Student Success, Academic Programs & Campus Identity Hearing
July 9, 2018
Notes

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

I.   **Call to Order**

Mr. Griffin called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

II.   **New Business – Action Items**

There was a motion to accept the minutes from the June 25th meeting. Motion passed.

III.   **New Business – Information Items**

   a. **Introduction and Context**

Chair Griffin provided an overview of the meeting agenda, public comment process and opportunities for input and feedback online. As the subcommittee will be hearing from/at each of the campuses, the goal is for the Task Force to make recommendations for "one" USF.

   b. **Testimony**

   i.   Developing New Degree Programs, the USF System Master Academic Plan and Current USF Degree Programs

Dr. Chisolm provided an overview of USF System Regulation 3.038 Academic Curricular Offerings. Each degree program requires a Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code, designated faculty effort, instructional resources and approval at only one degree level. These regulations align with the regulations from the Board of Governors.

Most students and outside community members think in terms of majors and not necessarily the degree program name. The major is reflected on the transcript and diploma. Beyond majors, other academic offerings are concentrations, minors and certificates, which are approved at the local (USF) level.

Criteria for new academic offerings includes 5 requirements:

1. Alignment with USF Institution/USF System/SUS BOG Strategic Plans

2. Demonstrated student demand/workforce needs that will prepare students for high-paying jobs/continuing education

3. If duplication, demonstration of necessity to deliver locally

4. Sufficiency of resources

5. Quality assurance

Mr. Piccolo raised the question of how USF determines the needs of each community. Dr. Chisolm explained there are tools available to research demand in local areas including the Bureau of Labor Statistics, regional data (economic studies) and other available resources. This criteria is used for all academic offerings, while also reviewing on a holistic level for the entire USF System. Concerns were also raised regarding the requirement to have resources available prior to the approval of a program, and how potential resources are viewed (campus vs. system). There was discussion regarding the level of community engagement in the degree program proposal process.

Dr. Fontenot provided an overview of the academic program process including the roles of faculty, deans and administration. The process stresses communication across the System to ensure that there is proper deliberation and collaboration.

Dr. Williams asked if, during the proposal process, there were any student representatives or any student advisory councils involved. Dr. Fontenot noted the process was designed to make sure that the System is in sync but offers opportunity for student input at the college level. APAC is advisory to the Board of Trustees (BOT) and is a quality insurance portion of the review. It creates some great opportunities for collaboration with regular meetings on a monthly basis.

Dr. Chisolm reviewed the 5 Year Master Academic Plan process for the USF System. The Office of Decision Support provides the research on academic programs including employment data, other state programs, national demand and other background information. There were questions regarding what steps are in place to ensure that all campuses receive ample new programs/opportunities for new programs. Dr. Chisolm noted that proposals can be limited by the size of the campus as well as budgets (faculty, space, students), but all proposals are discussed to determine feasibility. One benefit of consolidation is that if a program is available at any USF System campus, then that program can now be expanded to the other campuses without submitting additional formal proposals. This deliberative process remains within regulations by BOT and BOG from pre to full proposal.

The subcommittee members discussed the length that it can take to move a proposal through to approval, typically 2 years minimum. Creating specialized certificates and other academic offerings, however, can sometimes be more responsive to community needs and trends. The subcommittee members noted that it will be important to either receive a one pager or a presentation at the next hearing regarding creating new majors, minors and certificates. There was some discussion around the process used to eliminate programs, noting that the USF System has closed more programs than it has proposed for approval.

Duplication between programs has occurred due to the initial USF System split, but the focus in recent years has moved to unique programs (to avoid direct duplication). Currently, there are several joint initiatives across USF System campuses including hosted social work and nursing programs. The emphasis is on communication between institutions to ensure alignment and avoid competition.

Possible benefits of consolidation include less confusion, allowing all courses to count on all campuses, one set of degree requirements and a single USF residency requirement. This will also eliminate some of the additional work required to manage programs between campuses due to the varying processes and procedures. Other benefits include shared resources, streamlined advising, systems for tracking and shared community resources with less confusion on internship requirements.

ii.   Florida Board of Governors Academic Program Planning and Coordination Process

Dr. Traki Taylor, assistant vice chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs at the Board of Governors for the State University System, provided an overview of the program approval process at the state level. The goal is to make sure the approved programs (degree programs only not new minor, major or certificates) are adequate while taking SACS requirements into consideration. After receipt of proposals, the BOG provides feedback on the programs while the BOT maintains formal approval. The process is collaborative among SUS institutions, community colleges and other affected entities. The process is the same for all programs, including in-person and online proposals.

Mr. Piccolo raised the issue of how to create a program if faculty and resources are required prior to approval. Dr. Taylor explained that with a brand new program, the institution must build on existing resources. Once demand is determined, the process to hire faculty and increase student enrollment begins.
Conversations occur with private colleges to measure the impact to other programs. There was discussion regarding program overlap and communication between USFSM, Ringling and New College.

iii.   SACSCOC Program Requirements

Mr. Michael Wrona provided an overview of SACSCOC requirements. In order to coordinate learning outcomes among campuses, there should be one lead faculty for each degree program to build consensus.

Mr. Griffin inquired about moving programs from campus to campus and any concerns with asking faculty to teach on other campuses from a SACS perspective. There is no concern from a SACS perspective, but other issues exist regarding faculty employment.

iv.   Developing Online Courses and Programs

Dr. Cindy DeLuca provided an overview of online education across all campuses and stressed that Innovative Education (IE) is an academic service unit across the System. Faculty own the courses, but IE provides the platform and support to move it online. IE focuses on student success by partnering with faculty to develop high-quality, media-rich online courses that adhere to research-based best practices. Both the number of online sections and enrollment have increased across all campuses. Fully online undergraduate programs are intentionally low with higher level graduate programs available fully online. A student on one campus can take one course from another campus, but not complete an entire program. All online courses will have an attribute either quality or high-quality pursuant to the Quality Matters program.

Dr. Williams asked how, within the Quality Matters process (technical setup, accessibility, etc.), the student experience is measured. IE brings in quality of course design, but also looks at analytics and data in terms of student success, especially when compared to data from prior to the course moving online. IE designs and develops while the evaluation and assessment remains with the faculty member.

Dr. DeLuca highlighted some potential challenges in consolidation including: dedicated faculty time to develop online courses, developing online STEM labs, recruiting staff members, balancing new online offerings and evaluation/enhancement of existing courses, changing technologies, resources and meeting expectations for deliverables. Consolidation is seen as broadening access for all USF students. Students can stay with their home campus while having access to required courses online. Positive opportunities include master courses, hybrid programs and shared resources.

c. **Public Comment**

Matt Lettellein from the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce addressed the issue of losing programs to other campuses. He requested that the members make sure that degree programs are split evenly so that students can take the correct classes at each campus.

No other public speaker requests submitted.

d. **Open Discussion**

Chair Griffin encouraged members to start thinking about the delivery of existing and new degree programs, including campus specific programs. The subcommittee will look for more information from academic officers, college deans as well as economic development information within region.

Mr. Piccolo thanked everyone for the helpful presentations – the online learning presentation was particularly of value to bridge the barriers to transportation.

Additionally, he raised concerns with preserving campus identity and continuing to struggle with the idea of required funding of new application process programs.

Dr. Williams requested a discussion centering on student success at the next hearing, what it means and ensuring that it is at the forefront in any program discussions. She also raised the issue of determining "who takes the lead" without causing major issues between the institutions. She remains concerned about the support services that come with the academic program changes. Dr. Williams noted that all the communities must be adequately served and that one size does not fit all.

Chair Griffin noted that much of this will take time to fully develop and implement. He wants the subcommittee to think beyond the immediate and really focus on the strengths of each communities. Members requested additional information regarding what student success is throughout the USF System.

III.   <u>Adjournment</u>

With no other discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.