AGENDA

The Agenda will be followed in order and items may be heard earlier than the scheduled.

I. CALL TO ORDER
   Ms. Peggy Rolando, Committee Chair

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
    Ms. Peggy Rolando, Committee Chair

III. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED WORK PLAN
     Ms. Peggy Rolando, Committee Chair

IV. INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (EEC) MEMBERS
    Dean Sam Huckaba, Chair

V. EEC COMMITTEE REPORT
   Dean Sam Huckaba, Chair

VI. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

VII. ADJOURNMENT
I. CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Peggy Rolando called the meeting to order.

II. REVIEW OF PROPOSED WORK PLANS
Eric Algoe reviewed the format of the work plans for the Board of Trustees Efficiency Committee (BOTE C) and the Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee (EEC). The responsibilities for the BOTE include setting the goal, guiding principles, and operating guidelines, for the on-campus Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee (EEC).

The campus-based committee would follow-up on the recommendations of the BOTEC, consultant ideas, peer ideas, and vet ideas and concepts in terms of feasibility, and to bring recommendations to the BOTEC for consideration and implementation. Mechanism and means for the reallocation of funds from savings and payouts of incentives for employees will be the task of the EEC.

The BOTEC will deliberate improvements to the University golf course, and make decisions on whether or not to engage outside consultants. BOTEC will bring recommendations and a schedule for making recommendations, and a structure which facilitates an employee incentive program for identifying and implementing efficiency ideas.

III. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS
University of West Florida is the only institution in the SUS with an incentive program in place for employees. FSU does not currently have a formal process or policy for rewarding employees for identifying efficiencies. EthicsPoint software is already in use by FSU for whistleblower and harassment reporting, and may also be useful for students, faculty and staff anonymous reporting.

The Faculty Senate is not enthusiastic toward the idea of paying an outside company to find ways to save money, especially as FSU is already reported to be one of the most efficient universities.
Les Pantin moved, and it was unanimously affirmed, that 'Quality' or 'Excellence' be added to the name of the Board of Trustees Efficiency Committee. This suggestion will be taken to BOT Chairman Bense for final decision.

IV. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY-LEVEL COMMITTEE
Constituency of the on-campus EEC will be composed of mainly middle-management representatives from the President's Office, Provost's Office, Legal, Research, Athletics, Students Affairs, Communications or Governmental Relations, three from Finance & Administration, two Deans, two from the Faculty Senate, and two students. Staff effort for the EEC must be identified.

V. CHARGES TO THE UNIVERSITY-LEVEL COMMITTEE
The first charges to the EEC will be
- Reviewing and giving feedback to the BOTEC on the goal, operating guidelines, and guiding principles of the EEC
- Developing a timeline, plan of attack, and communications matrix
- Developing an incentive plan
- Putting out an initial query for ideas to community (employee, faculty, students, and vendors)

VI. TIMELINE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
Results of May EEC meeting will be discussed at the June BOTEC meeting. A conference call of the BOTEC will be held between the June and September meetings to evaluate and action ideas ready for launch. The BOTEC will meet again on Thursday, September 12, the day before the general Board of Trustees meeting on September 13th.

MEETING ADJOURNED
I. Call to Order
Ms. Peggy Rolando, Committee Chair

II. President’s Remarks
The University has been experiencing budget cuts for the past six years and may in budget austerity for several years to come. Finding efficiencies is necessary to be able to provide opportunities for funding other areas. The University has actively been seeking and reporting efficiencies to the Board of Governors over the last three years. A Board Committee was established to hear ideas, and responses to ideas suggested by others, from our business-savvy trustees. The University is also establishing an internal committee to report to the Board committee their findings. The committees will look at the Division of Finance and Administration first, as it is the operation most familiar to trustees’ experience, and will most easily allow for the establishment of processes to be expanded to the larger University.

II. Reports on Efficiency Accomplishments and Review of Sample Work Products
Mr. Eric Algoe, Associate Vice President for Administration, reviewed the composition of the University operating budget, focusing on Education and General, specifically on Plant Operation and Maintenance (PO&M), and Administrative Services. The University is maintaining PO&M costs as university gross square footage steadily increases. FSU was named first in efficient universities, by $300,000, by U.S. News and World Report. State support has decreased by 29% over the last five years. 800 positions have been eliminated, many of them vacant. Sample efficiency reports were provided to the committee for their reference.
III. DISCUSSION OF APPROACH
There are two primary approaches universities utilize in identifying efficiencies; hiring an outside consultant, and using an internal committee. Internally-driven processes take longer, are less expensive, and yields more realistic expectations and more easily transitioned to a recurring process. External consultants work much faster, offer bolder suggestions, identify huge cost dollar amounts, may be less realistic for implementation, and are usually a one-time process. An internal process, and possible later external consultant engagement, is proposed for FSU. Efficiency reports from University of Kansas, University of West Florida, and Auburn University were shared with the Committee.

