

**Student Success, Academic Programs and Campus Identity Subcommittee Meeting
September 19, 2018
USF CAMLS
NOTES**

I. Call to Order

Chair Griffin called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

II. New Business – Action Items

a. Approval of August 28, 2018 Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes from the August 28, 2018 Subcommittee meeting were approved.

III. New Business – Information Items

a. Introduction

Chair Griffin noted the subcommittee is about halfway through their work, and looking forward to their third and final hearing.

b. Academic Programming in the Context of Consolidation

Mike Stallworth and Franca Nurczynski of Huron Consulting Group provided a presentation on academic programming in the context of consolidation at the request of the Student Success, Academic Programs and Campus Identity subcommittee during their August 28th Hearing. The presentation provided information on several topics including an overview and approach to their proposal, the current state at USF, data from peer and aspirational institutions, an introduction to the proposed future state and finally the proposed future proposal.

Mr. Stallworth emphasized this proposal is preliminary and for discussion purposes only – representing a framework for moving forward that will continue to be refined. The proposed academic structures outlined are supported by various quantitative and qualitative inputs, from internal and external sources. There are still several ongoing discussions with deans, faculty, staff and students across all three USF campuses and at this time, no definitive decisions have been reached. Finally, Mr. Stallworth noted that Huron is looking forward to hearing feedback from the USF community on the preliminary proposal.

Mr. Stallworth began the presentation by discussing a set of guidelines Huron developed to help inform the draft recommendations on USF's academic structure and organization. The intention is to increase student access to programs, align programs with campuses in a strategic fashion, and increase efficiencies across the university. Mr. Stallworth stressed Huron guidelines related to providing students access to, and success in, a broader array of integrated degree programs by discipline, level, mode of delivery and location; aligning colleges by

academic discipline across one university; establishing realistic and manageable-sized college units. To inform the decision-making, Huron looked at comparable public institutions from among the State University System in Florida (SUS), AAU institutions and other systems whose consolidations Huron has supported. Mr. Stallworth also emphasized the Guiding Principles for USF Consolidation set forth by the USF Board of Trustees. Additionally, relevant SACSCOC guidance, key terms including definitions for college and school and home and hosted were covered. Mr. Stallworth highlighted the advantages of “one” USF and covered the analytical inputs Huron examined when developing the proposal. Information on projected labor market needs, institutional data and themes from internal and external stakeholder forums was also provided.

There was discussion regarding the timeline and legislative charge for the Student Success / Academic Programs / Campus Identity subcommittee as well as questions regarding SACSCOC guidelines and flexibility. Additionally, there was discussion regarding the structure at other SACSCOC institutions. A question was raised on if a school had to report through a college per SACSCOC guidelines.

A brief overview on USF’s current academic state was provided - highlighting total enrollment, faculty headcount and Carnegie classifications.

Ms. Nurczynski provided an overview of benchmark institutions, noting Huron conducted benchmarking among SUS and AAU institutions to address questions regarding structure and size of academic units at the request of the subcommittee chair, Mr. Griffin. Several institutional examples were covered including Florida International University, Purdue University, University of Washington, Florida Atlantic University, Georgia Tech and The Ohio State University. Ms. Nurczynski noted there are various examples of schools reporting into colleges among SUS and AAU peer institutions and on average 3.33 schools report into the one college. Furthermore, data showed on average there are 32 programs in a college.

The benchmarking section of the presentation concluded with a discussion regarding faculty headcount in a school. Ms. Nurczynski noted that on average, there are 40 faculty members in a school among SUS and AAU peers. The subcommittee members discussed faculty head count at the college level and noted it was important to distinguish between departments, schools and colleges.

Mr. Stallworth illustrated the intended outcomes for USF students noting that the reimagined academic structure provides students increased access to, and success in, a wider array of program offerings and presents various opportunities for students at USF Tampa, St. Petersburg and Sarasota-Manatee. Specific examples regarding areas of unique strength for potential expansion and potential opportunities to broaden student access were presented. There was discussion regarding the potential of offering doctoral programs across all three campuses and the mode of delivery for certain degree programs.

