

Notes
Shared Governance/Transparency Subcommittee
October 24, 2018

Present: Melissa Seixas, Chair; Kayla Rykiel, Nicole Washington

I. Call to Order

The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.

II. New Business – Action Items

Minutes from the October 2, 2018 and October 8, 2018 meetings were approved.

III. New Business – Information Items

a. Introduction and Context

Chair Seixas outlined the work of the committee to date and thanked 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 discussed the overall framework of governance and creating bold and visionary recommendations as to what one USF can look like. The goal of the members, through recommendations, is to shape what the consolidated university will look like. Members emphasized the need for transparency, checks and balances and accountability in an effort to raise all three campuses.

Chair Seixas asked for clarification on the difference between branch campus and instructional site definitions under SACSCOC guidelines. Peter Stokes from Huron Consulting explained that a large component of the difference is budget and hiring authority. Members were concerned that if USFSP and USFSM are designated instructional sites by SACSCOC that it could affect students ability to access services and the ability to hire talented instructors. It was noted that SACSCOC requires uniform services across the system so there would be no loss in services. Members discussed various aspects of branch campus vs. instructional sites with Huron including risks associated with a branch campus designation as well other SUS institutions.

The subcommittee focused on language for a recommendation that emphasized the processes around governance noting the recommendation must include a high degree of transparency, accountability and checks and balances. A change in governance cannot

result in a dramatic decrease in the responsibilities of the Regional Chancellors to serve in the role of external leader as well as internal leader for students.

Members discussed a second recommendation around the mutual accountability that goes beyond congenial collaboration but establishes a process to ensure ongoing dialogue. Members stressed the importance of enhanced services for students and avoiding any decline. This includes the idea of a process that provides for mitigation built in in case issues with services do arise. Members discussed concentrating on what the campuses look like, not as much what the designation might be.

In reviewing the General Education recommendations on the facilitation guide, members highlighted the impact of Gen Ed is on the student experience and campus identity, noting the language should reflect that. Members noted that the pyramid example from the presentation during the October 2nd hearing showed how Gen Ed is infused throughout the curriculum. There was some concern about transfer students not being required to take additional, unnecessary credits.

In reviewing student governance, members noted the importance of representation across the three campuses that would include collaboration as well as individual campus vision. Any recommendation on creating one student government system structure must stress campus representation and transparency as well as the idea of rotating lead representation across the campuses. Members discussed student fees and the need for a transparent process, including students be informed about the process. There should also be an assessment process in terms of services as well as some uniform expectations around service and quality.

Budget transparency should entail responsibility and accountability to all three campuses. Members agreed that student should not pay a fee for services they do not receive. All discussed creating a consolidated fee structure that provides for a differentiated fee built around service provided. Any efficiencies created through additional shared services should not have a negative impact on students. The university should look at opportunities to enhance shared services in an innovative and integrated way.

Next step is reviewing a draft of the final recommendation document on a subcommittee phone call the week of October 29th.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.