

MINUTES
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
TRADITIONS HALL
GIBBONS ALUMNI CENTER
TAMPA, FLORIDA
JUNE 23, 2011

Ms. Parker convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Governors at 9:40 a.m., in Traditions Hall, Gibbons Alumni Center, University of South Florida, Tampa, June 23, 2011, with the following members present: Dean Colson; Pat Frost; Tico Perez; and Dr. Rick Yost. Other Board members present were Dick Beard; Ann Duncan; Charlie Edwards; Michael Long; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Gus Stavros; John Temple; and Norman Tripp.

1. State University System Strategic Plan

Ms. Parker said the Committee had been discussing a number of topics to be included in the Board's Strategic Plan. She said it was critical to address issues of System structure in order to organize the System for access and economic development needs. She said the Committee had a lengthy conference call on June 6, 2011.

Dr. Minear said in March, the Committee had reviewed a range of data on increasing the educational attainment of Florida's citizens. She said the Commissioner had advised the Board that the universities could expect more students coming to the System who would be better prepared and who would be seeking further education. Staff had continued to gather critical information. She reported that during the conference call on June 6, the Committee had reviewed a draft outline of Phase 1, "Vision and Overarching Goals," included in the agenda materials at p.3. She said this document was a high-level outline of the visioning and goals for the University System in the 21st Century. She commented that the categories and topics were similar to those in the Board's original Strategic Plan. She said the Board would continue to focus on degree attainment, changing student demands, increasing competitiveness and Florida's changing demographics. She said the System would continue to emphasize quality and excellence, and identify programs for pre-eminence at the state, national and international level. She said that the universities would also have a focus on community engagement and service. She said this framework captured the primary areas to be addressed in the Strategic Plan. She said contextual information was still to be added.

Dr. Minear explained that in this Phase 1 the document addressed overarching high-level goals; strategies to address these goals were to be in a later document. She

said that if increasing the number of baccalaureate degrees were the big goal, then the strategies might be improving retention and graduation rates. She noted that in the discussions about organizing the University System and moving from vision and goals to strategy development and implementation, the Chancellor had proposed convening New Florida Strategy Teams to recommend particular strategies and initiatives. She said that these teams would be asked to tackle critical need areas in the state. She said the agenda included potential topics for these teams, e.g., energy, environment, public health.

Dr. Minear said the Committee had also discussed the organization and coordination of academic programming in the System. She inquired whether it would make sense for the Board to develop a list of academic degree programs to avoid the "wasteful duplication" of degree programs. She said such a list could include an array of programs over a five-year cycle within a longer-term strategic plan. She said such a list would be informed by institutional strategic and work plans. She said that if the Board chose to adopt a master list of programs, it would be adjusted with the discussion of annual work plans. She said the Board's regulation requires the Board to identify the criteria and the process for the review and approval of university strategic plans; this was not yet done.

Ms. Parker inquired if there were any questions. Mr. Colson moved that the Committee begin working with the strategic plan outline, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion.

Ms. Duncan inquired about the proposed five-year academic program list. She said she was unsure how the Board would review programs that were not included on the list. Dr. Minear said it would be akin to the use of the PECO project list. She explained that it would be a master list for exploration of programs, but that if some great opportunity arose for a university, the Board could revisit the list. She noted that the Board now had an annual discussion of university work plans. Ms. Duncan said she was concerned about a "lock-down" list.

Ms. Frost noted that life was too static for a five-year list. She said new professions were constantly emerging. She suggested a one- to two-year program list. Dr. Minear said that universities go through a planning process in the development of new degree programs. She noted that they followed a timeline from the time of a degree idea through board of trustees and, when needed, to Board of Governors approval. She said it was often a lengthy process from the concept of a degree to implementation.

Mr. Colson said he was interested in having one university in the System among the nation's top 10 schools, another university among the top 25, and others in the top 50. He said the Strategic Plan should be a short document. He commented that the six universities with medical schools should be ranked among the top 100 schools. He said

the universities should have institutional strategic plans which feed into the overall System goals to create the best State University System over the next 20 years. He said the universities would have to be entrepreneurial. He said the universities should be able to demonstrate how a degree program would help move them into the top 50.

