Student Success, Academic Programs and Campus Identity Subcommittee Hearing
August 28, 2018
USF Sarasota Manatee
NOTES

I.   **Call to Order**
Chair Griffin called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Chancellor Holbrook welcomed attendees and applauded the efforts so far of tpproved.

must go hand in hand. In meeting the
community, the committee should
resh perspectives. Chair Griffin stressed
editation by July 1, 2020, it does not mean
will take time to fully implement.

ee campuses during the consolidation

anded Academic Programs.

a Bay Partnership, gave an overview of
t, which includes Pinellas, Hillsborough,
n Tampa Bay is healthy at nearly 4%.
or moving into new markets. USF Muma
the number of bachelor's and master's
e per capita GDP by $233 and $615

st metro areas in the country in terms of
t are in healthcare, professional services
ograms in all these areas.

Mr. Aspinwall reported that one out of four jobs in Tampa and St. Petersburg area are related to IT. In Sarasota, finance and sales jobs were prevalent. There is shared demand but it still gives opportunities for campuses to serve local needs.

Using their labor market data, Burning Glass reviewed 40 programs and related concentrations at USF Tampa's College of Arts and Sciences and offered recommendations to strengthen programs for job related outcomes. Some results included teaching Women's and Gender Studies students project management skills.

Potential recommendations include aligning curricula to labor market needs and Program Reviews should update its labor market data sources often, so that students to understand real life applications. Additionally, it is important to empower faculty to have conversations about careers related to majors.

There was discussion regarding curriculum alignment related to certifications.

Chair Griffin asked the committee to keep in mind the use of predictive analysis to ensure we are offering what the community needs in degree offerings.

> i. **Consolidation Update: Academic Programming in the Context of Consolidation**

Peter Stokes, managing director at Huron Consulting Group, provided an update on the overall consolidation effort to date and outlined guidelines for future recommendations on USF's academic structure and organization. He noted the labor market discussion suggests many opportunities for how a consolidated USF can deploy an integrated curricula to serve the diverse needs of its communities.

Mr. Stokes started with a brief overview of the consolidation and the key milestones. The Task Force is focused on what USF should be doing and to continue with an aspirational agenda for the university. The Consolidation Internal Committee (CIC) is focused on the question of how, and what action plan will enable a successful consolidated USF. Both of these bodies are working under the same parameters of Preeminence and SACSCOC regulations. The drive is toward an integration to one USF. Mr. Stokes covered the CIC subcommittee charges and discussed the interdependencies of the subcommittees. The Task Force will prioritize its recommendations, but will also submit a full catalogue of recommendations from the committees in the final report.

Mr. Stokes framed how to start to think about connecting these different academic and curricular assets to the needs of these communities. He reported that Huron is bringing a set of benchmarks and comparators to consider including other public systems that Huron has worked with during a consolidation. These include the University of Wisconsin and University of Texas systems, and also at public AAU institutions. Mr. Stokes outlined key terms to agree upon:

<u>Home & Host</u>
- **Home:** A *home* is the campus location of the principal academic structures and functions of a College, School, Department or program/discipline. However, it is not required that all related resources, facilities, or personnel be physically located in the *home* location.
- **Host:** A *host* location provides access to programs and courses from a *home* location for students in the *host* location, whether the instruction is delivered via in person, online, or hybrid model. *Hosted* programs and courses on campuses expand student access to an array of programs that otherwise would not be available to them. Programs and courses to be delivered through *host* campuses will be dependent on student need, availability of resources (faculty, space, instrumentation, financial aid etc.), and approval by the Board of Governors.

<u>College & School</u>
- **College:** A College has an Executive Dean or a Dean, faculty, academic programs, and an academic *home* location. There can only be one College per field of study, per the SACSCOC guidance. A College may have multiple Schools and Departments, in the same or different locations that report into a singular academic structure.
- **School:** A School has a Dean or a Director, faculty, academic programs, and an academic *home* location. The School's programs and administrative structure roll up to a single College, led by an Executive Dean or a Dean, as required by the SACSCOC principles and standards.

Mr. Stokes emphasized each discipline will have a home site. There will be a density of critical mass and effort at one location. In addition, there will also be host locations—i.e. if Campuses B and C have market demand, there may be access to additional programs. Although there is a larger integrated curriculum to work with, July 1, 2020 will not be the final date to make all programs available everyone—this will be a long process. He noted the importance of being deliberate in considering labor market demand and also be considerate of time and resources.

Mr. Stokes clarified there is no single way of using College and School, but the above outline will be the designation at USF. There can only be one College per field of study, per SACSCOC legislation, though there may be multiple Schools reporting into one College and not necessarily located in the same location as the College.

There was discussion regarding the potential risks for consolidation as it relates to Preeminence and student success. Additionally, there were questions regarding current deans' titles and communication between the CIC and the Task Force. Mr. Stokes emphasized the need to create organizational structures that benefit students.

Chair Griffin summarized takeaways from the hearing and requested that Huron return to the Student Success Committee with preliminary recommendations during the meeting scheduled for September 19th. He noted the importance of having time to collect community input and having demand data to support the recommendations.

     ii.   Student Success and Employment

Dr. Ruthann Atchley, AVP for Community Engagement at USF Tampa, *discussed career*

Michael Gillespie, President of Faculty Senate at USFSM:
Dr. Gillespie explained how faculty can best serve the system in pursuit of Preeminence and some of the most important metrics are retention and graduation rates. As the discussion around one USF, one mission, one T&P guidelines continues, there needs to be thought concerning how faculty are required to support student success metrics. He noted that if the T&P guidelines are at the USFT level, but the resourcing at USFSP and USFSM is much lower, that will be an issue for serving students. There needs to be additional conversation regarding what needs to happen about navigating the gap between performance expectations and the resourcing.