FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Special Committee on FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021

Friday, May 20, 2016
Cohen Center, Room #213
Florida Gulf Coast University

Minutes

Members:
Present: Trustee Shawn Felton – Chair, Trustee Russell Priddy, Trustee Robbie Roepstorff, Trustee Ken Smith, Trustee Christian Spilker

Not Present: Trustee Darleen Cors

Others:
Trustees: Trustee Dudley Goodlette, Trustee Kevin Price

Deans: Interim Dean of the College of Education Ivan Banks (arrived at 10:12 a.m.); Dean of the Lutgert College of Business Robert Beatty; Dean of the U.A. Whitaker College of Engineering Richard Behr; Dean of the College of Health Professions and Social Work Mitchell Cordova; Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Robert Gregerson; Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies Tachung (T.C.) Yih.

Staff: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Ron Toll; Senior Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Planning and Institutional Performance Paul Snyder; Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans; Vice President and General Counsel Vee Leonard; Director of Media Relations Lillian Pagan; and Executive Secretary Barbara Kundus.

Item 1: Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Remarks
Committee Chair Shawn Felton called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Roll call was taken with 5 of 6 Trustees present, thus meeting quorum requirements.

Item 2: Consent Agenda (Tab #1)
Chair Felton noted the one item on the Consent Agenda as Minutes of May 10, 2016 Special Committee on FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021 Meeting.

Trustee Robbie Roepstorff made the motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Trustee Christian Spilker seconded the motion. There was no public comment. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.
Item 3: *Draft FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021: Discussion for Recommendation to FGCU Board of Trustees on June 7, 2016 (TAB #2)*

Chair Felton said he called the meeting to discuss the *Draft FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021*.

Chair Felton thanked FGCU Board of Trustees Chair Dudley Goodlette and Trustee Kevin Price for attending the meeting. He asked Trustee Goodlette to reiterate his previous charge to the Committee as it moves forward.

Trustee Goodlette acknowledged the work of President Bradshaw and his team on the University’s strategic plan. He said that after the Board’s review of drafts of the strategic plan, it was important to appoint this Special Committee with the charge of reviewing the *Draft FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021*, review the FGCU 2016 Work Plan for the Board of Governors (BOG), and report back to the FGCU Board of Trustees (BOT) at the June 7, 2016 full Board meeting.

Chair Felton noted that the *Draft* of the FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021 was developed as a synthesis of more than 60 pages of feedback received from the University’s eight deans. For the draft, he developed themes under the four pillars based on the deans’ information.

Chair Felton said that to prepare the document, he met with the deans in groups, and after receiving feedback prepared a spreadsheet for the deans to complete in terms of the pillars that were developed in consensus during the FGCU Board of Trustees meeting on May 10. He said that under each of the pillars he asked the deans to provide: (1) objectives; (2) action/goals for the objectives; (3) timeline to achieve the objectives/goals; (4) performance outcomes for objectives/goals; (5) persons responsible for objectives/goals; and (6) needed resources for the objectives/goals.

He noted that from the feedback received from the deans, he developed the draft called “Focus 2016-2021” for the Committee’s review.

Chair Felton summarized items on the document with regard to the Mission, Guiding Principles, and Essential Activities sections for the Committee to note.

He confirmed that the word “comprehensive” in reference to the institution and the word “practices” in terms of environmental sustainability, remain intact in the Mission statement and that the document before the board contains the recently updated Mission statement. He said with regard to the Guiding Principles that have been in place since 1996, that “academic freedom” and “diversity” as guiding principles are based on what we do day in and day out at the University.

He said that drawing upon other strategic plans, and part of the name of this Strategic Plan, Focus 2016-2021, the Essential Activities section would be the areas we will identify as we move forward in the next five years and beyond.

He stated that the ultimate goals for the University are to ensure that our students are successful in four years and also to improve on the four-year
graduation rate. He said that is the ultimate focus for this upcoming five-year Strategic Plan.

He noted that the draft document provides the general framework, but more work with additional people involved will need to be completed for specific actions and timelines.

He indicated that in the Committee’s agenda packet he included the 2025 strategic goals for the Board of Governors relating to its Strategic Plan. He noted that much of what is in the draft FGCU Strategic Plan addresses the goals of the BOG.