There is not an existing standing process for submitting cost-saving ideas. Ideas for efficiencies have been suggested via the Budget Crisis Committee blackboard site in the past. The Board of Governors has recently requested a state purchasing portal, and used FSU as the standard for emulation.

IV. CHARGE FROM CHAIRMAN
Governor is attentive to university efficiency. This committee has been established to ensure that the University is ahead of the curve for monitoring costs and utilizing resources to the best of our ability.

V. DISCUSSION
Internal self-study approach will come from those who understand the operation and needs of the university community. Our internal responders should be incentivized for generating ideas, protected from potential ostracism, and the savings gleaned should be reinvested. The University must publicize its efficiency measures. An internal process should be established on a recurring basis. President Barron expressed doubt that adequate funding currently exists to engage a consultant.

Susie Busch-Transou proposed that students in the College of Business be tapped as a valuable resource for initial examinations of efficiencies. Peggy Rolando proposed that internally-developed benchmarks for judging efficiencies be presented to the legislature to increase the University's visibility of effort. Savings, especially from faculty ideas, must be reinvested in faculty support, fostering a culture of openness and reassurance of quality.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEE
Eric Algoe was tasked with developing a structure, organizational approach and timeline for the committee, to be discussed via conference call in three weeks' time.

MEETING ADJOURNED
Florida State University
Board of Trustees
Committee on Efficiency

Proposed Work Plan - May 2013

Florida State University’s Board of Trustees recently established a standing Committee on Efficiency to identify strategies for streamlining campus operations, reducing cost, and optimizing processes and policies to build upon FSU’s renowned efficient campus environment. This document will serve as the Board Committee’s work plan and the operational guidelines for the on-campus Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee (EEC).
Introduction

As responsible stewards of public funds, Florida State University is committed to operating as efficiently as possible while maintaining our position as one of the world’s premier institutions of higher education. Recently, *U.S. News & World Report* ranked FSU at the very top of the list of the nation’s most efficient universities in producing the highest quality education. At its March 2013 meeting, the FSU Board of Trustees formed a standing Committee on Efficiency (*hereafter referred to as “the Committee”*) to identify strategies for streamlining campus operations, reducing cost, and optimizing processes and policies in an effort to build upon FSU’s already renowned efficient campus environment.

Board of Trustees Chairman Allan Bense established the Committee’s overarching goal as identifying opportunities to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of operations among the broad areas of finance and administration (to include facilities and support operations), university advancement, university relations (to include communication and marketing), student services, research, academics, and information technology services while remaining focused on maintaining or enhancing the overall quality and excellence of the University.

In order to facilitate this work, President Eric Barron has created an on-campus Efficiency & Effectiveness Committee (EEC) that will solicit and vet suggestions and comments from the campus community regarding ways to seek greater efficiencies and effectiveness. The remainder of this document describes the Committee’s approach to fulfilling this goal. A separate document is attached which provides a work plan for the EEC to use in defining and planning its work.

Proposed Approach

The Committee will begin its work by discussing and outlining a set of high-level guiding principles and more specific operational guidelines for the EEC to utilize. The EEC will recommend a process for routine reporting on progress, soliciting feedback, seeking approval, and identifying successes with the Committee.

The Committee should consider charging the EEC with establishing a set of recommendations regarding the creation of a self-sustaining fund that could be used to cover the start-up costs of proposed efficiency projects, to pay for occasional direct costs of the effort, and to pay incentives to employees when established criteria are met.

The recommendation of the administration is for the committee to allow the EEC the opportunity to make the first attempt at identifying and bringing forward opportunities for improved efficiency and effectiveness, rather than hiring an outside consultant. The EEC
already has access to a number of consulting reports on efficiency done for other universities that it can utilize for ideas in addition to those generated on campus. The Committee may consider using an outside consultant in the future to help identify efficiency improvements, and it should also be noted that the Committee will not be limited to considering suggestions from the ECC exclusively. The Committee may independently identify, research, and approve plans or projects aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness.

The Committee’s ongoing meeting schedule will be set to coincide with the established meetings of the Board of Trustees. Additional meetings and conference calls will be scheduled as necessary so as to aggressively pursue efficiency and effectiveness opportunities. Subcommittees or focused task forces may be used as needed to enhance the work of the Committee.

