

NOTES
Student Success, Academic Programs & Campus Identity Subcommittee
November 6, 2018

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

I. Call to Order

Chair Griffin called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

II. New Business – Action Items

Motion to approve the October 18, 2018 meeting notes was made and minutes were approved.

III. New Business – Information Items

a. Introduction

Chair Griffin thanked Drs. Wilcox, Holbrook and Tadlock for completing the questions the subcommittee requested as follow-up to information presented during the October 18th hearing. Dr. Williams noted that there are still several outstanding questions and is looking forward to the discussion to begin to move forward with drafting the final recommendations. Mr. Piccolo complimented Drs. Wilcox, Holbrook and Tadlock on their work and was very pleased with the response.

b. Testimony

• Student Success in the Context of Consolidation

Dr. Paul Atchley, Dean of Undergraduate Studies at USF Tampa, (Dr. Paul Dosal, Vice President for Student Success and Student Affairs, could not attend), introduced Dr. Brett Kemker, Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs at USF Sarasota-Manatee to highlight current student success metrics on graduation, retention and academic progress rates. Dr. Kemker provided an overview of metrics throughout the system and added that all three campuses have developed a unified student success committee in order to be agile and act quickly when addressing student issues.

There was discussion from the subcommittee regarding swirl and the difference between the performance based funding and preeminence metrics and goals.

Dr. Patti Helton, Regional Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs at USF St. Petersburg, provided an overview of four-year graduation rates for Pell and non-Pell students and noted the numbers presented do not include swirl. Additionally, she highlighted the academic progress rate, four-year graduation rates including race and ethnicity and six-year graduation rates.

Dr. Atchley closed the presentation by discussing the current student success momentum along with future initiatives, noting student success is everyone's responsibility. He explained the several elements are currently in place for a system-wide student success movement including coordinated enrollment planning and management; central management of Financial Aid; development of Persistence Committees at each campus; use of the System-wide predictive analytics platform with the Archivum Insights case management tool; a uniform System-wide Course Scheduler; and development and implementation of Four-Year Graduation Rate plans across USF campuses. Finally, Dr. Atchley provided potential recommendations for a consolidated student success effort including the continued formation of a new unified student success committee, support for persistence committees at each campus, and the implementation of coordinated retention and completion efforts.

There was discussion regarding student success best practices, including the USF Tampa Smart Lab and the need to deliver these types of services throughout the system (e.g. remotely). Chair Griffin posed a question regarding the consistency of graduation rates at USFSM and USFSP when the student satisfaction surveys show the numbers should be higher. Dr. Helton noted the lack of programs at USFSP and USFSM could be a contributing factor to students moving to another campus or leaving the USF System. Dr. Kemker noted the lack of housing at USFSM could also be a factor in the retention of students through to graduation.

The subcommittee members complimented the USF Student Success team on their hard work and dedication to student success and encouraged them to continue to find innovative ways to grow continued success for students.

- **Academic Programming in the Context of Consolidation**

Chair Mike Griffin provided a brief overview of the work the subcommittee has completed to date, as well as highlighted several areas of focus throughout the process. He explained that the subcommittee posed several questions to academic leaders, Dr. Ralph Wilcox, Dr. Martin Tadlock and Dr. Karen Holbrook, and was very pleased with the unified response provided by all three campuses. He concluded his introductory remarks by asking Peter Stokes of Huron Consulting Group to facilitate the process for the subcommittee to sift through gathered information and reflect on the answers in an open discussion.

Mr. Stokes began the discussion by highlighting the question the subcommittee asked pertaining to research capacity and provided a high level summary of the response received by academic leadership. There was discussion regarding the subcommittee's responsibility in terms of size and scope of recommendations by the Task Force and the influence that the recommendations would have. There were also questions raised regarding the proposed faculty search plan and the need for hires beyond instructors.

Chair Griffin acknowledged the need for additional legislative focus and resources in order to support all USF campuses and their continued growth. Dr. Williams noted how important expanding research capacity will be in terms of the subcommittee's

recommendations and said resource allocation may need to be dispersed differently in order to achieve the subcommittee's desired outcomes.

Further discussion ensued regarding online education and the ability for all online courses currently delivered to be accessible to all students by July 1, 2020. It was noted that several traditional degree programs will still need to be expanded, realizing infrastructure and resource constraints. The subcommittee members raised questions regarding where distance learners tended to reside, either locally or outside the service area, and how residence could potentially affect online education..

Mr. Stokes noted the Task Force's useful role in bringing important conversations to a public setting, including the discussion on research capacity. He raised key points regarding aspirational goals and noted timelines should be factored in when discussing potential recommendations concerning the expansion of research capacity and degree programs due to infrastructure and resources. He noted the subcommittee will play a pivotal part in provided guidance on what the university can realistically achieve over the next five, ten, and 20 years.

Mr. Stokes continued to facilitate the discussion and recapped the questions the subcommittee asked regarding campus identity and provided a summary of the response received.

The subcommittee members discussed how the campuses can fully meet the needs of their communities, the correlation between academic programs and performance, and the importance of seeking greater levels of investments to support success. There was further discussion regarding recommendation prioritization and how to ensure USFSP and USFSM excel in research. Mr. Piccolo suggested that recommendations are formatted as minimum and maximums for each location, also noting that some recommendation may not be the most efficient from the university perspective but may be important to incorporate based on the feedback received during the process.

The subcommittee reviewed academic leadership's proposal on academic program data and the possible timeline to deliver degrees. The committee thanked academic leadership for laying out the resources needed to deliver all of the programs outlined, noting programs could be adjusted based on the scale of the investment. Dr. Williams highlighted the importance of proposing recommendations based on a multi-layer, multi-year approach and communicating the expectation that consolidation cannot be finished overnight.

There was further discussion regarding start-up costs related to faculty research and the use of graduate assistants. Further discussion ensued regarding preeminence metrics, notably that meeting the metrics are non-negotiable and USF will be required to meet 11 of out 12 metrics across all three USF campuses as of July 1, 2020.

Mr. Stokes noted the need for a balanced portfolio, but evidence of student demand must be examined when drafting recommendations around academic programs.

Discussion followed regarding USFSM's unique identity and need for a residence hall, noting this opportunity would help raised the academic profile of those students. Dr. Williams expressed the need to set guidelines and standards in terms of student services across all three campuses in areas such as housing, science labs and student affairs.

Chair Griffin expressed the importance of drafting recommendations to ensure a successful future for all three campuses. He suggested the subcommittee consider a recommendation that at least one college is "homed" on each USF campus with the expectation that certain benchmarks must be achieved in order to maintain that status. Inversely, these benchmarks can be referenced when a school aspires to become a college.

Dr. Williams noted the need to look at student access across all three campuses. Ms. Nurczynski from Huron Consulting Group noted there will be an opportunity at the full Task Force meeting on November 29th to marry the recommendations produced by the Student Access subcommittee and the forthcoming recommendations from the Student Success subcommittee.

Mr. Stokes thanked the subcommittee members for a very robust conversation.

c. Discussion

Chair Griffin asked Huron Consulting Group to provide the subcommittee with initial recommendations to discuss during the November 14th workshop. He asked they continue to highlight data and benchmarking from other peer and aspirational universities.

Adjournment

Adjourned at 3:20 p.m.