Chair Felton opened the floor for discussion.

Trustee Ken Smith said he liked the Strategic Plan. He noted that two things he hears from the BOG are getting students out in four years and getting good jobs when they leave. He noted that in the Work Plan piece, those two matrices alone drive 95% of the balance of the metrics we have. He said that he liked the format of the Strategic Plan, and suggested that the “action” heading be taken out for the time being, and maybe include a little more verbiage about the “timelines.” He indicated that those are on-the-ground work plans.

He stated that one thing that needs clarification as he looks at the Entrepreneurship category, is that the Emergent Technologies Institute (ETI) needs to become the entrepreneurial and innovation hub. He suggested that a committee be formed with Dr. Mitchell Cordova as its lead to develop a plan on how to do that. He said he doesn’t see renewable energy as being a major focus of this University. He indicated that we’re not ramped up to do it, and we have tons of competition. He commented that the ETI has been empty for a year, and the facility needs to be ramped up. He noted that a conversation with the University should occur about what to do regarding the property.

He said with regard to the Institute of Entrepreneurship category, he would like to understand how to get to a full-blown college. He mentioned that conversations on how to make it happen need to occur and Vice President of Advancement Chris Simoneau needs to be on the conversations in terms of private funding.

He mentioned that the University needs to make sure the deans become responsible for the four-year graduation rate. He indicated that the deans should be empowered to communicate what they need in their colleges to make them top-notch colleges. He noted that engineering students might have a different set of standards in order to graduate, versus other disciplines.

U.A. Whitaker College of Engineering Dean Richard Behr noted that the ETI facility opened in January of this year. He said the facility was designed to launch the master’s program in engineering; laboratories were designed to facilitate the research activities there; and classrooms were designed with distance learning.
capabilities so it could accommodate non-traditional students. He said they also have an endowment called the FGCU Backe Chair for Renewable Energy held by Dr. Joe Simmons, who retires in the summer. He added that they have hired a new chair from St. Louis University, Dr. John Woolschlager, who is scheduled to start at FGCU in August. He stated the chair is endowed with over $1 million in funding to facilitate its activities and earmarked for renewable energy activity. He indicated that Dr. Woolschlager has a well thought out plan that will take the ETI to a very high-level of activity in a reasonably short period of time. He noted that the facility has only been opened four months, but if anyone were to go out there now they would see a different picture with more activity in terms of ramping up the program. He respectfully asked the Committee to consider the original intention for the ETI and allow it to pursue that mission. He concluded that the long-range mission is to have research activities in all the engineering program areas at the ETI and also to accommodate the entrepreneurship activities, which is very much in alignment with our mission, vision, and our objectives.

Trustee Smith clarified that if Entrepreneurship is going to be listed as part of the pillars, the Board needs to have a thorough and thoughtful conversation about emphasizing Entrepreneurship and Innovation in this Plan. He said that at the end of the day, this is about resources: what resources do we have and where do we maximize the benefit for the region and the State; and ultimately, what do we do to get students out in four years so they can get jobs. He restated that we should confirm that using the facility primarily for renewable energy research is the correct thing to do. He continued that he still sees the ETI facility being part of the whole equation of renewable energy; however, he thinks that we have to determine the best strategic fit for Entrepreneurship initiatives. He concluded that the $10-million facility will maximize that resource to the benefit of the Strategic Plan of the University.

Trustee Russell Priddy stated that Dr. Behr’s comments about what is going to take place at the facility is exactly what he heard three years go. He said that he is hoping this time we can get some traction and actually get moving in that direction.

Trustee Smith commented on his earlier suggestion to appoint Dr. Cordova to lead a committee to develop a plan for Entrepreneurship and Innovation. He said he thought a third party not involved would be more impartial.

He referenced a paper generated from Harvard that Trustee Price shared which talks about how to take different disciplines in higher education and combine them. He said that’s what he sees happening here, which is a positive to this University. He said that he sees the College for Entrepreneurship being the nexus for these different disciplines coming together and working on things. He mentioned seeing a biomedical degree down the line, and suggested that the program be moved up sooner. He said that it all comes down to numbers and this is about resource and allocation. He noted that we have limited resources.
today as a 20-year-old University struggling for space, and that we have to take
that into consideration.

