

MINUTES
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
BY TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
JUNE 6, 2011

Mr. Martin convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Governors, by telephone conference call, at 9:00 a.m., in Tallahassee, June 6, 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, and Gus Stavros.

Mr. Martin said that Chair Parker had asked committees to conduct some of their business by conference call prior to the June Board meeting to provide more time for Board discussion of the university work plans. He said the call today would provide an opportunity for thoughtful discussion of the strategic planning process and about the structure of the System and the need for better coordination.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held January 20, 2011

Mr. Stavros moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee held January 20, 2011, as presented. Dr. Yost seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Martin said that he and the Vice Chair of the Committee, John Rood, had met in Tallahassee on April 19, 2011, to discuss the process for updating the Board's strategic plan and how best to use the time at the June meeting. He said the materials included notes from that meeting, which did not need Committee approval.

2. State University System Strategic Plan

Mr. Martin said at the Board's last meeting, members had looked at a range of data that emphasized the magnitude of the challenge if Florida were to increase significantly the educational attainment levels of its citizens. He noted that Commissioner Smith had emphasized that a larger number of secondary students would be graduating from high school well prepared and seeking to further their education in the State University System. He said that over the next six to eight months, the Committee would be focusing on ways to expand the System's capacity to help address these student access demands and economic development goals. He said they would also produce an updated strategic plan, or a series of strategic planning

documents. He invited Dr. Minear to explain a proposed approach to the work on the strategic plan.

Dr. Minear said the agenda included a draft outline for Phase 1 of the Strategic Plan, which would describe the vision and overarching goals for the State University System. She noted that the topics were similar to those in the current Strategic Plan. She said the focus would be on degree attainment goals at both the undergraduate and graduate levels that respond to changing student demand, increased competition, and Florida's demographic changes; degree, research and technology transfer goals that addressed critical state needs and areas of strategic emphasis; an emphasis on quality and relevance, as well as identifying select programs that could move to greater levels of state, national and international preeminence. She said the Plan would also address issues of community engagement and community partnerships.

She said that this document would not identify strategies, but would focus on the high level goals. She said that moving forward, the Board would be looking at ways to organize the System for success and the strategies and initiatives needed to realize the vision and goals.

Chancellor Brogan said that he and Mr. Martin had talked about creating *New Florida* strategy teams. He said the Board staff was not big enough to broker the work for the size and scope of this System's Strategic Plan. He said, however, that there were so many talented people within the System who could work on the System's Strategic Plan. He said he wanted to assemble teams of people who could focus their expertise on the stated goals. He said it made sense to use the many talents of the presidents, the provosts, other vice presidents, faculty and staff to provide a System perspective on issues such as alternative energy, health, space, the future of Florida, biotechnology, technology transfer, biomedicine and so forth.

Dr. Minear explained one additional recommendation regarding the coordination of academic programming. She said among the responsibilities of this Board, as described in the Constitution, was "avoiding wasteful duplication of facilities or programs." She said the question had been raised as to whether the Board should develop a five-year list of academic programs being considered by the universities. She noted that the Board had not yet developed a process for the approval of institutional strategic plans. She said that any program list would have to be flexible enough to address new needs or opportunities. She said a proposal would need to be developed for how such an academic program list would work.

Chancellor Brogan said it was important for the System to take a longer view look at the types of academic programs being developed. He said this would give the Board notice of new programs the universities were considering. He said a five-year array would provide this longer view.

Ms. Duncan said she appreciated this approach. She inquired how such a five-year approach would discourage universities from throwing everything on the list. Mr. Martin said the Board had begun discussions in January about the System and how it should look. He said this was an outline of what the process should look like. He said in terms of the five-year focus, this would allow the Board to begin to capture what the universities were planning and how this fit into System planning. He said for the period, 2012 - 2025, the Board would be looking at population trends, growth, the state economy, and the numbers of high school graduates moving into the State University System. He said the Board needed a process which was nimble enough to address new trends coming in off the planning cycle.

Mr. Martin said he viewed the Board as having been more reactionary in its early years. He said he felt the Board was now maturing, and that it was time for the Board to be more proactive. He said he expected this to be a fully collaborative process. He said they also needed to consider public input. He inquired if members thought this was the right direction for the process, and whether adjustments were needed.

