NOTES
Student Success Academic Programs and Campus Identity Meeting
November 14, 2018

Present: Mike Griffin, Chair; Rick Piccolo, Dr. Tonjua Williams

I.   Call to Order

Chair Griffin called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

II.   New Business – Action Items

Meeting notes from November 6, 2018 were approved.

Chair Griffin welcomed the committee and attendees.

III.   New Business – Information Items

    a. Introduction and Context

Mr. Stokes introduced the meeting objectives, stating this was the subcommittee's final in person meeting. The process will incorporate reviewing each focus area to move to a final drafting. Huron will create this final draft from the discussion and feedback from members and provide it to the subcommittee for final review prior to submitting to the Task Force at large.

    b. Discussion

The committee began the discussion with student success. The members expressed concern that USFSM campus housing as a recommendation should be relocated to the campus identity recommendations, noting that the housing project is important to establishing a campus identity.

There was further discussion regarding establishing a definition for student success, as it is not clear how it is defined or who decides what is and is not student success. They also stressed the importance of making sure that all three campuses have a voice. Members further discussed the current system and structure of ensuring success and strategies that will be tailored to the students at each campus. Finally, it was noted that strategies for student success are not "one size fits all" and would need to be adjusted at each campus.

Chair Griffin recommended that all three campuses create guiding principles that explain how student success is done and measured. Mr. Stokes agreed that student success should include local voices and overarching principles. Chair Griffin also suggested that the current System Academic Program Advisory Committee add that the student representative should rotate annually among the three campuses.

Members then reviewed the academic programs draft recommendations. Mr. Stokes described the evidence-based business plan for success measures. Members discussed the process that is

already in place, wanting to ensure any additional processes won't overburden or override current processes. Members expressed their desire to ensure that new programs are supported with the philosophy in mind of supporting those closest to the communities they are in.

Members expressed concern that there was an omission of bachelor's programs and USF Tampa and rather should include both in the particular recommendation for expanding master's and doctoral degrees. The committee discussed timing for new program creation and were reminded that BOT/BOG have requirements that must be fulfilled. Members expressed provided clear direction that establishment of new master's and doctoral degrees would be a priority alongside keeping everything that is currently available on each campus available. Members expressed that they will not be defining which colleges and programs should be homed at each location without feedback from academic leadership. The committee members expressed that a recommendation they would like to include is least one college was housed at every campus.

Members requested more clarification regarding the meaning of "develop guiding principles" on the draft recommendations. Mr. Stokes noted it was in reference to the college unit. The committee discussed the need to establish benchmarks at individual campuses in order to ensure that they are realistic and achievable alongside a process and protocol in the event that the benchmarks were not met. It was mentioned that resources also need to be evaluated to make a determination. The members suggested that these benchmarks are also tied to the marketing of unique identities and more language reflecting that should be added to the recommendations.

The members recommended the addition of an organizational plan that included partnerships with workforce and community organizations. The members requested to add to the vision statement an inclusion of partnerships.

Next, members reviewed the draft recommendations regarding research capacity. It was recommended that resources already available are deployed wherever they may be needed. It was also suggested that technology be used to facilitate more collaboration across the three campuses. Additionally, the members recommended that language should be added regarded expanding research office services support.

The members noted the critical needs for additional facilities should be a priority, including adding a recommendation regarding the technology building ad USFSM.

The members noted that the quality of faculty makes a big difference. They recommended that language regarding hiring quality faculty in order to increase campus identity be included as a recommendation. The members also mentioned that the arts were brought up multiple times in St. Petersburg and the need to ensure that partnerships go beyond academic be included in the recommendations.

Mr. Stokes suggested a separate carve out related to partnerships that could be curricular or other partnerships. The members recommended this section be titled "community engagement." Discussion regarding partnerships ensued, including the sectors most important to the communities which USF serves.

Chair Griffin expressed that the committee needs to be careful not to set expectations for things that cannot be achieved. Mr. Stokes asked the committee if they saw any risks that needed to be communicated to the BOT. The members noted the following risks: funding, lack of community buy-in around the recommendations, visible community results, and attainable recommendations.

The committee discussed their next steps to be the following:
- Synthesize and update document
- Considerations will become recommendations and fleshed out
- Subcommittee reviews and approves
- Call to discuss
- Review of the updated document.

IV.   **<u>Adjournment</u>**

Meeting adjourned at 11:26am