

Shared Governance/Transparency Hearing
July 18, 2018
Notes

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

I. Call to Order

Chair Seixas called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. New Business – Action Items

There was a motion to accept the minutes from the June 13

Three is capped at 40% of tuition. Other smaller fees include things like parking or lab fees and are set by a dollar amount. Any new fees require proper notice and approval. Housing costs are set by the University BOT. There was discussion regarding adjusting current fee schedules Ms. Shirley outlined that the BOG used to have authority to charge a tuition differential but now only preeminent universities can charge this additional tuition and it is capped (none have done so to date). No universities have brought fee or tuition increases to the BOG in recent history.

Florida law controls general education (core) and requirements cross over both colleges and universities. Core general education includes: communications, humanities, mathematics, social sciences and natural sciences. The BOG is required to define courses that satisfy the critical thinking skills in those key areas with a goal to have every FTIC to satisfy all 36 credit hours in order to obtain a degree regardless of where they took the courses (accepted anywhere in the SUS).

There was a question in regard to the preeminence statutory structure potentially being able to impact student fees given that preeminent universities can charge tuition differential. Ms. Shirley clarified that all fees would still have to go through (il)ati

who has jurisdiction and how the process will function. Faculty has corollary issues because of their single representative on the BOT.

There was discussion regarding any overlap between existing student governments. Ms. Adamchak noted the only overlap is the System meeting where the SGA presidents come together to discuss issues. This same group elects the student member to the BOT on an annual basis.

Fees are separately collected by the institutions and budgeted through the A&S process at each institution. The President signs the budget, but delegates authority to the Regional Chancellor (or their designee) for oversight. The budget process is independent because needs are different.

The members discussed the System level policies versus campus policies. Ms. Adamchak noted there are very few generated at the campus level. Policies are signed by the VP or Chancellor and cannot conflict with BOT regulations. Policies do not have to go to the BOG for approval, but do still have to be noticed and allow for comment.

Additionally, there was discussion regarding whether or not there is an exclusion for multiple campuses to have individual SGAs. Ms. Adamchak clarified that the Florida Legislature created the ability for the BOT to create student governments on campuses and centers. However, the bigger issue goes toward budget authority under the A&S fees or granting allocations to student groups (not budget authority).

iii. Overview of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Guidelines (taken out of order from agenda – prior ii)

Mr. Wrona and Dr. Madden provided an overview of the SACSCOC updated requirements. Shared governance means the relationship between faculty and administrators. Both have important roles: faculty approve curriculum and programs while administration ensures consistency with institution mission and adequate resources.

The members discussed curriculum creation and community involvement, as well as the process for consolidating and removing programs. Mr. Wrona noted that the USF System routinely reviews productivity of programs to determine ongoing feasibility. SACS could be concerned regarding closing programs depending on where they are offered. SACS looks to make sure that all students receive the program that they enrolled in so, if a program is closing, the system must create teach out plans. **c. Public Comment**

No public comment cards received.

d. Discussion

Ms. Washington was appreciative of all of the information provided as it did provide some guidance as to areas that may not be within their purview such as the effects of preeminence on fees. The general education core might not be as big of an issue but need to look into the student governance piece and strategic planning around one system at a higher level.

Ms. Rykiel's biggest takeaway was student government and how to include all student voices across all 3 campuses in an effective, cohesive way. Interested in the shared services specific to student services to make sure the structure is accessible for everyone.

Chair Seixas noted the critical need to ensure that all governing structures are aligned while being mindful of home campuses within a centralized system. Shared services will warrant more discussion and attention. Overall it is important to be attentive to the financial efficiency of the university and the physical space and capital assets that go into supporting programs.

IV. Adjournment

Adjourned at 9:45 a.m.