Mr. Tripp said he was interested in what needed to be done immediately to reach the top tier. He said he was not interested in watching the universities battle against each other; he said the Board supported all the universities.

Ms. Parker inquired how long it would take to complete the plan. Dr. Minear explained that there were overlapping timeframes for the high-level document, the contextual elements and the development of the metrics for the System. She said she hoped the overarching document would be completed by the end of December. She differentiated between a strategic planning process and a written strategic plan. She said she viewed the Phase I document as a visioning document. She noted that addressing the issue of expanding System capacity was on a different timeline.

Ms. Frost said she wanted to move quickly. She said the universities knew their goals. The Board might need a one-page outline describing where the System was headed. Ms. Duncan said the outline was needed, but she was concerned about a five-year degree approval list. She said she was unsure how the Board would manage such a list.

Mr. Colson said the document should be short and concise. He said he knew the Board needed a plan, but that it was difficult to articulate. He said he was interested to see how the university strategic plans lined up with the Board's plan. He noted that spending money on job creation might not result in raising the universities in the various ranking systems. He said this should be a two-page document rather than a 20-page document.

Mr. Perez said that the plan should be a macro-document setting aspirational goals for the System. He said the Board should work with the universities to see how they would contribute to these System goals. Ms. Duncan suggested that the staff review the plans of System peers, e.g., North Carolina, Michigan or California, and measure the System against other systems.

Ms. Parker inquired about the work of the New Florida Strategy Teams. She said these teams would address high level goals for the System and develop mini-plans as to what it would take to move the metrics. Chancellor Brogan said the Board was developing a Strategic Plan for the System aligning with the university plans in the ways each would contribute to the overall System goals. He said the Board needed an organized plan with all parts aligned. He said this discussion was about the things that were important to be included in the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Tripp said a few specific things should be identified with targets and a challenge to the universities to accomplish these targets. He said the Board needed to set definite goals for the universities to achieve.

Mr. Beard said he envisioned a more practical document, e.g., how the System should prepare to accommodate 38,000 more students in five years, and over 100,000 more students in 20 years. He said the Board needed to figure how to accommodate the growth in numbers of students, in size and in quality. He said the Board should develop a 20 year plan with overarching goals.

Ms. Duncan said it was important to reconcile the Board's budgetary and visionary goals. Ms. Parker said the Board had not "approved" or acquiesced with the proposed university work plans. Mr. Perez suggested that there be another Committee meeting to discuss the format document further. He moved that the Board table the discussion. Mr. Beard seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Chancellor Brogan said that he would continue to work with the leadership of the Committee to create a proper template for the Strategic Plan. He said this would be a lengthy process. Ms. Parker said it did not need to be a lengthy process.

President Bense spoke on behalf of the smaller universities. She said the Board needed to be cognizant that not all the universities aspired to be in the top 50. Each institution was meeting different needs; they were not all trying to be the same thing. She said they were all playing on the same team, each with different roles. She noted that some of the universities were on the cusp of national recognition, and she felt the smaller institutions could assist them while still meeting their smaller school goals.

Ms. Parker said she would ask Mr. Martin and Mr. Rood to set a date for a Committee meeting prior to the September Board meeting.

2. Organizing the System for Success; Discussion of Proposed Regulations

Ms. Parker said the Committee had begun discussions of several proposed Board Regulations on the conference call held June 6, 2011. There had been a number of differing opinions on the regulations. She said that through the Board's Regulation Development Procedure, the Board welcomed comments concerning the regulations once they were officially noticed. The Board also had the opportunity to amend the regulations further after the comment period. She said the three regulations on Continuing Education, Academic Program Coordination, and Educational Sites addressed related issues. She recommended that the Committee approve noticing these regulations and continue to work with the universities on them until September.

