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I. Call to Order
Committee Chair Gary Wendt called the Strategic Planning Committee meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

II. Roll Call
Michele Rush called the roll: Committee Chair Gary Wendt, Committee Vice Chair Lyn Stanfield, Trustee Susan LeFrancois, Trustee Narendra Kini, and Trustee Beth Kigel were present (Quorum).

Other Board Trustees present: Board Chair Cliff Otto, Trustee Mark Bostick, Trustee Bob Stork, Trustee Melia Rodriguez, and Trustee David Williams

Staff present: President Randy Avent, Provost Terry Parker, Dr. Allen Bottorff, David Fugett, Mike Dieckmann, Kathy Bowman, David Blanton, David Calhoun, Melaine Schmiz, Alex Landback, Michele Rush, and Kristen Wharton.

III. Public Comment
There were no requests received for public comment.

IV. Approval of the November 15, 2022 Minutes
Trustee Narendra Kini made a motion to approve the Strategic Planning Committee meeting minutes of November 15, 2022. Trustee Beth Kigel seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

V. Review and Approve Proposed 2023-2028 Strategic Plan Priorities
President Avent reviewed the University's positioning statements. He reminded Trustees of the Balanced Scorecard and the defining of each level, followed by key elements of the Board of Governors’ Performance Based Funding (PBF) metrics and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). These elements inform the proposed four priorities for the 2023-2028 Strategic Plan:

- Grow the academic enterprise
- Transform students’ lives
- Become an engine of innovation
- Improve campus operations
Trustee Beth Kigel commented that “transform student’s lives” may be interpreted in multiple ways and inquired if it was articulated anywhere. President Avent explained that under each of these four priorities there will be goals defined to achieve the priority. In this case, transforming students’ lives includes a goal of providing students the necessary tools to be successful while at Florida Poly and in their career; the annual operations plan details the tasks required of staff and faculty to meet that goal.

Trustee Narendra Kini asked if student success should be listed as the number one priority. President Avent stated the four items are not in any priority order, however the first two carry more weight than the others. Trustee Kini also inquired on the best metric to measure faculty success. Metrics will be discussed in detail at the next Strategic Planning committee meeting.

Trustee Lyn Stanfield inquired if there are metrics to help administration understand the student sentiment and whether they believe their lives are being transformed. She asked where within the metrics does administration hear from the students. President Avent mentioned there is an annual student survey conducted and metrics from that survey will be integrated into this priority. He also touched on having student focus groups participate in the “transform students’ lives” goals.

The motion to recommend approval to the Board of Trustees the four priorities for the 2023-2028 Strategic Plan was postponed by the Committee Chair until the next meeting when the Committee can consider the four priorities and the goals within each priority together as a whole.

VI. Closing Remarks and Adjournments

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 10:19 a.m.
Advancing to Excellence
2018-2023 Strategic Plan
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Build Prominent Programs in High-Paying Industries

• Enroll a high quality and diverse incoming class
  – Undergraduate body to at least 1,450 students, graduate to 60
  – Average SAT over 1300, more than 20% in top 10% of HS class
  – Female greater than 20% and racial diversity greater than 10%

• Grow faculty body committed to excellence
  – 40% of faculty internal professional development for teaching
  – 70% of faculty have taken advantage of professional development funds
  – 18:1 student-to-faculty ratio and <5000 student credit hours taught by adjuncts

• Improve instructional effectiveness and consistency of quality
  – ABET accreditation for four programs

• Grow the number of academic programs in strategic disciplines
  – Five additional programs

• Mature and grow the graduate program
  – Addition of two new tracks and 40 incoming students per year
  – More than 10% working with industry on their theses
Prepare Students for a Lifetime of Success

• Help students achieve academic goals
  – First-to-second year retention rate will be over 85% and four-year graduation rate over 48% and six-year graduation rate over 70%

• Build essential skills in communication, leadership, design, and business
  – 75% of graduates will achieve job placement or graduate school with a starting salary at or above average wage in Florida

• Embed projects in a sustainable manner to enhance professional development
  – More than 50% projects will be supported by industry with >5 entrepreneurial efforts a year and 10 undergraduate research opportunities

• Support students through work experience programs and career opportunities
  – 85% of graduating students will complete an off-campus internship
Grow a High-technology Economy Around Florida Poly

- Conduct applied research to strengthen University impact
  - Generate more than 50 government or industry grant proposals per year with more than five awards each year
  - R&D expenditures will have grown more than $500K annually

- Develop extended campus to support University growth
  - Build a new Applied Research Center and request funds for a second building on campus
  - Develop a plan for building out the campus using P3s and leased spaces in surrounding areas
Maximize Value for the Student

- **Concentrate spending on academic programs**
  - Commit more than 30% of overall expenditures on instructional effort
  - Keep cost of attendance near the average cost of attendance across the SUS
  - PBF scores at or better than the average across the SUS

- **Continue advocacy efforts to support University growth and reputation**
  - Increase endowment to $1.5M while raising an additional $5M in new scholarships and $5.5M in support of University operations
Outline
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- Summary
Peer Institutional Types*

