



Consolidation Planning Study and Implementation Task Force

Shared Governance/Transparency Committee Meeting

October 24, 2018
4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
USF CAMLS Classroom 2B

Committee Members: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel; Nicole Washington
Staff Liaison: Amy Farrington

A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order Melissa Seixas
- II. New Business – Action Items Melissa Seixas
 - a. Approval of October 2, 2018 Hearing Notes and October 8, 2018 Meeting Notes
- III. New Business – Information Items
 - a. Introduction and Context Melissa Seixas
 - b. Discussion Peter Stokes
 - 1. Overview of draft recommendations
 - 2. Prioritization of draft recommendations
 - 3. Finalize top five recommendations
 - 4. Next steps
- IV. Adjournment Melissa Seixas

Shared Governance and Transparency recommendations will be presented to the USF Consolidation Task Force at the meeting on November 29, 2018 at USF Sarasota-Manatee.

**Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee Hearing
October 2, 2018
Notes**

Present: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel; Nicole Washington (via telephone)

I. Call to Order

Chair Seixas called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

II. New Business – Action Items

Minutes from the September 11, 2018 hearing were approved.

III. New Business – Information Items

a. Introduction and Context

Chair Seixas outlined the focus of the committee, introduced the topics for discussion at the hearing, and described the process for public comment.

b. Testimony

i. Overview of General Education

Dr. Phillip Wagner at USFSM provided an overview of Gen Ed for undergraduate degree programs. Gen Ed plays an important role in campus identity and skillsets and it sets the identity of an institution with a strong academic foundation.

With the passage of legislation establishing consolidation, the Gen Ed leaders across all three USF campuses immediately began meeting to determine a path forward. Gen Ed is a key component related to student success and will have the greatest impact on students.

USF Tampa conducted a review of Gen Ed requirements in 2017, creating a program with increased rigor in courses and focused relevancy to career success. The emphasis was on integrating skills throughout the four year degree that supported student success beyond graduation. The Enhanced Gen Ed model allows for students to count major-courses toward Gen Ed requirements and increases the use of High Impact Practices (HIP).

In working through to a consolidated approach, the general education team found that programs across the campuses were not that different, but that there were several key focus areas for their work including curricular alignment, course alignment, assessment and faculty oversight and ownership.

Curricular alignment requires one Gen Ed program across all three USF campuses to help ensure student success while also protecting campus identity. There is agreement to adopt the Enhanced

Gen Ed framework with ongoing discussions regarding specifics to ensure the maintenance of campus identity. There is also consideration given to “teaching-out” of existing Gen Ed programs for students that entered the university pre-consolidation.

Course alignment will provide the need for all courses certified within the framework to be the same across all campuses. In order to do this, departments and colleges must engage in meaningful discussions to align general education offerings. The existing "cap" on the number of general education courses that can be certified must be revised to ensure all campuses have equal opportunity to participate in building the new Enhanced Gen Ed program. New processes around Gen Ed course review and approval must be implemented on all campuses to maintain consistency and uniformity.

Assessment alignment creates a comprehensive and standard method of assessment across all three campuses. This assessment could be created by Gen Ed leadership through involvement by faculty from all campuses.

The structure and ownership alignment allows for one consolidated General Education Council empowered to make overarching decisions while also maintaining campus-specific subgroups to preserve unique identity, assist in assessment and implementation, and serve as a resource to faculty. This Gen Ed Council would include representatives system-wide with individual campuses identifying and defining Gen Ed leadership locally.

Committee members inquired about the communication with advisors to ensure knowledge is shared regarding changes in Gen Ed requirements. Consistent Gen Ed leadership on each campus works to coordinate consistent communication. This works differently on each campus, but there is a structure for information sharing as it pertains to student needs.

Discussion around the impact on transfer students included two types of transfer students: (1) those with A.A. degrees and (2) students coming in with a mix of credits. A student with an A.A. degree is exempt from Gen Ed requirements. A student with a mix of credits is worked with on a case-by-case basis to allow for ease of transition.

Discussion concerning campus identity within one Gen Ed model provided that the HIPs and the courses would preserve the unique campus communities. HIPs allow practices that engage with the local community such as internships, community engaged learning and others. The courses would be approved as something of a shell (within the standards) to allow for faculty to build out the content which would encourage students to engage in communities in innovative ways.

ii. Overview of Faculty Governance

Dr. Deanna Michael provided an overview of the importance of shared governance within higher education. Accrediting agencies look for evidence of faculty ownership of the curriculum and effective shared governance creates a healthy campus academic structure. Shared governance involves collaborative efforts by participating in the identification of priorities, development of policy, and defining responsibility for ethical leadership. Within shared governance, faculty

senate functions include being the principal advisory body to administration, and playing a significant role in the appointment of academic administrators.

Drs. Michael, Boaz and Gillespie provided an overview of the current state of faculty governance on each campus. Within that overview, it was noted that there are several councils and committees with similar functions across the three campuses including the Honors & Awards Committee, Curriculum Committee and the Research Council.

An approach to a consolidated faculty governance structure is being discussed between the campus faculty senate leaders, as well as the internal Consolidation Implementation Committee on Faculty Affairs. This structure would create one Faculty Senate that would include equitable representation from all campuses, with an estimated 100 members total, and the creation of an Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would be composed of 4 elected officers, 3 members at large (representing each campus), and 12 council/committee chairs. The councils and committees would be largely based on USF Tampa's current structure but membership would be determined depending on the mission of each entity. USF Tampa's existing constitution and bylaws would serve as the base for the governance documents, with the addition of individual items from existing regional campus documents.

There are still a number of issues that remain under discussion including the number of senators from the regional campuses, the rotation of officers, membership of councils and committees and governance document review.

The committee inquired as to the existing rotation of the President of the USF System Faculty Council. In the current state, there is a one-year term for the System President, but there is an option for re-election. It was noted that they often they serve two terms. At USF Tampa, the President serves a two-year term but cannot run for re-election.

There was discussion regarding the impact of potential of changing of colleges and schools on the proposed structure for faculty governance. There could be an impact on the structure as the membership of the councils is apportioned by college at USF Tampa so every department would not be represented within the councils. This is an ongoing consideration and there are options to satisfy the need for representation. There are models to review that could provide some further insight.

iii. Overview of Campus Boards

Gerard Solis, USF System General Counsel, provided a general approach for recommendations while also identifying accreditation concerns. He provided an overview of the Guiding Principles and their importance in terms of priorities and final recommendations. Another guidepost is the statutory requirement that USF will have one accreditation beginning July 1, 2020. In reaching this requirement, it is important to note that SACSCOC determines accreditation by looking at the entity in its totality.

In terms of a campus board, SACSCOC reviews autonomy and if it is determined that an extended unit is autonomous, SACSCOC may require that unit to become separately accredited.

Campus boards should not resemble boards on a separately accredited campus in that they are perceived as autonomous and impairing the control of the Board of Trustees.

Article 5 of the BOT Operating Procedures outlines campus board responsibilities. All of these are consistent with Florida law with the one statutory role for a campus board is the review and approval of annual legislative budget requests.

Discussion about student roles on campus boards noted that a student does serve on the USF BOT. At the regional campuses, students participate at the campus boards but not as voting members.

c. Public comment

There was no public comment.

d. Discussion

Members had no further discussion. Chair Seixas thanked all of the presenters for their time and participation in providing valuable information to the Subcommittee.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Notes
Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee Call
October 8, 2018

Present: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

I. Call to Order

The meeting began at 1:01 p.m.

II. Fee Structure Update

Mr. Trivunovich explained that he has been working with Dean McDonald's team/counterparts and SGA presidents across all campuses to come up with a potential recommendation for the committee's consideration.

The recommendation discussion centered on the transition to a consistent set of student fees across all campuses. This would also include the provision of equitable services. Equitable services does not mean the exact same services on each campuses but making available services more accessible in an equitable way to all students. Currently, there are limitations on participation in non "home" campus activities.

Within the discussion regarding a consistent student fee, there are some items that will require consideration:

1. The initial target date for one student fee is July 1, 2020. All students enrolled prior to that date would be grandfathered in under the now existing fee structure. The grandfathering allowance would sunset four years after the consolidation date to move all students to one system.