Mr. Stevens explained proposed Board Regulation 8.002, Continuing Education. He said this regulation came from an old Board of Regents rule that was first

promulgated in the 1970's. He said it was not aligned with the current governance structure for higher education and was too centralized and restrictive to meet the needs of the state. He said a workgroup had been working on this regulation for some time. He said they had reviewed regulations from other states. He said the regulation redefined continuing education and clarified that college credit courses could not be in competition with courses which were state-funded. He said the regulation included reporting requirements and corrected inconsistencies with the new market rate regulation. He said the old rule included geographic service areas that had now been moved to the regulation on academic program coordination.

Mr. Stevens also reviewed paragraphs (1) and (2) of proposed Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination. He explained that the regulation proposed to establish economic development regions designating universities to work with community partners to identify unmet higher education needs and student demand. He said the regulation also established a process for universities to use when they wished to go into other regions to meet identified needs. He said they had distributed a new copy of the regulation which addressed the activities of the Florida Cooperative Extension Service, which did not include academic degree programs, and recognized the community partnerships of New College.

Dr. McKee reviewed paragraph (3) of proposed Board Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination, explaining the process to be used when one university desired to offer a college-credit degree or certificate program, or substantial parts of a program, that required a substantial physical presence in another university's region.

Dr. McKee also explained proposed Board Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites. She explained that the basis for this regulation had also been a rule of the Board of Regents and did not reflect the current governance structure and did not delineate a planning and approval process for educational sites. She said there was confusion as to the types of matters to be brought to this Board for approval. She said the regulation established a new typology for system structure planning and data reporting; provided a role for the boards of trustees; required Board approval prior to branch campuses seeking separate accreditation; and provided flexibility for universities to offer lower-level courses on branch campuses, while respecting the partnerships with institutions in the Florida College System. She said the regulation also addressed international programs and a process for closing branch campuses.

Ms. Parker said she would recommend proceeding to notice these regulations while staff continued to work on them with the universities.

Chancellor Brogan explained these regulations and what they meant to accomplish and what they did not do. He said the intent was not to hold universities inside the defined "region." He said there was no intent for the Board to serve as a

bureaucratic impediment nor to prevent universities from responding to program requests. He said the intent was to promote conversations between the universities.

Mr. Beard said the regulations should address certain important topics, e.g., that universities should not be building facilities in others' "backyards;" that there not be impediments to research/private sector access to the universities; and that learning should be market-driven, that distance learning efforts were without borders.

Ms. Duncan inquired how these regulations applied to a certificate program being offered as professional development at a temporary site, such as a hotel. Mr. Stevens said they had no impact on such courses offered at a hotel or other temporary rental site on a short-term basis.

Ms. Duncan inquired about the concept of a "lead" institution. Chancellor Brogan explained that the idea was that if a university wanted to offer a degree program in a place where there was already another publicly funded state university, at a minimum, there should be some conversation between the two universities. He said this did not address research facilities, but that as to basic baccalaureate programs there should be dialogue and a process for resolution in the case of conflict.

Ms. Parker said that an institution would not make such a decision overnight. She wondered if there were concerns about someone else taking a good idea if the discussions occurred too early in the process. Chancellor Brogan said these discussions should occur early in the process before the program was too big and involved too many players. He said when the universities were exploring economic development opportunities, the discussions should include University System considerations. He said the Board could not organize the System on the basis of newspaper clippings.

Mr. Edwards said he understood the intent of the proposed regulations, and he agreed with the intent. He said he also understood statewide roles for FAMU, UF and FSU. He said he understood the concerns that had been expressed and that the issues were complex. He suggested that staff continue to work with the universities in crafting the regulations.

President Machen said there should be no problem endorsing the goals for the System. He said the members' rhetoric suggested they were supportive of the goals. He said the problem was that the text of the proposed regulations did not match the rhetoric. He said the Board was a long way from having regulations that met the System's goals. He said he had a problem with the process; the universities should not have to "mail in" their comments. He said the participants should all be in a room for discussion and dialogue. He did not believe the regulations were ready to be noticed.