* Thanks to Rei Sanchez
Peer Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Pell/FinAid</th>
<th>% admitted</th>
<th>SAT (75th)</th>
<th>ACT (75th)</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>4-yr grad</th>
<th>6-yr grad</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvey-Mudd College</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin College</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>6774</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
<td>8287</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>78.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-Hulman Institute</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>97.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>7187</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>99.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>7230</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri University of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>7241</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee School of Engineering</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM Institute of Mining</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>84.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering University</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech</td>
<td>7008</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson</td>
<td>3953</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>65.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Institute of Technology</td>
<td>7830</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Polytechnic University</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red text denotes metrics that are similar to Florida Poly

- Peers should be based on the “inputs”, i.e., student quality (Pell, SAT, ACT) and similarity
- Performance will be measured on the “outputs”, i.e., retention, graduation rate, …
### 5-Year Outcome Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>SUS Avg</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>5-yr Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROW THE ACADEMIC ENTERPRISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduates Employed or Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Wages for BS Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$54,800</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BS Programs in Strategic Emphasis</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Grad Programs Strategic Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORM STUDENT LIVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progress Rate</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Graduate Rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Yr Graduation Rate</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BS Degrees w/o Excess Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Access Rate</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-to-Degree</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BECOME AN ENGINE OF INNOVATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BS with 2+ Workforce Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures ($K)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (FT Students)</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (Certificate Students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVE CAMPUS OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-to-Administration Ratio</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Engineering Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,597</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$25,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost to Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,062</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>($9,370)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Goals are external, determined from a combination of internal, SUS, and peer performances, and will be reported each year
- Diagnostics are internal and meant to provide insight to process health and repair pathways (e.g., check engine & diagnostics)
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Grow the Academic Enterprise

• Programs & curriculum
  – Grow curriculum that promotes foundational technical knowledge in traditional engineering disciplines yet complements industry trends through concentrations
  – Preserve small classes with hands-on active instruction in core courses
  – Focus on high-quality instruction and innovative use of technology
  – Strengthen and grow the graduate program
  – Consider applied sciences & retreat pathways

• Faculty
  – Grow high-quality faculty body with a commitment to collegiality and self-governance
  – Provide faculty professional development opportunities that help faculty build national recognition in their chosen field
  – Grow research programs

• Students
  – Grow enrollment while preserving quality by attracting students with exceptional math and science aptitude
  – Continued primary focus on resident FTIC campus
Potential Diagnostics

• **Applicants**
  – Application measures (#applications, %accepted, %enrolled)
  – Diversity (%female, %BAA, %Hispanic, %outside Florida)
  – Quality (Concordance scores, %top 10% in high school, %calculus ready)

• **Curriculum**
  – Faculty-to-Student ratio (1rst year, overall)
  – Departmental distribution of students
  – Number of new programs (disciplines, concentrations, degree offerings, retreat, …)

• **Faculty**
  – Faculty growth (numbers, student/faculty per program, rank distribution,…)
  – %Faculty participating in professional development (pedagogy, research, …)
  – %Service participation (internal and external)
Transform Students’ Lives

- **Academic success**
  - Student preparation and connection to resources
  - Improve logistical support for student advising, hiring, counseling, etc.
  - Provide summer bridge programs that improve student preparedness

- **Leadership & Professional Development (LPD)**
  - Curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular professional development
  - Workforce development experience (e.g., internships, capstones, UROP, …)
  - Engagement in career preparation and strategy
  - Provide research experience and support structures for undergraduates

- **Engaged campus community**
  - Vibrant campus environment with campus social programming
  - Experiences that support sense of belonging and social interaction
  - Create alumni pride
  - Promote diversity in thought and experiences, and civil debate
Transform Students’ Lives

- **Student well-being**
  - Pride in achievement and accomplishment
  - Accountability and ownership
  - Community engagement that enriches academic experience
Potential Diagnostics

- **Academic success**
  - Progression dynamics
  - Success rates (DFW, probation, suspension, %STEM core completion, …)
  - Student Success Center efficiency (%students-at-risk served, #meetings/student, …)

- **Leadership & professional development**
  - Program participation (leadership programs, professional development, …)
  - Employer engagement (career fairs, contacts, meetings, information sessions, site visits, career coaching appointments/reappointments, career service offerings, …)
  - Service-learning participation (e.g., Habitat for Humanity, food bank, …)

- **Engaged campus community**
  - Registered Student Organizations (total #, #events, %participation, …)
  - Campus recreation (team, intramural, aquatics, fitness, eSport)

- **Student well-being**
  - Number of student stories highlighting accomplishments
  - Number students attending student success workshops
  - Mental health (demographics, number & time-to-appointment (emergency, nonemergency), %in-person, …)
Become Engine of Innovation

• Industry
  – Build brand recognition with state-wide industry partners
  – Build stronger links between curriculum and industry
  – Become thought leader on state policies that bridge the “valley of death”

• Research
  – Grow traditional graduate programs in fundamental disciplines with a trajectory towards doctoral programs
  – Build infrastructure and recruit a faculty body committed to research