Trustee Robbie Roepstorff agreed with Trustee Smith’s comment about the
University struggling for space. She indicated that gears have been shifted as to
how funding is to take place. She said we have to be more focused on our
strategic plans since they’ve been too broad-based in the past. She referred to
Pillar #4: Emerging Pre-eminence and said that if we are going to put it in the
five-year Strategic Plan, then everything we do has to maximize and utilize what
we have today to get there. She suggested including in Pillar #4 the sentence,
“Within the next five years, we want to be known as the most improved University
in the State University System.” She asked for clarification about the Emerging
Pre-eminence within the Strategic Plan, specifically, what six of the 12 goals
listed are we going to be able to meet and stay focused on to accomplish at the
end of the five years.

Chair Felton explained that the Emerging Pre-eminence goals are very
aspirational. He said that it would be long term, maybe 40-to 50-year goals and
within the individual objectives. He said that we could rename that pillar, but it
has to have an aspirational goal as we move forward.

Trustee Roepstorff said that our role as trustees is that we have a fiduciary
responsibility to make sure that everything we do is going to maximize the
University to get more funding.

Trustee Smith said that one thing that is missing in the document is that there are
no performance outcomes in the timelines. He said that this is not a five-year
kind of goal. He said we’re not going to be an emerging pre-eminent in five years.
He suggested that deans guide the outcomes and timelines. He said two things
we need are (1) who is accountable, and (2) what is the timeline to measure
progress.

Chair Felton suggested that after the Strategic Plan is approved at the June 7 full
Board meeting, we have a work plan developed for the next year, and then a
longer output with maybe 30 to 40 days that comes back to the Board for
approval. He suggested that a group with staff, deans and himself as liaison get
together to work on it.

Trustee Christian Spilker said he is very pleased with the document and is fully
comfortable to recommend it to the full Board. He said when you read through
the BOG materials on what a strategic plan is, the plan is aspirational and
visionary. He explained that the five-year plan is meant to be revisited to make
sure the University is still heading in the direction it needs to be in the long term.
He suggested developing a document that says what we think the University
should be in 10 years and what we’re going to do to get there. He agreed that the
Committee should get together and develop an intermediate product that lays out
the particulars of the pillars.
Trustee Priddy echoed Trustee Spilker’s comments and said he is pleased where we are with the Strategic Plan. He indicated that perhaps the name of the fourth pillar could be a touch misleading. He said that while it is aspirational, it takes some focus off of what we are really able to accomplish.

Trustee Roepstorff stated that we need to know internally what it is we can do that is measurable in terms of the Board of Governors’ expectations. She said that as a trustee she really wants to know where we’ll be in three years.

Trustee Smith stated that we are a 20-year-old University, the youngest University of significance. He said that if there is one University in the state that ought to have the aspirational goal to become an Emerging Pre-eminence, it is us. He said the Strategic Plan is a five-year plan. The document is not a plan to be a pre-eminent school in five years, but a plan to figure out what programs we will develop that are top-notch and effectuate things that will drive that home. He said the key is to have measures in the plan. He suggested that we need to keep the name Emerging Pre-eminence because we have a unique story. Trustee Roepstorff agreed with Trustee Smith. She said she has no problem with leaving the name Emerging-Pre-eminence in the document as long as it shows up in the Work Plan. She said she also wants it to show in the supplemental document previously discussed.

Trustee Spilker suggested leaving Emerging Pre-eminence as a pillar, but to pick one of the 12 items where we think we can accomplish in three years and be able to demonstrate to the BOG we’ve been working hard on that item, and include a short range topic on how we get there, laser-focused, on that particular item.

Trustee Kevin Price commented on the Work Plan and suggested bringing the Strategic Plan back to the BOG’s Work Plan. Trustee Smith said the document does reflect the Work Plan.

Trustee Spilker motioned to forward the Strategic Plan to the full Board on June 7. Trustee Smith seconded the motion.

Trustee Smith asked the deans to comment on the Strategic Plan document.

Lutgert College of Business Dean Robert Beatty said that Chair Felton has done an amazing job because one thing deans can do is provide lots of information; all the deans of the colleges were asked to provide their view as part of the four pillars. He said the document is an excellent overview of what he’s heard throughout the process, and does a nice job of representing the goals and visions of the colleges.