Chair Seixas asked for further clarification regarding equitable access to services. Mr. Trivunovich noted that campuses currently vary by service and that equitable access would maintain current services while providing some accessibility to student services at other campuses (e.g. student health at USFSM). The challenge is determining how those services are provided (e.g. transportation provision). The overall result could be an increase of services to all students. The physical locations would still dictate actual services but the focus would be on how to make those services accessible to all

2. Certain fees support campus specific facilities fee (Marshal Student Center and the USFSP student center) and it remains to be determined how these could be maintained under a uniform, single. There was discussion around whether facility specific fees could be encompassed within another fund. However, these facility specific fees are pledged to the bonds on both student centers. This creates a commitment to the bondholders that the fees that are charged will pay off that specific debt. Eventually this debt will pay itself out. Ms. Washington requested a phase out timeline and information regarding if/how other SUS entities have similar issues.

3. In finalizing a student government structure that could exist under one set of student fees, it is important to adhere to the principal of equal representation for all campuses. Student government advisors are still working on this recommendation and are looking at various models. One option is allowing all A&S fees to fund one pool with a combined student government. The combined SGA would then allocate funds. Another option is to divvy up an amount of funds to each campus and allow individual campus leadership control over use and allocation. A concern regardless of model is that fees remain at a level that allows for current campus budget amounts to be realized so that existing services are maintained. There was concern to avoid any adverse effects on a regional campus through an increase in fees. SGA budgeting process could follow a single fee structure in that it be centralized or via overall fund to individual campus for allocation.

Members discussed whether the tuition differential could allow for a main campus credit hour fee with differentiation between regional campuses that may allow for uniform reporting at the BOG level but maintain some flexibility at the local level. FAU and FIU have multiple campuses and their fees and access to services are, for the most part, consistent. FSU has the Panama City campus that does maintain a different fee schedule. Mr. Trivunovich does not believe the access to services is the same for Panama City but will verify. Members discussed looking at the overall cost structure and stressing a transparent fee process but also keeping in mind the potential impact on regional campuses.

Chair Seixas is most concerned with the regional campuses and how a single fee structure may impact them in terms of services. The challenge is trying to focus on the future student and not just today's reality. Members communicated concerns on the reality of access in terms of students actually using services on other campuses. A student survey regarding use of services was suggested to better inform decisions. Again, the challenge is asking current students about future changes. The law does not require a single fee structure and would allow the Task Force to make a recommendation either way.

Chair Seixas suggested focusing on recommendations that do not require additional discussions while recognizing fee structure is not an easy issue. The members will provide specific requests for follow-up. (Both Chair Seixas and Ms. Washington had to leave the call at 1:35 p.m.).

There was discussion regarding how to recommend a single fee structure or realize the cost/benefit of one without an absolute on a transportation structure. There are examples of where programs are not physically located on the Tampa campus and are either paying and not using or paying and figuring out how to use services.

III. Adjournment

With no other discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

Consolidation Planning Study and Implementation Task Force



Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee

Committee: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

First Hearing on July 18, 2018 at USF Tampa

Attendance: Approximately 15 people

Topics :

- Board of Governors Regulations and Florida Law
- USF Board of Trustees Policies and Internal Procedures
- SACSCOC Related Requirements
- USF System Shared Services

Speakers:

- Vikki Shirley, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, Florida State University System Board of Governors; USF System SACSCOC Liaisons; USF System General Counsel's Office Representative

Hearing Summary

The State of Florida's higher education regulatory process is complex, but creates a system of well vetted academics, accountability in structure and transparency in process.

Hearing Summary Cont.

- The USF System has many **shared resources**, including general counsel, controller, human resources and others. Some services can not be shared due to SACS requirements for separately accredited institutions. With an accreditation consolidation, more resources could move to a centralized function while others will need to remain present on each campus.
- The USF System has 3 **student government associations** with separate budgets as determined by current regulations.
- The Subcommittee's future work includes a closer look at shared resources, fee structures, student and faculty governance structures and general education process.