Mr. Colson inquired about the timeline. Mr. Martin said he anticipated being done by the end of the year. Mr. Colson also inquired about deliverables. Dr. Minear said the first document was the goal document, which should be completed by year end. She said they could begin the strategy development before having all the numbers for the goals. She said that simultaneously, the strategy teams could begin working on specific issues.

Mr. Colson said the document should include specific goals, not just broad statements, e.g., the six universities with medical schools should be in the top 50, with one university in the top 10, and one university in the top 25. He said that quality mattered, and the Board should impose these types of goals on the universities. He said he saw the Strategic Plan as providing "marching orders" to the universities, but not prescribing how they achieved the goals. Chancellor Brogan agreed that the Plan should contain specifics. He said the Strategic Plan was not meant to create a strategic plan for every university, but a strategy for the System.

President Delaney said he viewed a strategic plan as setting a destination, but that first it was necessary to determine where the Board wanted to go. He said the universities had metrics comparing institutions within the University System and with their peers, such as graduation rates. He said the university work plans should be consistent with the Board's overall vision. He said it should contain a combination of specific and not-too-specific goals.

Dr. Minear suggested that the Plan might address topical area goals for the System, such as number of baccalaureate degrees, number of graduate degrees, research

and commercialization goals. She said these could be aggregated at the high macro level and the institutional plans should be aligned in a way to accomplish these goals. Mr. Stavros noted that retention figures were also important.

Mr. Perez said the Plan should include tangible target goals. It was important to set markers. He suggested that requests for new programs could be viewed against this template.

President Delaney commented that to move the markers would require funds. He said the Board should set some destinations, e.g., some expectation numbers for the universities to address student retention. Dr. Yost said it was also important to look at excellence, not goals where all the universities are deemed adequate.

Mr. Beard inquired about the strategic plan of the State Board of Education. Chancellor Brogan said the State Board was in a transition period to new leadership. He said he would sit down with them to discuss their strategic plan to try to align all the education sectors. He said this was one of the continuing topics of discussion of the Higher Education Coordinating Council to be sure that all were moving in the same direction.

Mr. Martin concluded that the Strategic Plan should include specific markers as to what the universities were to achieve.

3. Organizing the System for Success: Discussion of Proposed Regulations: Amended Regulation 8.002, Continuing Education; New Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination; Amended Regulation 8.009, Educational Sites

Mr. Martin said the Board had recognized in its 2005-2013 Strategic Plan the need to continue to study ways to create the optimum structure for the State University System. He said the Board had engaged in several discussions about better organizing and coordinating efforts within the System. He said the agenda included three proposed regulations relevant to this effort. He said they were written to ensure better communication and coordination within the System.

Mr. Stevens explained that the regulation on Continuing Education had existed for many years as a rule of the Board of Regents. He said a group of staff and university representatives had started working on the proposed new regulation about three years earlier and had found the content of the proposed regulation was linked to proposed regulations dealing with educational sites and service areas. He said the proposed regulation defined continuing education as it now existed in the University System. He said the regulation described how continuing education was administered by the universities and included some reporting requirements.

Dr. McKee explained the regulation dealing with Academic Program Coordination. She explained that there were three main components of the regulation. She said the first section described the process currently underway for the annual review of all academic degree program offerings, as well as university plans for the addition or termination of any degree programs. She said this review would inform both institutional and System level strategic planning. She noted that the Provosts were currently engaged in this review.

Mr. Stevens said the second section dealt with ways to facilitate articulation and coordination of academic program delivery across the System and the State. He said the former Board rule articulated "service areas" for the universities. The proposed regulation addressed the concept of proximity and designated economic development regions, as developed by Enterprise Florida. He said the idea was to engage the universities in both economic and community engagement. He said the idea to use economic development regions came from ideas discussed by the Higher Education Coordinating Council and the Council of 100 to align education and the business sectors. He said the idea was not to prevent programs from being offered in other parts of the state, but to identify who might already be engaged in a particular area.

Dr. McKee said the third section of the proposed regulation articulated the process when universities sought to offer degree programs in an area of the state where there were already universities, when they planned to create "a substantial physical presence" in another university's region. She said the process included discussions by the university presidents, with resolution by the Chancellor or the Board if the presidents were unable to resolve the matter. She said the proposed regulation included a threshold definition for "substantial physical presence."