College of Arts and Sciences Dean Robert Gregerson said he echoed Dr. Beatty’s sentiments. He said the deans submitted a lot of information.
including timelines and specific goals. The documents contain a lot of background material that we can take forward and strategize around in the Plan.

College of Health Professions and Social Work Dean Mitchell Cordova said the Strategic Plan is fantastic. He said it gets to what we really need to do and that is to identify some things to focus on whether we accomplish them in five years, or make progress and build upon the next five years of the Strategic Plan. He indicated that to bridge the gap between the Strategic Plan and the Work Plan, the data the deans provided could be a roadmap internally to help guide the steps that you’re talking about to help get us there. He said the Strategic Plan could be a little more broad-based with the information provided in the matrices as the internal roadmap for us to follow and keep us on track, and used to create the Work Plan that’s going to guide the University in reporting to the BOG. He said that is his suggestion on how to integrate and take what we’ve done, use it internally to help us move forward, but yet make it functional for those we need to be accountable to.

Whitaker College of Engineering Dean Richard Behr indicated he was okay with the Strategic Plan. He said that in the process of doing this it helped to map the things we need to do in the College; and that the pillars fit reasonably well. He stated that the 12 criteria for the pre-eminence pillar are corrected too far away in the distance to accomplish in five years. He said we’re talking about research expenditures of $200 million dollars; top 100 university ranking; and 100 or more patents in three years. He said these are the things that are so far in the distance it doesn’t resonate. He indicated that the only two that he sees can be chipped away in five years are freshmen retention rates of 97% or higher, and six-year graduation rate of 70% or higher.

Trustee Roepstorff said she very much appreciates what Dr. Cordova said about the internal roadmap. She said she doesn’t mind keeping Emergent Pre-eminence in the document, but we need an internal roadmap to tell us what we want to accomplish in year two or three of the Strategic Plan.

Dr. Behr mentioned that generally speaking most of these criteria are research driven so any activity that promotes graduate progress will be broadly aligned with those criteria.

Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies Tachung (T.C.) Yih said that he is pleased with the Strategic Plan and happy with it moving forward.

Dr. Cordova said that he doesn’t disagree with what Dr. Behr said. He indicated that those are wickedly aspirational goals. He explained that if we double research expenditures in five years, that would be fantastic; and if we increased research productivity of faculty to 150% in the top journals in their fields, that also would be outstanding. He said any steps we make will be positive and successful.
Chair Felton reminded the Committee that a motion made by Trustee Spilker to forward the Strategic Plan to the full Board on June 7 and seconded by Trustee Smith needed a vote. There was no public comment. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Chair Felton asked the Committee to clarify the suggestion made earlier by Trustee Smith to put together a group to further explore the ETI and entrepreneurial pieces.

Trustee Smith requested that Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Ron Toll ask the Cabinet if it would put together a group, led by Dr. Cordova, to evaluate and provide a full report at the September Board meeting on how we can incorporate and integrate Entrepreneurship into the ETI.

Chair Felton noted Trustee Smith’s request that Dr. Toll ask the Cabinet if it would put together a group, led by Dr. Cordova, to evaluate and provide a full report at the September Board meeting on how we can incorporate and integrate Entrepreneurship into the ETI.

Item 4: Draft FGCU 2016 Work Plan for Board of Governors: Final Recommendation to FGCU Board of Trustees on June 7, 2016 (TAB #3)

Chair Shawn Felton presented for discussion the revised Draft FGCU 2016 Work Plan.

He stated the draft document was discussed at the May 10 meetings of the Special Committee on FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021 and the FGCU Board of Trustees. He said that following discussions, the Draft FGCU 2016 Work Plan for the Board of Governors (BOG) was updated by President Bradshaw and his staff and timely submitted in accordance with the BOG May 13 deadline as “Pending BOT Approval.” He noted that the deadline was met. He also noted that special attention will need to be given to the projection of goals in the document.

Chair Felton noted that the BOG is aware that we are having this meeting today for further discussions, and that there could be some changes made to the Work Plan as related to the narratives and the goals. He said following the completion of the draft Strategic Plan and reviewing the draft Work Plan, he modified some language in the strategies, and also highlighted some of the pieces.