Potential Recommendations

- Structure that allows for 3 student governments in an effective way including system-wide representation.
- Shared services that can be more centralized after consolidation but that allow for accessibility and integration across campuses.
- General education

Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee

Committee: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

Second Hearing on September 11, 2018 at USF St. Petersburg

Attendance: Approximately 15 people

Topics :

- University Fees
- Student Governance
- System Strategic Planning

Speakers:

Nick Trivunovich, *VP Business and Finance and CFO, USF System*; **Eddie Beauchamp**, *RVC Business and Financial Affairs, USFSM*; **Nick Setteducato**, *Interim RVC Administrative and Financial Services, USFSP*; **David Everingham**, *RVC Business and Finance, USFSP*; **Michael Klene**, *USFSM SGA President*; **Kaeden Kelso**, *USFSP SGA President*; **Moneer Kheireddine**, *USFT SGA President*; and **Dr. Gregory Teague**, *Special Advisor to the President for USF System Strategic Planning*

Hearing Summary

- Fee structure is multifaceted and varies by campus, with no fee increases in the past five years. The process for approval, along with the regulatory environment surrounding fees, is transparent but complicated.
- Student government focuses on representing the student body and student interests while ensuring the proper allocation, budgeting and support of A&S fees. Campus student governments have some similarities but are uniquely shaped to best serve each campus community.

Hearing Summary Cont.

- Strategic planning occurs at all levels of the System with all aligning with the higher level strategic plans. With consolidation, and approval of the implementation plan by the USF Board of Trustees, all strategic plans will have to be revisited to support those new goals and objectives.

Potential Recommendations

- Explore the feasibility of differentiated fee structure among the three campuses.
- Create an ongoing/regular communication plan that provides for transparency and easy understanding regarding how fees are assessed (home campus flat fees vs. course/tuition based fees), how they are used and services provided.
- Formalize system student leadership structure to allow for a unified student voice while still maintaining campus representation.
- Streamline A&S funding process to allow for system student leadership structure to review and approve/deny individual campus student budgets at a high level while also maintaining individual campus allocation processes.

Potential Recommendations Cont.

- Hold system-wide events that can further leverage student collaboration and partnership between the three campuses.
- Research feasibility of additional transportation fee to support additional connectivity between campuses.

Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee

Committee: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

Final Hearing on October 2, 2018 at USF Sarasota-Manatee

Attendance: Approximately 30 people

Topics :

- General Education
- Faculty Governance Structure
- Campus Boards

Speakers:

- General Education Leadership: Scott Besley, Ph.D., Kyna Betancourt, Ph.D., Morgan Gresham, Ph.D. and Phil Wagner, Ph.D.
- Faculty Governance Leadership: Ray Arsenault, Ph.D. (President, USFSP Faculty Senate), Tim Boaz, Ph.D. (President, USFT Faculty Senate), Michael Gillespie, Ph.D. (USFSM Faculty Senate) and Deanna Michael, Ph.D. (President, USF System Faculty Council)
- Gerard Solis, J.D., USF System General Counsel

Hearing Summary

General education is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree ensuring breadth of knowledge while based on a coherent rationale.

Existing faculty senate structures function as the principal advisory body to administration regarding welfare of the university, particularly the academic mission. These structures allow a unified faculty to

Hearing Summary

provide positions and initiate policies as well as perform a significant role in the appointment of academic administrators.

Campus boards play an important role within the system but authority ??? by statutory and SACSCOC guidelines and requirements.

Potential Recommendations

- Gen Ed leadership to create opportunity for ongoing discussions regarding a consolidated program, identify existing areas of overlap, and methods for “teach-out”.
- Discussion among departments and colleges across the system to align general education course offerings, create equitable participation opportunities and implement consistent review and approval processes.
- Gen Ed leadership to create a uniform assessment plan for the consolidated general education program.
- Create a General Education Council with equitable campus representation that includes an identified Gen Ed leadership on each campus.

Potential Recommendations Cont.

- Develop one Faculty Senate, including an Executive Committee, across the system to include a equitable representation by campus as well as within the academic structure.
- Review structure of councils and committees to determine function and best fit and allocate membership appropriately.
- Overhaul governance documents to allow for a unified structure while also maintaining any unique items from individual campuses.
- Campus Boards should remain continue to represent individual communities, but structure, authority and governance documents should be evaluated to ensure there is no negative effect on the consolidated accreditation through impaired control of the USF BOT.