Dr. McKee said the third regulation in the package defined various "educational sites." She said this had also been an old Board of Regents rule that was out-of-date. She said the old rule provisions were confusing as to when universities should bring proposals for developing certain sites to the Board for approval. She said they had reviewed and fine-tuned the current classifications. She said they had eliminated a classification for "centers." She noted that the classifications were for reporting purposes, to allow for a campus being called a "regional campus," and reported to the Board as a "branch campus." She said these classifications have not caused a problem with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. She said the proposed definitions were more detailed than SACS' definitions in order to be useful for planning decisions. She explained that the regulation also addressed the approval process, including board of trustees approval and adoption of appropriate trustee regulations.

Dr. McKee said the proposed regulation also prescribed the approval process for offering lower-level courses away from the main university campus. She said the

proposed regulation also outlined the elements to be addressed in proposals for establishing new sites and included provisions for closing or re-classifying sites.

Mr. Martin said these regulations were part of the Board's continuing discussions about ways to create an optimum structure. He said it was important to clean up these regulations that had not been addressed in a long time. He said they were proposed to be in accord with the new direction for the System of greater collaboration and coordination among the universities.

Chancellor Brogan commented that these regulations had been under discussion for about two years. He said the philosophy in creating these regulations was to better organize the System without trying to micro-manage it. He said there was nothing in the regulations which would prevent universities from being innovative in other parts of the state outside their home campuses. He said he understood that universities would continue to grow and evolve, but that this growth and change should be organized and include certain reporting mechanisms. He said the System had undergone a decade-long process of devolution; these regulations were proposed to better organize that process for the System as a whole.

Mr. Colson said he had heard many comments on the proposed regulations. He said that distance learning was available on the Internet and on-line. He inquired about the situation if a university wanted to offer a course on-line in Miami for a course equal to one hour a week. Mr. Stevens pointed out the regulation on Academic Program Coordination and the definition of "substantial physical presence." He noted that there was also a federal regulation requiring universities to seek state approval from any state from which students were enrolled in an on-line course, if that state required such approval. He said the regulation was written to provide an avenue for universities to convene a class, do testing, and have orientation, without reaching the threshold of "substantial physical presence." He said the focus was more on the situation where a university put down a permanent footprint. He noted that students were now enrolled in far greater numbers of "blended" courses, combining various methods of instruction.

Chancellor Brogan said the regulations were not meant to micromanage the System, but that it was also important that a university not have a negative effect on another institution in the System.

Provost Glover said UF had great concerns about all these regulations. He said they were a disservice to the state and to the universities. He said he had provided the staff with a detailed analysis of each one of the regulations. He noted that IFAS programs were in every county of the state and should continue to be recognized. He said it was not in the state's best interest that every time UF was invited by a company to deliver a certificate program or a course, that UF should have to worry about discussing this with a great number of people before it could act on the invitation. He

said he had offered alternate language and none of those suggestions had been incorporated in the proposal before the Board.

Chancellor Brogan said that nothing in the proposed regulation would prevent UF from responding to such an invitation. He said there was nothing in the regulation that diffused UF's mission; nothing in the regulation impinged on the university's capability to act. He said he strongly disagreed with Dr. Glover's interpretation, noting that there had been significant discussions about these regulations.

President Bense said that she agreed with the proposed regulations. She said there needed to be a process. She said the universities should be meeting economic opportunities in the state and there should be statewide organization of university activities. She noted that with the offering of electrical engineering by UWF, UWF had partnered with UF and this had strengthened the UWF offering. Chancellor Brogan said the regulations prescribed opportunities for collaboration. He said he did not want the universities to lose opportunities to address specific requests from business, and the regulation created opportunities for that type of communication.

Mr. Martin said the intent for the regulations was to foster coordination and collaboration. He said they were part of setting the framework for the dialogue.

Mr. Colson said that a block from his office in Coral Gables, Northwestern University was offering weekend MBA programs. He said he would not want other System universities coming in to areas where there were already SUS universities and building facilities without some type of Board of Governors approval. He said he would suggest working on the regulations to try to address some of UF's concerns.

President Delaney said the state should have some role in decisions about the locations for degree programs.

Chancellor Brogan said he viewed these regulations as a baseline of information. He said the regulations were meant to start these important conversations, so decisions about the location of degree programs were not done in a vacuum.

Mr. Colson said that he was concerned about offering undergraduate on-line courses. He said he worried about the possibility of harming the regional universities.

Mr. Martin recommended that the regulations be moved forward for noticing. He said once noticed, the regulation procedure provided time for continuing the discussions through the summer. Mr. Colson so moved. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

4. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m., June 6, 2011.

Frank T. Martin, Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary