

Shared Governance/Transparency Committee Call

November 1, 2018 12:00 p.m. 1:30 p.m.

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

AGENDA

I. Call to Order Melissa Seixas

II. New Business Action Items Melissa Seixas

a. Approval of October 24 Meeting Notes

III. New Business Information Items

a. Introduction and Context Melissa Seixas

b. Discussion

h

Notes Shared Governance/TransparencySubcommittee October 24, 2018

PresentMelissa Seixas, ChaiKayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

I. Call to Order

The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.

II. New Business±Action Items

Minutesfrom the October 2, 2018 and October 8, 2018 meetings were approved.

III. New Business±Information Items

a. Introduction and Context

Chair Seixas outlined theork of the committee date and hanked everyone for rescheduling the meeting.

b. Discussion

Mike Stallworth with Huron Consulting provided an overview of the facilitation guide and reviewed subcommittee focus areas.

Committee members discussible overall framework of governance and eatingbold and visionary recommendations as to whate 'USF can look like. The goal of the members, through recommendations, is to shape what the duniversity will look like. Members emphasized the need for transparency, checks and balances and accountability in an effort to raisal three campuses

Chair Seixas asked for citiacation on the difference betweenanch campus and instructional sitedefinitions under SACSCOC guidelines Peter Stokes from Huron Consulting explained that a large compent of the difference is budget and hiring authority. Members were concerned that USFSP and USFSM and use signated instructionals it is serviced in the could affect students abity to access services and the ability to hire talented instructors. It was noted that SACSCO uniform services across the system so there would be no loss in ser Meessbers discussed various aspects of branch campus instructional sites with Union including risks associated with a branch campus designation wellother SUS institutions

The subcommittee focused on language for a recommendation that emphasized the processes around governamceing the recommendation must include the degre of transparency accountability and checks and balance's.change in governance cannot

result in a dramatic decrease the responsibilities of the Regional Chancellors to seime the role of external leader as well in the role of external leader as well as w

Members discussed a second recommendation atbendutual accontability that opes beyond congenial collaboration beattablishes a processerosure ongoing dialogue. Membersstressed themportance enhanced services students and avoiding any decline. This includes the idea of a processet provides formitigation built in in case issues with services do ariskembers discussed concentrating on what the puses look like, not as much what the designation might be.

In reviewing the General Education recommendations on the facilitation guededers highlighted the impactof Gen Edis on the student experience and campus identify noting the languages hould reflect that. Members noted that the pyramid example the presentation during the October Dearing showed how Gen Ed is infused throughout the curriculum. There was some concern about transfer students in the take additional, unnecessary credits.

In reviewing student governancembers noted the importance of representation across the three campusets at would include collaboration as well as individual representation. Any recommendation on creating one student government system strongstress campus representation transparencys wellasthe idea of rotating adrepresentation across the campuset lembers discussed tudent fees and the net of a transparent process, including tudents be informed about the process. There should also be an assessment process terms of services as well as some uniform experimentation across and quality

Budget transparency should entraisponsibility and accountability all three campuses. Members agreed that student should not pay a fee for services they do not receive. All discussed cating a consolidated fee struce that provides for differentiated fee built around service provided. Any efficiencies created through additional strendes should not have a negative impact on entraism. The university should locate opportunities on enhance shared services in an innovative and integrated way.

Next step is reviewing a draft of the final recommedation document a subcommittee phone call the week of October 29

IV. Adjournment

Meetingadjourned a5:55 p.m.



Top Five Recommendations

USF Consolidation Taskford Shared Governance and Transparency Subcommittee DRAFT RECOMMENDATION Cober 27, 2018

Focus Area Description Issue Statement Recommendation Broad Governanc Empoweredampuses make for a stronge Conduct and execute all governance USFand fulfilling student experience reviews, changes and implementation processes that guarantee transparence The future governance of the sallbuild mutual accountability and collaboratio upon the existingengths of each campus among internal stakeholders including and the historical by trongorganization hand faculty, staff and stude httpsvide collaborative nationfeell three campuses to seamless consolidation transition to ensure continued and increased benefits students, faculty and staff by e Wh5e USF students regardless of home çampl. to enableontinued status as a epmeinent Florida university



USF Consolidation Taskford Shared Governance and Transparency Subcommon DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS, October 27, 2018

USF Consolidation Taskford Shared Governance and Transparency Subcommon DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS, October 27, 2018

USF Consolidation Taskford Shared Governance and Transparency Subcommod RAFT RECOMMENDATIONS, October 27, 2018