• Entrepreneurship
  – Build meaningful programs that help students develop and market ideas
  – Build faculty culture of industry engagement and spinoffs (i.e., Deshpande Center, …)

• Land Development
  – Consider ways to strengthen secondary schools
  – Use multi-year student interactions to attract industry onto campus
  – Work with developers to shape a technology innovation park
Potential Diagnostics

- **Industry engagement**
  - Student measure of engagement (internships, capstones (#, %industry, %multidisciplinary), industry funded research, …)
  - Curriculum Advisory Board engagement (#members, #meetings, …)

- **Research**
  - #External grant proposals
  - %External grants funded
  - #Peer reviewed journal articles

- **Development**
  - Total economic development investments around Poly
  - State investment in campus infrastructure (PECO)
  - State operational funding
Improve Campus Operations

• Employees
  – Attract, train, and retain talent with growth paths and career roadmaps
  – Improve evaluation processes to provide productive feedback and metrics
  – Empower employees and provide “do people”

• Facilities
  – Build campus that supports students, academic and campus operations
  – Bring satellite offices to main campus

• Technology
  – Coherent technology architecture that is integrated
  – Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for training
  – Be deliberate with our technology investments

• Business processes
  – Clean and simple business processes enabled by technology
  – Stable budgeting process and formats
  – Re-engineered policies, procedures, and processes
Potential Diagnostics

- **Employees**
  - Staff retention (%, exit surveys,…)
  - Professional development (total funding, %participation, …)

- **Facilities**
  - %Facility space relative to projected needs assessment
  - Construction measures (time, budget, quality)
  - Utility efficiencies relative to building use

- **Technology**
  - %Completion of the three-year technology architecture plan
  - %Core business processes documented
  - %Roles supported by “desk reference” documentation
  - %Core infrastructure under formal cyclical renewal/replacement
Potential Diagnostics

- **Business Processes**
  - %Processes reviewed (policies and processes)
  - %Core business processes re-engineered and moved to Level 3 maturity

- **Advancement**
  - Net production (unrestricted, restricted, temporary restricted)
  - Donor metrics (retention, acquisition, %alumni giving, …)
  - Brand recognition through familiarity surveys (students, industry, influencers, …)
Summary

• Prior elements of strategic planning process have been presented throughout this year

• Current presentation focuses on Priorities and Goals to be included in the final strategic plan
  – Peer analysis presented and used to set outcome goals
  – Diagnostic metrics provided for each Goal and will be used to set funding priorities and determine the health of those efforts

• Next steps will gather all materials and begin process of building an official Strategic Plan to be approved by the BOT and BOG in the Fall, 2023
Positioning Statements

• Mission Statement

Serve students and industry through excellence in education, discovery and application of engineering and applied sciences

• Vision Statement

Florida Poly will be the academic leader in building Florida’s technology-based economy

• Envisioned Future

Florida Poly will be ranked as the top STEM university in the South and widely recognized for producing graduates in fields who are well-rounded and prepared to be leaders in industry. With this, industry wants strong collaborations with the University. Many of these businesses will move their technology centers into a vibrant research park attached to the University. Through strong interactions with our students and our faculty, this leads to a growing research influence in critical fields.
Core Values

- What values are most important to us as an organization?
  - Access and embrace diverse perspectives
  - Resilient organization that supports the community
  - Developing future technology leaders
  - Design process that puts the student at the center – different than a student friendly university
  - High expectation for student values, accountability, integrity, leadership
  - Innovation to contribute to a greater society
  - Culture of excellence across the entire university
Key Differentiating Analysis

- **Florida Poly is a small institution**
  
  *(O)* – Can offer a high-touch model with smaller classes and rich curricular experiences
  
  *(O)* – Can build relationships with Small and Medium Businesses (SMBs) in Florida
  
  *(O)* – Can focus on traditional FTIC students
  
  *(T)* – Must graduate exceptional students to increase impact
  
  *(T)* – Must offer an outstanding user experience
  
  *(T)* – Lack of strong graduate program limits economic development efforts

- **Florida Poly is a young institution**
  
  *(S)* – Has no legacy programs, administrative structures, or traditional bureaucracies
  
  *(T)* – Must be creative in building out the campus through nontraditional means
  
  *(W)* – Lack of branding even within the state
  
  *(S/T)* – Faculty growth and rank demographics

- **Florida Poly is 100% STEM**
  
  *(O)* – Can offer industry-aligned majors in fast-growing areas
  
  *(O)* – Can build strong partnerships with industry for economic benefit
  
  *(T)* – Must provide opportunities for professional skill growth
  
  *(T)* – Must control administrative costs to offset expensive programs
  
  *(W)* – Has poor retention and graduation rates associated with STEM
## SWOT Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Engineering</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Undergraduate Engineering</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Research Engineering</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Research Engineering</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical University</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Comprehensive</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large comprehensive</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Suggested trajectory: Emerging Engineering -> Elite Undergraduate Engineering (5) -> Emerging Research University -> (15)