He said with regard to the latest draft FGCU 2016 Work Plan provided in Tab #3, he suggested spending some time looking at the goals, as well as program pieces to make sure we are where we think we need to be based on the Strategic Plan.

Chair Felton opened the floor for discussion.

Trustee Smith said he liked the Work Plan. He said it follows the Strategic Plan, and that he is good with it.
Trustee Roepstorff mentioned she noticed red highlighting in the performance areas and asked for clarification. Chair Felton clarified that the red is to quickly highlight where goals are changing. He said anything in red indicates a change from last year to this year. He referred to page 12 on the Work Plan as an example. He said for example, the FTIC six-year graduation rate on the Performance Based Funding Metrics indicates 43%; but because the goal has changed to 45%, the red indicates a change for an upcoming goal in 2017.

Senior Associate Provost and Vice President for Planning and Institutional Performance Paul Snyder provided further explanation. He said that the BOG in a couple of instances tweaked the metrics in some way or included new metrics with regard to what is shown on page 13 of the Work Plan, with key performance indicators where they added measures taken directly from the System-wide strategic plan metrics.

Trustee Priddy asked about moving from 43% to 45% on the key performance indicators in the Work Plan and asked whether there was data that supports our being able to do that, and not an aspirational target. Dr. Snyder responded that we believe we will come close to that target and not see some wild variation.

Trustee Spilker said he wanted to reiterate his support for a 30% four-year graduation rate on the 2015-2019 goal. He noted it’s a big shift, but if it truly is the priority of the University, we can do it. He said that in speaking with Dr. Toll, he knows they are laser-focused in taking all the steps we can. He noted we also will have the Dashboard where we will have real-time feedback. He said he encourages the University to stick with that four-year graduation number.

Trustee Roepstorff noted that there is a big leap in the four-year graduation rate for the 23% in 2019 goals and 30% in 2020 goals. She asked Dr. Toll to talk about what cohorts we’re dealing with in 2020 in terms of reassurance that they will graduate in four years.

Dr. Toll said that we’re seeing cohorts of students entering that are better prepared to succeed for the 2015 cohort. He stated that this is a group that will benefit from having a larger number of academic advisors; benefit from the implementation of a new software program called Degree Works, which we are already entering students now and essentially doing some beta testing as a new program; benefit from the deans having completely reworked with their leadership teams four-year graduation plans, which are now available on the website; and the deans responding to something that they were asked to do by the end of the summer, which is to have every course we teach listed in the catalog as an every year, or every other year, and if it’s one semester, as fall or spring and so on. He said that we should be in the position for the first time to be able to have a student know exactly when these courses are going to be offered with much less curricular churn, where we are potentially adding and deleting courses without having the full benefit of what the assessment is of those
changes to the curriculum. He said they have also made amazing hires of academic advisors.

Trustee Roepstorff asked for clarification with regard to the freshmen that entered in 2014 in terms of getting them out. Dr. Snyder explained that the big difference between the 2015 cohort and the others, particularly with regard to the student tracking that will begin to take place intensively with that class, is the addition of the Governor’s Challenge Rebate Program at FGCU, which provides the incentive for students to stay here and focus on a major. Trustee Roepstorff asked Dr. Snyder if the 2015 cohort students have signed the rebate program contract. Dr. Snyder responded that the Governor’s Challenge Rebate Program at FGCU is being reviewed and details are being finalized.

Trustee Roepstorff noted that although she keeps hearing that we are doing intrusive tracking and have counseled our advisors as to what our expectations are, she still is surprised to see no movement. Dr. Snyder indicated that maybe 23% is a conservative estimate. He said we’re looking at possibly 22% for this next four-year cohort figure, so that it is possible we’ll be a percentage point or two ahead.

Trustee Smith stated that Dr. Toll and Dr. Snyder had done a presentation on the 2016 FGCU Productivity and Efficiency Dashboard that clearly shows the measures that Trustee Roepstorff asked about.

Dr. Toll said that the measures we have in place are going to demonstrate the reflection of our success. He said the issue with four-year graduation rates is that for students who graduate in four years, things generally need to be going well along the way. He said that by the time a student is moving from sophomore to junior year, if they’ve had changes in majors, drop classes, or fail classes, to retrieve those from being a semester behind or a year behind is difficult to do. He said having those students show in the six-year graduation rate is easier to do. He said the Dashboard that Trustee Smith referred to will provide the data that Trustee Roepstorff is interested in seeing. He said that the data shows roughly 1½ to 2% increase in the freshman-to-sophomore retention rates, and roughly 1 to 1½% increase in four-year graduation rates. He said the six-year graduation rates are a little more difficult to predict because the data where we show freshman to sophomore, sophomore to junior are retention rates, and there’s a difference between retention rates and graduation rates. He said you want to retain them for a certain portion of time, and then you want to get them out.

Trustee Roepstorff commented on implementation and execution of the tracking and advising systems in place in terms of success. She stated that there is a disconnect between the implementation and execution. Dr. Toll stated that they have recently established milestone courses for every degree program that will be part of the Degree Works program that literally blinks a red light any time a student falls off the path. He said he believes the numbers are moving in the right direction. Dr. Toll stated that they have just added two full-time employees in
Institutional Research to provide code writing that allows for a deeper dive than before. He noted that the disconnect here is that three and four years ago we were saying what we needed, but didn’t have the funds; now we have the funds that have allowed us to put those measures into place, and now we will be seeing the benefits of those improvements.

Trustee Spilker stated the topic warrants more time at a full Board meeting. He suggested having a presentation on the Dashboard to talk about the tracking and measures that we have put in place because it is a topic that we all are focused on and that is important to us. He suggested putting it on the next Board meeting agenda.

Trustee Smith suggested that Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences Mary Ann Zager be invited to present on the Degree Works program. He said that between that and Dashboard there are many positive things to report.

Trustee Smith asked what are we doing about the seniors, super seniors and juniors in terms of tracking. He said that we need to address those groups at the same time so that when they come in the fall they’ll know what the plan is to get them out.

Trustee Priddy asked if we know yet what our improvement is in SAT scores for incoming freshmen for this fall over last year. Dr. Toll responded that we don’t, in that you only know what that number is in terms of same day, year to year. He said we won’t know until students get here in the fall, but so far the numbers are up. He explained that the group that offers the national SAT exam changed it this year. He said the scores going out to students were delayed, but he has reason to believe that we will again show a healthy increase in SAT scores.

Dr. Toll responded to Trustee Smith’s earlier comments about super seniors. He said last year we started at the end. He said he believes we had 117 students who fell into that cohort and we, one by one, were able to get to 109 of 117 students with phone calls, personal visits and other methods, and we had success in reaching those students. He indicated that they are not a forgotten cohort. He said we addressed it in a high-touch manner rather than a high-tech manner. He said both methods can be successful, and our goal is to use both, which is what will happen when Degree Works is implemented.

Chair Felton referred to page 13 on the Work Plan relating to the institution’s specific goals as they relate back to what we want to do. He asked Dr. Snyder if we needed to repeat Key Performance Indicator number 5 on page 14. Dr. Snyder responded no because it’s redundant. Trustee Spilker said it was okay as it is.

Chair Felton referred to page 17 on the Work Plan examining the academic program pieces and asked for feedback from the Committee.
Trustee Roepstorff noted that Real Estate is not STEM, but if the other Trustees are fine with keeping it in, then she’s fine with it as well. She asked Dr. Toll for confirmation that the Construction Management program indeed is being offered at other universities, as a follow-up to discussion at the May Board meeting. Dr. Toll said yes. Trustee Roepstorff noted that she would like information verified about a proposed academic program before Trustees lobby legislators.

Trustee Smith stated that he did not see the School of Dental Medicine and Pharmacy listed and wondered if it should be included in this Work Plan.

Trustee Roepstorff asked Dr. Beatty if the Real Estate program was important to include in the Work Plan. Dr. Beatty said the program was placed there three or four years ago and has been waiting for resources as part of a process where multiple institutions work together on a degree program and get state funding to do it. He said the College already has started working with FAU and FIU on a real estate degree that will span three universities as part of that process.

Trustee Smith commented on the Construction Management program. He asked if that is something we need to keep on our minds on for the next budget request. He asked what is it that we need right now. Trustee Roepstorff responded that it is her understanding that the program is being asked for from the community related to job market demands.

Dr. Behr agreed that there is a strong demand for the Construction Management program. He said with regard to the other such available programs, we are only seeing three with accreditation. He stated there are a lot of Construction Management programs, but the College is seeking the highest accreditation program possible. He said there actually are more than four Construction Management programs in the state of Florida, but they have different accreditation standards. Trustee Roepstorff stated there is a disconnect with the information provided in terms of lobbying for the program. Trustee Priddy stated the idea for the program came through him, through the Governor, and through the community. He said if you look at the individual who contacted the Governor and said there is only one Construction Management program in the state, maybe he meant only one program that he would hire people from. He said with regard to accreditation, there may be a disconnect with how you interpret what programs are out there, but he suggested not backing off of this program.

Trustee Spilker said that one of our primary goals is employment, and agrees that the two bachelor programs that we are proposing are in direct response to the demands of the community, and we need to have programs where students coming out are highly sought and become gainfully employed in this region.

Trustee Smith stated that the deans’ involvement in the Plan is very important. He suggested that the deans own the metrics, and that the deans need to have performance based funding at their level. He said it can’t happen from the top down, but rather must happen at the boots-on-the ground level. He said Dr. Behr
just told us what we needed to know. He said he believes the deans must be empowered.

Chair Felton asked Dr. Toll to respond to Trustee Smith’s earlier comment about where the pharmacy and dental programs fit in terms of the BOG’s Work Plan; and how much emphasis is placed on where these programs show to help inform us where we need to be. Dr. Toll stated that generally for those very large signature programs, he believes that the BOG likes to see iterations of those ideas in order to receive support. He said this is a decision that comes from the highest levels of the University working with key leadership in Tallahassee that could help inform whether the best approach would be to add the programs now or to have the productive conversation to see at what point it would make the most sense to add the programs.

Trustee Price asked why we are not considering a program in professional sales. He said sales is a noble profession and a key function in every corporate environment. He indicated a program in sales would serve a huge demand in the marketplace that other universities are not serving. He gave FSU as an example in that not only does the university have a thriving bachelor’s degree in sales, they also have a master’s level sales management degree. He said the qualities that we are going to develop in professional selling capacities are going to help our people become more successful. Trustee Smith said that he recently followed up on it and what he heard back is that there was a connotation that sales meant retail, and that it might not work. He said that the question to consider is how we make a professional sales degree work.

Dr. Toll responded to Trustee Price’s comments and said that Dr. Beatty is currently working on a professional sales certificate. He said that while a certificate is not a degree program, it is oftentimes how you begin to develop interest and the faculty expertise to get it there. He said they are hoping to pull together something like four courses. He said corporate support would be needed to garner additional faculty that would help to get there with a quick opening of the pipeline. Trustee Roepstorff asked if the certificate is something that needs to go to the BOG. She asked if there was a certificate out there today. Dr. Toll responded there is not one today, but the goal of the certificate is to understand what kinds of faculty resources are needed in order to do it, and where and how it is housed.

Trustee Spilker asked if there was any reason not to list the professional sales program as a degree under consideration. He recommended that the degree be considered. Chair Felton said we could put forward a final recommendation to the full Board to consider a professional sales degree on the baccalaureate level.

Dr. Toll referred to page 6 on the Work Plan under Pillar 2: Entrepreneurship. He said that we have a healthy Institute of Entrepreneurship and wanted to make sure it is listed correctly and not make it look as if we are not at that level. Chair Felton said his understanding was that it was a center and not an institute. Dr.
Toll confirmed that it is an institute. He said the systematics of it is that it was not a standalone. It was under the Centers and Institutes. He said we are in the registration process, but it does not mean it is not a viable institute under the leadership of Dr. Sandra Kauanui, who has received grant support, including with the Veterans Program. Dr. Beatty said that perhaps the more appropriate term would be to create a School of Entrepreneurship that would move to a College because right now it says “create an institute that exists.” He suggested that or to say “grow the current institute into a College.” Chair Felton suggested “grow Entrepreneurship that would further be expanded into a College.” Dr. Beatty said that would be appropriate because the institute does exist and has existed for a number of years.

Trustee Spilker referred to page 12 on the Work Plan and noted that the number of the cost of the University per bachelor’s degree changed and wondered what caused the increase. Dr. Toll said Metric 3 is under significant review by the BOG. He said that this is very formulaic and what the BOG the numbers into the current formula with BOG Chair indicating that the have a strong desire to change this. He explained that according to the formula, these are the numbers we expect to have. He said we don’t have a great deal of ability to change these numbers based on that algorithm.

Trustee Spilker asked Dr. Toll if he believes all universities will follow the same trend, and since they have to adhere to the formula, will the cost of the University per bachelor's degree go up? Dr. Toll said we could put a tremendous amount of effort into somehow morphing this to our advantage, but suggested to wait perhaps a few more months because the current algorithm could go away. Dr. Snyder clarified that part of performance funding obviously counts against you, but also the way that the formula is set up there is room for institutions to frame the data, which particularly favors research universities because it has to do with ascribing costs to undergraduate education. Trustee Spilker thanked Dr. Toll and Dr. Snyder for making sure that we’re getting our point to the BOG that it’s not apples to apples across the institutions.

Trustee Smith commented on the formula and asked if increasing the four-year graduation rate would drive the number down. Dr. Toll stated that they have attempted to put this number together using data applied to the algorithm. He suggested not to attempt to override that with a gestalt image of what may happen with other metrics. He said he believes that by the time we get into 2017, Metric 3 will look very different.

Dr. Gregerson said the Work Plan is built on existing strengths. He noted that there is nothing in the preamble or introduction of the materials about the quality of existing programs. He suggested adding a sentence or clause to indicate that we’re building on the strengths of excellent academic programs. Trustee Smith said his concern is that our performance data is indicative of how the BOG measures us.
Dr. Gregerson referred to page 8 of the Work Plan that reads “among FGCU strengths are our focus on teaching and learning” and “the quality of facilities and classrooms.” He stated that is important, but so is the focus on education and the quality of our programs.

Chair Felton stated he potentially sees two spots to add in the verbiage that Dr. Gregerson suggested. He suggested one place on page 6 within the Statement of Strategy section, and another on page 8 within the Strengths and Opportunities section. He said he would work with Dr. Snyder to add the correct wording.

Chair Felton recapped the changes made to the Work Plan and listed the changes:

1. Page 6: add a piece related to the quality of our programming.
2. Under Pillar #2 – Entrepreneurship – change verbiage to say “grow the Institute of Entrepreneurship that will further be expanded into a College.”
3. Page 8: talk about the quality of the academic programs, not in large detail, but in very succinct statements.
4. Page 17: add under new programs for consideration by the University by 2017-2019 a professional sales program.

Trustee Smith made a motion to recommend to move the Work Plan to the full Board with the suggested changes. Trustee Priddy seconded the motion.

Chair Felton asked if there was further discussion.

Dr. Beatty pointed out that on page 10 of the Work Plan, he wondered if the placement for outreach for health sciences under the Health Sciences pillar might be better placed under Entrepreneurship. Chair Felton asked Dr. Beatty if he meant suggesting to move number 2 (Entrepreneurship) out of Pillar #3: Health Sciences to Pillar #2: Entrepreneurship for simplicity. Dr. Beatty said correct.

Chair Felton thanked Dr. Beatty for pointing out the change. He said that there was motion from Trustee Smith and seconded by Trustee Priddy with the changes he identified.

Trustee Smith amended his motion to include the additional changes on the Work Plan that will be recommended to the full Board. Trustee Priddy amended his second. There was no public comment. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Trustee Goodlette expressed his appreciation to Chair Felton and the Committee for the work put into the Strategic Plan and the Work Plan. He said all the members of the Board will echo that when the documents are presented at the full Board meeting on June 7.
**Item 5: Old Business**

There was no old business for discussion.

---

**Item 6: New Business**

Chair Felton said the only thing he heard from the Special Committee on FGCU Strategic Plan 2016-2021 is that after the document is approved by the full Board, the Committee will continue with the internal supplemental work plan document to move forward with a suggested deadline of at least 30 to 40 days to work on the document.

Trustee Roepstorff agreed with Chair Felton continuing his leadership with this project. Trustee Smith suggested to meet as a Committee one more time to work on it and then bring it forward to the full Board at the September meeting.

---

**Item 7: Closing Remarks, and Adjournment**

Chair Felton thanked the Committee, and Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans for her assistance and support.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24 a.m.

---

*Minutes submitted by Director of Media Relations Lillian Pagan.*

---

**Agenda Item:**