The subcommittee requested that future presentations highlight the maximum potential degree programs that could be offered in the future. It was also recommended that Huron

consider state colleges in their research, as many are offering baccalaureate degrees that could be built upon at the university level.

Mr. Stallworth closed the presentation by discussing the proposed future academic structure. The draft academic structure outlined preliminary recommendations at the program-level for six colleges in the future state, including potential home and hosted schools, departments and programs. Mr. Stallworth noted that various conversations are still ongoing, however the subcommittee requested the proposal in draft form to be considered, studied, and revised over the next several months. It was emphasized that each campus would continue to offer the degree programs that currently exist, while potentially gaining access to a much wider array of degree programs, which will ultimately help students graduate faster and be better prepared to meet the needs of communities across the Tampa Bay region.

There was further discussion regarding doctoral programs, as well as how the proposed structure would impact administrative structures and alignment. Mr. Piccolo was concerned that while the student may benefit from increased access to degree programs, having no “home” colleges at USF Sarasota-Manatee might be perceived negatively by the community. Dr. Williams stressed the importance of presenting recommendations that will help the campuses maintain their identities and also grow. Researching specific degree programs that will yield high-paying jobs for graduates will also assist with the development of recommendations.

The subcommittee requested Huron reflect the potential doctoral programs that could be possible at USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee in their next presentation as research is an important component of the subcommittee’s charge.

Chair Griffin explained that the goal of this presentation was to begin the conversation. It will be important to continue to engage with the USF community as the final recommendations are defined. He noted that it was important to continually reference the benchmarking data as the subcommittee continues through the process and put the opportunities for students at the center of the discussion.

Chair Griffin encouraged the other members of the subcommittee to reach out to Paige should they have any questions and begin to think of presenters they would like to invite to the final hearing. Dr. Williams recommended that the Committee discuss the student experience and student success during the October 18th Hearing.

c. Public Comment

- **Deborah Read (Regional Vice Chancellor for Advancement, USF St. Petersburg):**
 - Stressed that due to diminishing public support, it is becoming increasingly important to offer relevant academic programming in each community to attract private support. Noting the need to be entrepreneurial in our offerings and deliver Research and Doctorate programs across the system.

- **Magali Michael (Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, USF St. Petersburg):**
 - Asked the Huron team where the place for the Humanities is at USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee. Huron responded that this is an understood omission in the document as the conversations among the Colleges of Arts & Sciences are still taking place.
- **Sri Sundaram (Dean, College of Business, USF St. Petersburg):**
 - Explained that Huron's benchmarking was useful and will be important to distinguish the Kate Tiedemann School of Finance and Entrepreneurship at USF St. Petersburg from the Department of Finance, which is proposed to be housed at USF Tampa.
- **Allyson Watson (Dean, College of Education, USF St. Petersburg):**
 - Stressed that the College of Education at St. Petersburg needs to have a substantial program to address the teaching shortage. While the number of faculty and students is low, they are working effectively to grow the program.
- **James Moy (Dean, College of the Arts, USF Tampa):**
 - Noted excitement around collaborating with USF St. Petersburg in the Arts. There is a deeply invested Arts community in St. Petersburg and currently five of his faculty live in St. Petersburg and would likely love to work there. Had envisioned "Arts networks" to extend access across campuses.
- **Jackie Dixon (Dean, College of Marine Science, USF Tampa):**
 - Requested a conversation with Huron. The College of Marine Science is a graduate-only program, which necessitates that it be located at Tampa due to their reliance on the research infrastructure but they are committed to partnering with USF St. Petersburg. What the college should be called and how it could be combined goes beyond just CIP codes.
- **Eric Eisenberg (Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, USF Tampa):**
 - Many of the problems graduates are asked to solve these days are of an interdisciplinary nature. His faculty want to continue to build connections between disciplines and have resisted splitting the College of Arts & Sciences in the past.
- **Ralph Wilcox (Provost and Executive Vice President, USF System):**
 - We need to put self-interest aside and focus on the benefit to students. Our Office of Research & Innovation is a system office that will expand in the future state to enable the embedding of Master's and Doctoral programs at USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee. A potential split of Arts & Sciences does not need to negatively impact collaboration across disciplines. This framework is a starting point for us to build from.