Mr. Tripp commented that the universities, large and small, had legitimate concerns. He said that President Saunders of FAU could have legitimate concerns if UF

came to Boca Raton; President Ammons could have concerns with FSU's proposals. He said the affected Presidents should have to talk. Ms. Parker added that the ultimate responsibility for appropriate coordination rested with this Board.

President Machen agreed that the Board had the responsibility. He said the questions were about the issues. President Barron said the Board needed to pay attention to the strengths of the institutions. He said the concept of regional zones was strange; it did not match the strengths of the universities. He said that university proposals to build buildings or to enter long-term leases should be considered by this Board, but that the Board should not be involved in decisions about continuing education certificates.

Mr. Perez suggested that the Board address these regulations as it had addressed the regulations on fee approval and market rate tuition and assemble a task group of university representatives, Board members and staff.

President Saunders said this Board served as the decision-maker for the State University System. She said she watched as state colleges invited universities as partners or as local businessmen or local elected officials worked with alumni to bring in university partners or as legislators introduced initiatives involving universities. She said in all of these matters, there was nothing brought for the consideration of this Board. She noted that co-located institutions were without a voice in the process. She said that without a mechanism for decision-making, decisions were coming from differing entities who had different views about the strategy direction for the SUS. She commented on President Genshaft's relationship with St. Petersburg College which was akin to a "right of first refusal."

Ms. Parker said that Mr. Martin and Mr. Rood should continue to work with the other members of the Strategic Planning Committee on these regulations. She said she would recommend that the Committee move forward with noticing these three regulations and continue to work on their content. Mr. Hosseini inquired if proceeding with the notice sent the wrong signal. Ms. Parker said she viewed notice as the real avenue to move forward from the current starting point of the content now before the Board.

Chancellor Brogan commented that the process allowed the staff to craft a proposed regulation. Once the regulations are noticed, the comment period begins. He noted that this did not bind anyone to the regulations, as currently drafted.

Mr. Hosseini moved that the Committee approve noticing proposed Board Regulations 8.002, Continuing Education; 8.004, Academic Program Coordination; and 8.009, Educational Sites, as presented. Mr. Colson seconded the motion. He suggested considering Mr. Beard's basic principles. He said he was particularly concerned about

undergraduate programs; he said graduate programs were probably more difficult to control.

Mr. Perez noted that there had been many concerns expressed about these regulations, and he encouraged the task group to be inclusive in their work. He suggested that if there were significant changes to the regulations, the Committee should consider re-noticing the regulations in September. Ms. Parker concurred.

There was no further discussion, and the Strategic Planning Committee concurred in the motion to notice the three proposed Board Regulations 8.002, Continuing Education; 8.004, Academic Program Coordination; and 8.009, Educational Sites, as presented, with Dr. Yost voting no.

Mr. Perez inquired about the membership of the task group. Ms. Parker said it was her intent that the members of the Strategic Planning Committee would serve as the task group. She said she would also ask some university staff to work with the Committee.

President Saunders requested that as the discussions of these regulations continued, that as a matter of courtesy, universities contemplating moving into other parts of the state inform the universities already located there.

3. Dentistry and Dental Education

Ms. Parker said that two schools, UCF and FAMU, had expressed an interest in new dental schools; UF, which has the state's only dental school, had expressed an interest in expanding its dental school. She said that several months ago, Dr. LeMon had written a White Paper on Dental Education.

Dr. LeMon said that staff had begun working on the issue of dental education 18 months ago. He said the Chancellor had met with the Florida Department of Health and with the Surgeon General, as well as with representatives of the Florida Dental Association and the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration, to discuss the challenges of providing dental care. He said there were three relevant reports: the Board's White Paper, the Florida Department of Health Dental Workforce Survey, and the 2009 Department of Health report which had included key recommendations in meeting the state's dental health care challenges.

Dr. LeMon said that dental education was one of higher education's most costly endeavors. He noted that Lake Erie College of Medicine was about to open a new dental school in which \$52 million would be invested. He said that the UF Dental School had a \$60 million budget.

Dr. LeMon commented that there were over 11,000 dentists in Florida with active licenses, and Florida ranked fourth nationally in the number of dentists. He said that according to the Workforce Survey, about 77 percent of dentists in Florida were between the ages of 20 and 59 and about 74 percent were in a general practice. He said the survey indicated that almost all dentists were accepting new patients and that 92 percent of them practiced 11 to 12 months a year. He reported that the projections showed that additions to the workforce outpaced retirements over the next 40 years. He added that this projection did not take into account the new Lake Erie College of Medicine School of Dentistry which would open in 2012 and graduate 100 additional dentists per year. He said the survey showed that only three percent of dentists were African-American.

Dr. LeMon said the challenge was to determine how Florida could provide dental services to the most needy in the context of geographical access and Medicaid challenges. He showed a chart of Florida with number of resident to number of dentists in each county. He said Florida had a bad track record in providing dental care to the Medicaid eligible population. He said Florida had enough dentists, but these dentists were not living and practicing in geographical areas of underserved need and/or they were not providing services to the underserved irrespective of where they lived. He said dentists were not serving Medicaid patients because of the reimbursement rates. He said that of the 11,000 dentists in Florida, 1500 were enrolled Medicaid providers and 1200 were active Medicaid providers.

Dr. LeMon identified a number of options to address the dental care challenges. These include: addressing Medicaid challenges; revising Florida's dental licensing process; creating feeder programs to address ethnic under-representation; providing incentives to dentists to practice in rural and underserved communities; and creating loan-forgiveness programs for dental students.

Ms. Parker recognized Ms. Amy Cober from the Florida Department of Health. Ms. Cober explained the clinical dental services provided by county health departments throughout Florida. She said they provided more than preventive services, and enumerated the patient services for FY 2009-10. She commented that key to improving oral health care was water fluoridation and dental care. She noted that there were different workforce solutions to solve the problems related to access for disadvantaged groups.

Ms. Cober said the workforce discussions and recommendations had been made in 2009. She said the Ad Hoc Committee had made some general observations that education and prevention were essential and that community-based oral health preventative services should be expanded. To address the training of providers, they had recommended providing dental school extern or residency opportunities in safety net programs and establishing short-term training programs in pediatric dentistry. The Committee had also recommended legal/policy approaches to expand workforce or

services by expanding the duties and reducing the supervision levels for allied dental providers who practiced in certain settings or provided dental services for certain populations. She said they had also discussed recruitment/ incentives to attract providers to public health dental positions. The Committee had recommended examining the compensation and improving the work environment for state-employed county health department dental providers; funding the loan forgiveness program, re-establishing the Florida State Health Service Corps and increasing the utilization of the National Health Service Corps; strengthening the local, regional and statewide coordinated volunteer workforce; and providing technical assistance to communities wishing to recruit dental providers through the construction and equipping of dental office space in exchange for provision of dental services in their community.

Ms. Cober said the Workgroup had made a number of goal recommendations: to increase education and preventive efforts; to improve data collection; to increase provider participation in the Medicaid program; to increase utilization of allied dental staff; to integrate oral health education and prevention into general health and medical programs; to increase training opportunities for providers; to improve the state oral health infrastructure; and to increase efforts to recruit practitioners to provide care to disadvantaged populations.

Ms. Parker welcomed Dr. Teresa Dolan, Professor and Dean, UF College of Dentistry. She said that Dr. Dolan had been Dean since 2002 and a member of the faculty since 1989. Dr. Dolan said the College was co-located with the Health Science Center. She said the College had been authorized by the Legislature in 1957, but funds for construction had not been allocated until 1968. She said the College had received \$19.7 million from NIH. She said the state had appropriated \$13 million, and that was the only state investment in the College of Dentistry.

Dr. Dolan said that by the mid-1970s, financing for dentistry shifted to the states and schools closed because of the costs. Nova Southeastern added a school of dentistry in 1997; it was the first new dental school in the country in 20 years. She said there had been fluctuations in the number of applicants to dental schools, with the number of applications having peaked in 1975. She noted that dental students graduated with debt ranging from \$85,000 to \$154,000 in the most recent graduating class. She said with tuition increasing ten to 15 percent a year, students' debt load was also increasing. At UF, resident students paid \$35,000 a year for tuition; out-of-state students paid \$60,000 a year.

Dr. Dolan said that the UF College of Dentistry offered 16 degrees and certificate programs. She said the College had a strong commitment to serve the underserved population and operated clinics at various locations throughout the state. She said they had ten partner organizations where students were sent for clinical rotations. She said the UF College of Dentistry was also interested in expansion.

Ms. Parker thanked all the presenters. She said she felt it was valuable for the members of the Committee to understand the general state of dentistry in Florida and to hear from Board staff, from the Department of Health and from UF. Ms. Parker asked the universities who were interested in proposing new programs, and UF was interested in expanding its dental program, to prepare presentations to be considered at the September 2011 Board meeting for consideration for action at the November Board meeting.

Ms. Duncan inquired about the process. Ms. Parker said the Board would consider whether there was a need to educate more dentists in Florida. She said that the universities should submit their proposals which should include an analysis of need and demand.

4. Status, SUS Strategic Plan

Dr. Minear said the next steps for the Strategic Plan was to focus on best ways to expand capacity and explore the role of e-learning. She said the Committee needed to determine how to create the optimum structure for the University System and the location of university campuses. She said the Board needed to establish the criteria or policies for locating branches, adding new sites or consolidating sites. She said the goal was to have the recommendations regarding future growth to the Higher Education Coordinating Council by December. She said part of the discussion included whether the state colleges should become a part of the System.

Chancellor Brogan said they were looking around the country to see how other states were organizing higher education. He said the Board needed regulations in place to establish how the System would grow and change. He said without such regulations or such structure, the Board was making it up as it happened. He said the Board needed to look at the current System and craft an organized approach. He said the Board needed to know how it wanted growth in the System to occur, in an organized way.

Mr. Colson agreed that the Board needed a process in place for how the System should expand.

Dr. Marshall said he was interested in the activities of the Higher Education Coordinating Council. Chancellor Brogan said the HECC served as an advisory board to the various delivery systems. He said the intent was for the HECC to articulate between the delivery systems which tended to operate in silos. He said the Council was working with the Agency for Workforce Innovation to look at the workforce needs of the state. He said they were getting information about existing and emerging industries to know the programmatic needs of the future. He said the Council was also about to complete an on-line inventory of all programs, public and private, offered in Florida's post-secondary institutions.

Chancellor Brogan reported that the last meeting of the Council had been at St. Petersburg College where they had learned about the program alignment on that campus. He said the Council was interested in how to organize academic programs logistically by delivery system. He said they hoped to have some general ideas by December if there were alterations needed to the delivery systems to ensure greater access to higher education in the future. He commented that HECC was an advisory body, not a governing body.

Chancellor Brogan noted that many students were transferring from the state colleges to the universities. HECC was looking at the integration of programs to serve the needs of Florida students. He added that Chair Parker had attended the meeting in St. Petersburg.

Ms. Duncan said she hoped that as the System grew, the Board would be considering more than just meeting the demand. She said the Board should also be studying whether it was or was not cheaper to grow larger.

Mr. Beard inquired about the authority to start another university. Chancellor Brogan said that this Board could make that recommendation and the request for the funding, but the Legislature would decide whether it would support that request. He said the current universities could expand with requests for the necessary funding to the Legislature.

Ms. Parker said the Board would like to see is a process for accomplishing growth, whether there were regulations in place or not. She said these discussions needed to continue.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:35 p. m., June 23, 2011.

Frank T. Martin, Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary