature.

President Delaney said the workgroup also addressed strategies to increase STEM and other critical-need graduates. He noted that Florida could no longer depend on agriculture, tourism and real-estate to provide an economic foundation. He said that nine out of the ten highest paying jobs were in STEM fields and there was a workforce shortage for these fields. He said the SUS and the Legislature should partner to define

the desired STEM degrees. He said the universities might be allowed to differentiate tuition among classes, charging more for high demand majors and charging less for STEM majors. He said the universities might create scholarships for STEM majors, use Bright Futures to encourage selection of STEM majors, and create STEM graduation grants. He said the universities might explore loan forgiveness for STEM graduates working in certain fields. He suggested “compete and complete” strategies for students to work in a targeted industry while continuing to work on a degree.

He said the workgroup had also discussed ways to fund these programs. He said universities were highly regulated in terms of spending. The goal was to liberate their internal finances to allow them to shift funding to fund the programs. He said they had discussed eliminating the requirement that 30 percent of differential tuition go to need-based aid, use market rate tuition both up and down, and allow tuition differentiation to be revenue positive. He said the group had also recommended eliminating specific restrictions on current funding streams, spend dollars to reach outcomes and eliminating spending authority limitation on student tuition and fees collected.

Finally, President Delaney said this presentation on helping make the SUS even stronger would not be complete if it did not include a strong recommendation that institutions be given the resources and flexibilities to reward effective teaching as an incentive for continuous improvement and create a rewards system that reflected and encouraged excellence in research and teaching. Finally, he said the workgroup had addressed outcome-based funding. He said this discussion should include many different constituencies to study outcome-based funding.

Ms. Parker thanked President Delaney and the workgroup for these suggestions. She said it was important to have these discussions and to have recommendations for a “Florida Plan.” Mr. Hosseini said he was concerned about the level of state support. He said it appeared that Florida was \$3600 per student under the national average in combined state support and student tuition. Dr. Yost added that the state support was less than the national average while the tuition rate was increasing.

Mr. Colson said he was interested to know how Bright Futures was counted. He said he was concerned about diverting the 30 percent of differential tuition now marked for need-based aid. He said room and board costs should also be considered as part of the equation. He said it was important to continue to provide access to higher education, and not just for students who were eligible for Pell Grants. President Delaney said the point was that each university should make that decision. He said the group was suggesting ways to provide more flexibility to the universities. Mr. Tripp said he continued to be concerned that the universities would not take care of all the students who needed financial assistance. He said the SUS needed to make sure that need-based aid was available to qualified students so that no group was left behind. He

said he was not comfortable with “trust me.” President Delaney said the question was who should make the decision. He said he was suggesting ways to address the metrics the Board wanted the universities to improve.

Mr. Martin said he served with an organization, America’s Public Transportation Business Board of Governors. He said with the funds for high speed rail, the industry was concerned that there were not enough engineers. He said they were looking for recommendations from European institutions. He noted that there were not enough engineers and planners to support the infrastructure for high speed rail. President Delaney said this was similar to the “Sputnik” effort of the 1950’s and 1960’s, to address a critical shortage of teachers and ramp up the need for scientists.

Ms. Duncan said she was interested in how to build agility into the SUS, with everything changing so quickly. She said the universities needed to be more nimble. President Delaney said the Texas approach seemed to lack recognition for the value of research. He said Florida’s universities needed to be cutting edge in research, as this was critical to research and development in the state.

Ms. Duncan inquired whether it was possible to develop leading edge indicators, to have some way of knowing that we were “on it” before we missed “it.” Mr. Tripp suggested using President Delaney’s report and ask a group of university trustees to use this as a “roadmap.” He said the Board should get feedback from the trustees on these suggestions and have the System coming together on them before going to the Legislature.

President Delaney inquired whether Board members liked the eight suggested metrics. He said the universities could show trendline movement on these metrics, that the universities were moving in the right direction on these. There were some policy changes that would have to be made by the Legislature, such as Bright Futures or different tuition flexibility.

Mr. Corr inquired how the universities presently measured success. President Delaney said each university had a distinct mission and each would give different responses to the question. He said that there was not one template, but that each board of trustees managed its institution. He noted that some of the metrics crossed all universities, e.g., graduation rates. He said that the Board should want System movement across the metrics. He said each university had identified peer institutions in other states, as well as comparing universities in the state. He commented that UNF had about 50 measures. Each university would approach improvement on any of the metrics differently.

President Bense said that performance or outcome-based funding was planned by many states. She noted that Tennessee had adopted five performance measures that

all universities had to meet; others were chosen by the universities, as appropriate. She said that Florida did not need to invent this wheel.

Chancellor Brogan said this was a conversation starter. He suggested that this paper be sent to the universities and various constituencies for further discussion and consideration. He inquired about how to move forward. Ms. Parker suggested the document be shared with the presidents and the trustees and that the Board come back in January for further discussion. Mr. Temple inquired if the Board intended to present something to the Legislature. Ms. Parker said the idea was that those entrusted with the responsibility for making policy were also leading the discussion about reforms in higher education that should be addressed in Florida. She said it was important for the Board to take the lead on reform of higher education in this state.

President Delaney inquired if the Board wanted to recommend any of the funding issues, eliminating the thirty percent requirement for need-based aid from differential tuition or eliminating the restrictions on funding streams, tweak Bright Futures, or eliminate the restrictions on the Student Fees Trust Fund. He said the Board needed to decide what to pursue in the Legislature; other issues might need a more lengthy discussion.

Mr. Rood suggested that the Strategic Planning Committee continue this discussion. He said they needed input from the faculty. Ms. Parker said she would ask the Strategic Planning Committee to take the leadership and make further suggestions to expand the recommendations.

Mr. Hosseini said the Governor was also interested in higher education and these issues and was looking to this Board to provide recommendations on efficiencies. He said the Board needed to look at the universities and find ways to create jobs. He said the Governor or his office should be involved. President Delaney said he had met with the Governor and the Governor's Deputy Chief of Staff. He said the Governor was most interested in job creation. He said that the Governor also needed a better understanding of university research activity.

Mr. Hosseini said the Governor had remarked on the cost differences between the Florida College System and the State University System. He said this state still had a vibrant "2 plus 2" system for higher education. He said the SUS had a different mission and provided a different experience for students.

Mr. Tripp said it was not possible to take "next steps" without including the boards of trustees. He said they needed their input before going to the Legislature and the Governor. He said to come together as a System, it was important to include the trustees and incorporate their thoughts. Mr. Martin suggested that President Delaney convene a webinar on these suggestions. President Delaney suggested that the

Presidents share the document with their trustees for discussion. Chancellor Brogan said new trustees during the Orientation Sessions were pleased with the opportunity to share ideas with members of this Board and had expressed the hope for more opportunities to do that. He said this process allowed the Board to organize the approach.

Ms. Parker said she would give this task to the Strategic Planning Committee to consider these remarks and to recommend next steps on how best to present this report.

Mr. Corr said this report was powerful, critically important. He said these ideas were circling in the business community. He suggested that some of the ideas should be acted on immediately. He said waiting for January seemed too passive.

President Delaney said the summary document was an attitude-setter. He suggested sending the metrics portion to the Strategic Planning Committee and ask Board staff to develop a template on the eight metrics. He said there might need to be an earlier decision on the funding issues because the Legislature convened in January, if the Board sought to free some of the money restraints this Session.

President Bense said the focus needed to be on "the end." She said "the end" was a group representative of legislative higher education leadership, the Governor, higher education leadership, faculty, staff, boards of trustees, students and this Board, and declare that to any group who could make it happen, this was the Board's plan. She said everybody was talking about higher education, but this represented what higher education had said and what it wanted. She noted that the Legislature was not likely to move from enrollment-based funding to outcome-based funding in one year.

Dr. Yost said faculty involvement was important; Mr. Long concurred as to student involvement. Ms. Parker encouraged Mr. Long to work with student leadership. She suggested that the Legislative Affairs Committee deal with the funding issues, while the Strategic Planning Committee looked at the policy issues.

Mr. Hosseini said a quick decision was fine, but that it was important that everyone be involved. Mr. Tripp concurred, noting that the trustees were a great asset to the process.

Ms. Parker said the five-year look back should be included as a part of the trendlines. She thanked the workgroup for presenting a framework for the conversation. Mr. Hosseini encouraged the Chancellor and staff to be actively involved in this project.

6. Welcome, Senator Maria Sachs

Senator Maria Sachs welcomed the Board to Boca Raton. She said that she knew that any economic recovery in Florida started with the universities. She said that they were the economic engines. She said that innovation needed to stay in the public universities. She said the state needed the right labor force, a high tech workforce, to improve the economy. She encouraged the universities to keep up their good work.

7. Continuation, Chair's Comments

Ms. Parker said she had a few additional comments. She noted that this could be the last meeting for several Board members, including her, but she reminded them that they continued to serve until their successors were named by the Governor. She said it had been her pleasure to serve as the Board's Chair; this had been a great opportunity for public service. She said service on this Board was an opportunity for meaningful service to the State of Florida and its citizens. She noted that the terms of Ms. Duncan, Mr. Martin and Dr. Marshall were also expiring.

Ms. Parker said that Ms. Duncan had championed a number of projects during her tenure. She said she had vigorously promoted shared services, greater university efficiencies. As Chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, she had worked with the Provosts on issues of greater program coordination and adult degree completion. She had also pursued improved services to veterans coming back to the universities to pursue degrees. She thanked Ms. Duncan for her energy and commitment to the work of the Board.

Ms. Parker thanked Mr. Martin for taking on the hard issues in the Strategic Planning Committee. She thanked him for his leadership and his commitment. She said that he was a planner by nature. She expressed her appreciation for the thoughtful discussions in the Strategic Planning Committee and his ability to keep the discussions on track. She noted that even with his busy work schedule, he always had time for his Board of Governors assignments.

Ms. Parker noted that Dr. Marshall could not be present for this meeting, but she thanked him as a great member of this Board. She noted that he had served as the President of Florida State University in the 1960's and 1970's. She said the Board had relied on his wisdom and understanding of academic programs. She thanked him for his special leadership in the review of university Ph.D. proposals.

Ms. Parker noted that 56 days had passed since the September Board meeting, eight weeks. She said she had spent at least some part of 50 days working on issues included in this agenda. She said that last January, the Board had promised to "man up" on the tough issues. Over the past year, she had tried to ensure that the Board did

not ignore the “big white elephants” in the room. She said the Board had the constitutional responsibility to take on the tough issues. She said it had been her approach that if an issue were coming to this Board, that the Board would deal with the issue. She said she felt the Board had assumed its Constitutional responsibilities in a thoughtful and deliberative manner.

Ms. Parker thanked Chancellor Brogan and the Board staff for their hard work. She said the Board could only be as good as the staff.

She said she appreciated that Governor Scott was interested in higher education. She said it was beneficial for the Executive Branch to recognize that the State University System was an economic engine for the state. She said the Governor had continued the conversations which began with his remarks to the Board last March. She said higher education was in the forefront of many conversations. She said it was important that this Board step up and provide input and that the Board was prepared to provide leadership. She noted that some might be concerned with his statements. She said it was more important that this Board was willing to talk about the issues and was willing to partner with the Governor on them.

Ms. Parker said she had met earlier in the day with the Faculty Senate Presidents. She said there were excellent faculty organizations on the campuses. She encouraged them to talk about how hard they worked and their importance to the work of the universities. She also encouraged them to become more vocal about their futures. She thanked them for their dedication to their work.

Ms. Parker said the next meeting of the Board was scheduled to be held at Florida A & M University, on January 18-19, 2012, in Tallahassee.

8. Election of Officers, Chair and Vice Chair, Board of Governors, 2012-13

Ms. Parker said that in accordance with the Board’s Powers and Duties document, as adopted by the Board of Governors, October 2003, and amended in March 2010, the Board was to elect its Chair and Vice Chair, at the last meeting of an odd-numbered year, to serve a two-year term of office, beginning the following January 1. She said the Board officers elected at this meeting would serve for a term beginning January 1, 2012, through December 31, 2013. She opened the floor for nominations.

Mrs. Frost congratulated Ms. Parker and thanked her for her outstanding service as Chair. Mrs. Frost said she was pleased to nominate Mr. Dean Colson, the Board’s current Vice Chair, to serve as Chair of the Board for the term ending December 31, 2013. She said he had done a terrific job as Vice Chair and would be an excellent Chair. Mr. Temple seconded the motion. Mr. Tripp moved to close the nominations for Chair of the Board of Governors. Mr. Temple seconded the motion. Mr. Perez moved that

Mr. Colson be elected Chair by acclamation. Members of the Board concurred unanimously.

Ms. Parker opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chair of the Board. Mr. Tripp said it was an honor to nominate Mr. Mori Hosseini for Vice Chair. He said Mr. Hosseini was clearly engaged in the work of the Board and that he had been an effective Chair of the Trustee Nominating Committee. He said he would serve the Board well as Vice Chair. Mr. Rood seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. Mr. Tripp moved that Mr. Hosseini be elected Vice Chair by acclamation. Members of the Board concurred unanimously.

Mr. Colson said he would have more formal remarks at the January meeting. He thanked Ms. Parker and said he was awed by her leadership. He also thanked the Board staff for their hard work and dedication.

Mr. Hosseini also thanked Ms. Parker. He said she was an incredible and effective leader. He said she had managed a great many hard issues the past two years. He thanked his Board colleagues for their confidence in him.

Ms. Parker congratulated the new Chair-elect and Vice Chair-elect. She noted that Mr. Colson had served as "education czar" for Former Governor Crist. She said she had come to know Mr. Colson as thoughtful in his leadership. She said she was confident that he and Mr. Hosseini would serve the System well.

9. Academic and Student Affairs Committee Report

- A. Public Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 6.018, Substitution or Modification of Requirements for Program Admission, Undergraduate Transfer, and for Graduation by Students with Disabilities

Ms. Duncan said that Board Regulation 6.018 was amended to reflect statutory changes enacted in 2011. She said the statement exempting documented intellectual disabilities from the definition of "other health disabilities" had been eliminated and the language of the regulation had been further clarified. In addition, the title of the regulation had been modified to capture the possibility of substitutions being made for university admission decisions.

Ms. Duncan moved that the Board approve the Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 6.018, Substitution or Modification of Requirements for Program Admission, Undergraduate Transfer, and for Graduation by Students with Disabilities, as presented, for publication on the Board of Governors web site, pursuant to the Board's regulation

development procedure. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

B. Public Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 8.016, Academic Learning Compacts

Ms. Duncan said that a workgroup had been working on Regulation 8.016 to clarify the process related to student learning outcomes assessment, including re-naming the Regulation previously titled, "Academic Learning Compacts." The amendments detail required policies and procedures and required products.

Ms. Duncan moved that the Board approve the Notice of Intent to Amend Board Regulation 8.016, Academic Learning Compacts, as presented, for publication on the Board of Governors web site, pursuant to the Board's regulation development procedure. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

10. Budget and Finance Committee Report

A. 2011 New Fees Report to the Legislature

Mr. Perez said that in 2010, when the Legislature gave the Board the authority to consider new fees, they also required the Board to submit an annual report summarizing the new fee proposals and actions taken by the Board in response to each proposal. He said the Report summarized the new fees, actions taken on each of the proposals, the amount of the fee, and anticipated revenues and expenditures.

Mr. Perez moved that the Board approve the 2011 New Fees Report for transmittal to the Legislature and the Governor's Office, as presented. Mr. Corr seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

B. 2012 Market Rate Tuition Proposals

Mr. Perez said the Budget Committee had reviewed and recommended for action university market rate tuition proposals. He said the Committee had approved each request individually. He said the Committee had recommended for approval all the university market rate tuition proposals; all but two of the proposals had been approved by the Committee unanimously.

Mr. Perez moved that the Board approve the following university market rate tuition proposals, as presented: 1. University of Central Florida, Professional Master of Science in Health Care Informatics; 2. Florida International University, a. Master of Science in Construction Management, b. Masters in Mass Communication - Global Strategic Management, c. Master of Science in Engineering Management, d. Master of Science in Finance, e. Executive Masters in Taxation; 3. Florida State University, a. Master in Criminal Justice, b. Master of Science in Instructional Systems, c. Graduate Certificate in Project Management, d. School of Communication Science and Disorders' Bridge Certificate Program; 4. University of Florida, a. Master of Arts in Mass Communication, b. Master of Arts in Urban and Regional Planning, c. Master of Science in Soil and Water Science; and 5. University of South Florida, a. Professional Master of Science in Electrical Engineering, b. Master of Science in Entrepreneurship, c. Master of Science in Management Information Systems, d. Master of Science in Nurse Anesthesia, e. Master of Public Administration. Mr. Temple seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

11. Strategic Planning Committee Report

A. Dental Education Proposals

Mr. Martin said the Committee had reviewed a joint proposal for dental education from the University of Florida and Florida A & M University. He said the Committee had given approval of the concept of the proposal, but had asked the universities to go back and review the costs and do some further planning. He said the issue was not before the Board for final action.

Mr. Hosseini said he was still concerned about some of the budget numbers in the proposal from Florida A & M University and the funding offered by other public and private entities. He said he was not clear whether these funds would transfer to the joint program and needed a better understanding of these funds.

Mr. Perez added that the Committee had approved the concept but that it had not reviewed precise budget figures and had asked the universities to continue to work together on the proposal.

B. Board of Governors' Strategic Plan for the State University System of Florida: 2012-2025

Mr. Martin said the Strategic Planning Committee had spent considerable time during 2011 on the development of a Strategic Plan for the State University System for the period, 2012-2025. He said the Committee had crafted a mission statement and a vision statement for the System in August. Since then, the Committee had worked to identify goals and performance indicators for the 13 year planning period. He said the Committee had identified three critical points of emphasis: Excellence, Productivity, and Strategic Priorities for a Knowledge Economy. He said the Plan included targeted goals. He said he was proud to deliver the Plan at this meeting, although it was not the final product. He said the Committee would continue to work on the metrics included in the Plan.

Mr. Martin moved that the Board approve the Board of Governors' Strategic Plan for the State University System: 2012-2025, as presented. Mr. Colson seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

C. Final Action, Promulgate Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination

Mr. Martin said Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination, had been re-noticed in September following significant revision after its first notice. He explained that to facilitate collaboration, articulation, and coordination of program delivery across the System, this regulation required a cyclical review of current academic programs at all levels, as well as those planned for addition or termination; and established a process for all universities to use when they sought to offer academic programs, or substantial parts of programs, away from their main or additional campuses. He noted that a few additional technical amendments had been made since the Agenda was posted. These additions had been distributed to Board members.

Mr. Martin moved that the Board approve Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination, as presented. Mr. Colson seconded the motion.

President Machen said there had been a mistake made during the development of this regulation. He said the reference to UF's and FAMU's unique land grant mission had been eliminated from the Board regulation. He said he had sent a letter asking that the reference be retained in this regulation. He said he had received a letter stating that

the regulation was not intended to address university mission statements. He questioned why the regulation would eliminate UF's unique land grant mission statement.

Chancellor Brogan said President Machen's request had not been ignored. He said there had been discussions about university unique mission statements. He said the determination had been made that while a university's particular status might be important, this regulation was not the place to include that provision. He said the purpose for this regulation was that universities communicate before making significant changes in degree offerings in the state. He said the regulation prescribed a process for the development and creation of degree programs including an appeal process. He added that UF's status was very important, it was regularly noted, but that this regulation was not the appropriate place to address unique mission.

There were no further comments, and members of the Board concurred in the motion.

D. Final Action, Amended Board Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites

Mr. Martin said Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites, had been re-noticed in September following significant revision after its first notice. He said this regulation had been significantly amended to reflect the new governance structure of the State University System and the planning and approval processes for new campus sites by this Board and by the university boards of trustees.

Mr. Martin moved that that the Board approve Board Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

12. Facilities Committee Report

A. Amended 2012-13 SUS Fixed Capital Outlay Legislative Budget Request

Mr. Beard moved that the Board approve the 2012-2013 SUS Fixed Capital Outlay Legislative Budget Request, as amended, and further, authorize the Chancellor to make technical changes as necessary. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

B. 2011 Higher Education Classroom Utilization Study

Mr. Beard said that the 2011 General Appropriations Act had included proviso language requiring the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors to develop recommendations for a revised funding formula or potential policy changes to increase the evening and weekend utilization of higher education classroom facilities during future school terms.

Mr. Beard moved that the Board approve the Florida Higher Education Classroom Utilization Study Draft and further, authorize the Chancellor to make technical changes, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

C. Resolution Requesting the Division of Bond Finance of the State Board of Administration of Florida to Issue Revenue Refunding Bonds on Behalf of the Florida State University Research Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Beard moved that the Board adopt a Resolution of the Board of Governors Requesting the Division of Bond Finance of the State Board of Administration of Florida to issue revenue refunding bonds on behalf of the Florida State University Research Foundation, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$21 million for the purpose of refunding all or a portion of the outstanding \$22,590,000 State of Florida, Florida Board of Education, Florida State University Research Foundation, Incorporated, Revenue Bonds, Series 2001, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

13. Trustee Nominating Committee Report

Mr. Hosseini reported that there was one position on the Board of Trustees at the University of West Florida to be filled. He said he hoped to complete that search by January.

14. Adjournment

Having no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting of the Board of Governors, State University System of Florida, at 11:15 a.m., November 10, 2011.

Ava L. Parker,
Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary



THE FLORIDA SENATE

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

COMMITTEES:

Budget - Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice
Appropriations, *Chair*
Banking and Insurance
Budget
Budget - Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism,
and Economic Development Appropriations
Communications, Energy, and Public Utilities
Health Regulation
Military Affairs, Space, and Domestic Security

JOINT COMMITTEE:

Administrative Procedures

SENATOR MIKE FASANO

11th District

November 8, 2011

Chancellor Frank Brogan
Florida Board of Governors
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1614
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400

Dear Chancellor Brogan:

Please do not approve the creation of a new university in the state of Florida. This is not the time to authorize an additional university anywhere in the state. With less than 60 days to go until the start of the legislative session, during which a projected \$2 billion dollar shortfall will have to be addressed, at the very least the fiscal impact of a new campus must be fully considered. I do not believe there has been adequate time for the fiscal issue or many other concerns to be addressed.

In the past, precedent has been set when a new university is being considered. Lengthy studies are normally conducted through which questions are asked and answered. The overall cost of such a project, the ability to attract competent teachers, the ability of programs to attract students are but a few of the many concerns that must be considered before a new member of the state university system can and should be approved.

I would encourage the Board of Governors to look at the critique issued by the University of South Florida Main Campus through which the wisdom of making the Poly Tech campus an independent university is questioned. It is clear that at the very least the dollars are not there to make this happen. It is also clear that the student base required to make the campus viable is not there either.

Despite the push by a few individuals to create a separate university, it is my opinion this is being done for all the wrong reasons. Perhaps the time will come

REPLY TO:

- 6217 Massachusetts Avenue, New Port Richey, Florida 34653-3111 (727) 848-5885
- 406 Senate Office Building, 404 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100 (850) 487-5062

Senate's Website: www.flsenate.gov

MIKE HARIDOPOLOS
President of the Senate

MICHAEL S. "MIKE" BENNETT
President Pro Tempore

November 8, 2011

Page 2

when Florida has the money and student base to make it work. However, that time is not now. I respectfully request that you not allow this project to move forward at this time.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have any questions or need any additional information please do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Fasano". The signature is stylized and cursive, with a large initial "M" and a long, sweeping underline.

Mike Fasano
State Senator, District 11

MF/gg



THE FLORIDA SENATE

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

COMMITTEES:
Commerce and Tourism, *Vice Chair*
Agriculture
Budget - Subcommittee on Education Pre-K - 12
Appropriations
Children, Families, and Elder Affairs
Rules - Subcommittee on Ethics and Elections

JOINT COMMITTEE:
Public Counsel Oversight

SENATOR PAULA DOCKERY
15th District

November 9, 2011

Dear Chairwoman Parker, Board of Governor's members and Chancellor Brogan,

I am writing regarding an issue that will have profound and lasting effects on the Senate District I represent. It is my responsibility to speak on behalf of my constituents who have been left out of the fast moving process of changing the direction of University of South Florida Polytechnic.

I'd like to provide a little history. The entire Polk County Community and its elected representation have been completely and enthusiastically supportive of developing, constructing and nurturing the Polytechnic under the USF umbrella. To that end, years ago, my role was to work toward getting an access road to the new campus on land donated by the Williams Company. After several meetings, representatives from City of Lakeland, Polk County, Florida Department of Transportation District 1 and attorneys from Gray Robinson, representing the Williams Company, came to an agreement that allowed that road to be built. I am happy to report that the road is near completion. So please understand that there has been a strong level of involvement and support from the entire community over many years.

Moneys have been raised from the City of Lakeland, Polk County, and other quasi-government groups and private donors under the belief that the campus would grow and prosper under the USF umbrella, a highly respected research university. The current administration asked for and received financial autonomy from USF through the Legislative process in 2008 allowing them to "control their own destiny."

Throughout this process, USF President Judy Genshaft, the USF faculty and the USF students have been very supportive partners. When we received the news that the \$35 million PECO appropriation had not been vetoed, again a very cohesive Polk County and USF Community celebrated. We were on our way to building a potentially "world class" Polytechnic with the help of USF.

The sudden call for independence from USF took many of us by complete surprise and quickly divided the unity of the supporters which had been built up in recent years. What still unites us is the desire for our Polytechnic dream to succeed. What divides us is how to best accomplish that.

Under the current scenario, there is little to no risk of failure. The construction takes place on the new campus, the 1300 current students continue their classes at the Polk State College/USF Polytechnic joint-use campus, the administration starts recruiting students, programs and faculty in earnest and all this is accomplished under USF, an accredited institution. The students will be able to graduate with a meaningful degree, faculty will be invested in the new program and a large donor base of USF Alumni can help to support the fledging campus in its infancy.

REPLY TO:

- Post Office Box 2395, Lakeland, Florida 33806-2395 (863) 413-2900 Toll Free: 1-866-248-6487
- 224 Senate Office Building, 404 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100 (850) 487-5040

Senate's Website: www.flsenate.gov

MIKE HARIDOPOLOS
President of the Senate

MICHAEL S. "MIKE" BENNETT
President Pro Tempore

Page 2

With push for independence from a small, but well organized group, there is great fear that this action is extraordinarily premature. Consider what is being asked:

- a 12th Independent University to be formed when the funding has not been secured for Phase I, let alone Phase II and build-out,
- campus has no buildings,
- student enrollment is 1300 and many of them want to stay with USF,
- faculty has not been hired for true polytechnic programs,
- polytechnic programs have not been developed,
- accreditation has been placed on hold and will take several years to achieve without the USF ties, and
- students will lose all benefits of being connected to USF, an established university.

I have heard from many of you that politics has certainly entered into the pace and tone of this issue and that is extremely disheartening.

The Board of Governor's was designed so that politics could be as removed as possible from educational policy, and so the BOG's members would not be treated punitively for votes or decisions. Please make your decision based only on merit, and not on political considerations, threats, intimidations and gamesmanship. Also consider the wide variety of stakeholders who have almost no political power, but have, for numerous reasons, voiced opposition to moving forward at this time: students, faculty, alumni, and members of the community. The decisions you make will significantly affect their daily lives and their educational hopes and dreams.

Over the past week I have had the opportunity to chat briefly with some of you and was left with the distinct impression that most of you believe this process has become mired in politics and the merits of the request do not justify the action for independence at this time. Please follow your hearts and minds and do what the Board of Governors was set-up to do.

Accurate financial data and a carefully thought out vision for Florida's higher education system should be driving this process. I am of the opinion the rush for independence NOW is being done for all the wrong reasons. I look forward to the day when our great state has the money and other necessary components to make this work. That time is not now. Those who will be most impacted, the students (our customers) and the faculty (our employees), have strongly stated their views despite efforts to silence them. Please listen to them. At a minimum a full and independent audit of all expenses and income should be conducted as well as an independent study of the business plan in comparison to that audit before you proceed. In the best interest of the Polytech's long term success, I respectfully request that you do not proceed with independence at this time.

Warm Regards,



Paula Dockery
State Senator, 15th District