



Item: SP: A-M

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Tuesday, June 19, 2012

**SUBJECT: ROLL CALL AND APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 19, 2012 DRAFT
MINUTES**

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Initiate roll call to document member participation and ensure quorum and approve the April 19, 2012 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Thomas Workman, Chair _____

Dr. Jeffrey Feingold, Vice Chair _____

Mr. Robert Stilley (ex-officio) _____

Mr. Anthony Barbar (ex-officio) _____

Mr. David Feder _____

Mr. Robert Huffman _____

Mr. Abdol Moabery _____

Mrs. Sherry Plymale _____

Mr. Paul Tanner _____

Dr. Julius Teske _____

PARTICIPATING BOT MEMBERS

Dr. Angela Graham-West _____

Dr. William McDaniel _____

Mr. Robert Rubin _____



STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday, April 19, 2012

DRAFT MINUTES

Thomas Workman, Chair, Strategic Planning Committee, called the meeting to order and Andrew LaPlant proceeded with the Roll Call of committee members.

SP: A-M: Roll Call and Approval of Minutes for the February 16, 2012 Meeting

Present: Trustees Jeffrey Feingold, Robert Stilley (ex-officio), Anthony Barbar (ex-officio), David Feder, Ayden Maher, Abdol Moabrey, Sherry Plymale, Paul Tanner, Julius Teske

Other participating Board members: Angela Graham-West, William McDaniel, Robert Rubin

University Personnel: President MJ Saunders, Diane Alperin, Gitanjali Kaul, Charles Brown, Dennis Crudele, Randy Talbot, David Kian, Tom Donaudy, Andrew LaPlant

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of February 16, 2011 without change or correction.

SP:A-1: Draft 2012 FAU Work Plan

Dr. Kaul provided an update of the FAU Work Plan which incorporated the changes that were introduced this year. For the past two years, a template was being used but that template has now been changed completely. Dr. Kaul provided background materials which included key performance indicators by source that provide a summary of how the new plan would appear. In general, the new plan has three main components, items common to all universities, items common to research institutions and institution-specific items.

Dr. Kaul pointed out some of the new data elements that would be collected. In the section common to all universities, the metrics being tracked are under the categories

academic quality, operational efficiency, and return on investment. Many of the metrics were being tracked previously, but there are new items such as “percentage of undergraduate seniors participating in research courses”. With a plan to introduce a quality improvement project for SACS focusing on undergraduate research, Dr. Kaul did not anticipate any problem collecting data in the future, although she was unsure about the current status of data collection for that metric. Additional examples of new metrics include “percent of bachelor’s graduates employed in Florida” and “percent of bachelor’s graduate continuing their education in Florida”.

The items under the section devoted to common to research universities are all basically new. The academic quality metrics are: “faculty awards”, “national academy membership”, “number of post-doctoral appointees” and “number of science and engineering disciplines nationally ranked in top 100 for research expenditures”. Dr. Kaul reported that the Board of Governors has included definitions for these new items which were part of the materials presented. There are some metrics that come from data collected for the NSF and are included for the first time. Those items are under the category return on investment. Dr. Kaul pointed out two new items – “science and engineering research expenditures in non-medical health sciences” and “national rank higher than predicted by the Financial Resources ranking based on *U. S. News & World Report*”.

Dr. Kaul reviewed new items under the final section – institution-specific metrics – such as “freshman in top 10% of graduation high school class”, “eligible programs with specialized accreditation” and “average time to degree for first-time in college students”. Dr. Kaul pointed out that there are new definitions associated with the average time to degree for FTIC students. In the past, the data was collected by looking at cohorts of students that had entered in a given year and tracking how many graduated in four years, five years and six years. Now, the definition requires looking at students who graduate in a particular year and going back to see how long freshman have taken to graduate. Also new are “number of adults (age 25+) undergraduates enrolled”, “number of faculty designated a highly cited scholar” and “seeking and/or maintaining Carnegie’s Community Engagement classification”. Dr. Kaul reported that several universities in the state have the community engagement designation, and the inclusion of this new metric seems to indicate the Board of Governors’ desire that all institutions seek to earn that classification.

The due date for submitting the information is May 21, 2012, and there will be a later opportunity for bringing the report to the Board.

SP:A-2: Request to Amend Regulation 1.001 – General Information

David Kian made a request to amend Regulation 1.001 titled “General Information” to updating the language of the regulation. A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment of Regulation 1.001 and passed by unanimous vote.

SP:A-3: Request to Amend Regulation 1.002 – Administrative Organization

The request is to amend Regulation 1.002 which describes the university’s administrative organization. The changes would remove references to outdated authority and update language to reflect current organizational titles and existing structure. Board member Plymale raised concerns that the direct-support organizations (DSO) were not listed under the description of the post of the Vice President for Community Engagement, but Mr. Kian indicated that all DSOs are not included and that although the Vice Present for Community Engagement serves as a liaison for the Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution Foundation (HBOIF), the delegation was personal rather than positional. Board member Plymale made a request for the Board to receive a copy of the organizational chart each year. Board member Plymale asked for the inclusion of language to the effect that the president must consult with the Board chair regarding the appointment, compensation and termination for high-level executive positions. Mr. Kian agreed that the language could be included under the regulation but indicated that there will be a proposed revision of the Board’s operating policies and procedures that would effectively serve as the Board’s by-laws. The revisions to the Board’s policies would be a better place to add the consultation language. A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment of Regulation 1.002 and passed by unanimous vote.

SP:A-4: Request to Repeal Regulation 7.004 – Code of Penalties

A request to repeal Regulation 7.004 which sets forth the penalties and sanctions for inappropriate behavior by faculty, staff and students was made. The University Regulations include separate regulations for faculty, staff, and students. Each of these sections contains the penalties and sanctions specific to the group concerned. A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment of Regulation 7.004 and passed by unanimous vote.

SP:A-5: Request to Repeal Regulation 7.005 – Disruptive Conduct

A request was made to repeal Regulation 7.005 which describes the types of conduct that are deemed to violate University standards by faculty, staff and students. These provisions are now covered in the separate sections of regulations applicable to faculty, staff and students. A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment of Regulation 7.005 and passed by unanimous vote.

With no further business to discuss a motion to adjourn the meeting was passed by unanimous vote.