**Goal**

The goal of the Committee is to identify ways of improving the general efficiency and effectiveness of the University’s operations that are in alignment with the mission of the university and that maintain our quality and excellence.

**Guiding Principles**

Underlying the work of the Committee are the following guiding principles as it considers possible efficiency & effectiveness improvements:

1. Compliance with the regulatory, statutory, and policy environments under which the university operates must be respected, though changes may be suggested;
2. Academic quality must be maintained, and, if at all possible, enhanced;
3. Florida State’s reputation as a leading national public institution of higher education & research must be preserved;
4. Sound internal controls and best business practices should be sustained;
5. Investment costs must be objectively and subjectively evaluated against relative value.

**Operating Guidelines**

1. Explore opportunities to revised, simplify, eliminate or create policies, procedures, processes and/or practices to improve efficiencies/effectiveness in an effort to better meet the needs of the Florida State University faculty, staff and students (these may include recommendations for changes to FSU, B.O.T., or B.O.G. rules & policies as well as state statutes);
2. Explore opportunities to increase revenue;
3. Investigate opportunities to reduce employee workload or increase employee morale;
4. Develop ways to consolidate programs and services to avoid duplication of services while maintaining service to the constituents;
5. Explore opportunities for reallocation of funds, personnel and other resources, rather than reductions;
6. Examine options to outsource services for cost-effectiveness;
7. Explore opportunities to create and introduce financial incentives to encourage and recognize appropriate entrepreneurial risk taking to enhance revenue or reduce expenses;
8. Develop ways to support and reward units for interdisciplinary collaborations and discourage unnecessary internal competition;
9. Identify methods to improve the communication and application of new policies, initiatives and procedures among the University community;
10. Find other opportunities not covered here that may be presented to the Committee for their consideration by faculty, staff, students and vendors that would increase the efficiency or effectiveness of the university.

A proposed work plan for the EEC is attached for consideration and discussion. The EEC work plan includes asking the EEC to provide feedback on the Committee’s stated goal, principles and guidelines using meetings, surveys, solicitations and as many other means as possible.

**Proposed Timeline**

**2013**
March – Board of Trustees’ Committee on Efficiency is formed and conducts initial meeting.
May – EEC Meets
June – BOT Meeting – work plan approved
Summer – EEC conducts monthly meetings and prepares plan and survey
August - Update phone call from EEC to BOT Committee
September – BOT meeting where EEC provides work plan, timeline, draft incentive program, and proposed budget to seed the efficiency effort
Fall – EEC work – Survey and engage stakeholders
Winter - EEC provides interim Report to BOT and continues work vetting ideas and projects

**2014**
Spring - EEC continues work and provides final annual report to BOT committee 60 days prior to the June BOT meeting
June - BOT Committee presents first annual report to full BOT
Florida State University’s Board of Trustees recently established a standing Committee on Efficiency to identify strategies for streamlining campus operations, reducing cost, and optimizing processes and policies to build upon FSU’s renowned efficient campus environment. This document will serve as the Board Committee’s work plan and the operational guidelines for the on-campus Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee (EEC).
INTRODUCTION

As responsible stewards of public funds, Florida State University is committed to operating as efficiently as possible while maintaining our position as one of the world’s premier institutions of higher education. Recently, *U.S. News & World Report* ranked FSU at the very top of the list of the nation’s most efficient universities in producing the highest quality education. At its March 2013 meeting, the FSU Board of Trustees formed a standing Committee on Efficiency (hereafter referred to as “the Committee”) to identify strategies for streamlining campus operations, reducing cost, and optimizing processes and policies in an effort to build upon FSU’s already renowned efficient campus environment.

Board of Trustees Chairman Allan Bense charged the Committee to identify opportunities to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of operations among the broad areas of finance and administration (to include facilities and support operations), university advancement, university relations (to include communication and marketing), student services, research, academics, and information technology services while remaining focused on maintaining or enhancing the overall quality and excellence of the University.

In order to facilitate this work, President Eric Barron has created an on-campus Efficiency & Effectiveness Committee (EEC) that will solicit and vet suggestions and comments from the campus community regarding ways to seek greater efficiencies and effectiveness, along with suggestions for reducing cost and saving time in areas throughout the University. These community suggestions will be vetted and documented by the EEC, then passed on to the Committee for consideration.

The EEC will begin its work by reviewing, vetting and providing feedback on the goal, guiding principles and operating guidelines developed by the Board of Trustees, and developing a process to be used as it considers recommendations. The EEC may form sub-committees and, following the requests for suggestions from the campus community, will vet and compile efficiency recommendations to be shared with the Board Committee. Feedback will be obtained from faculty, staff, students and vendors using multiple means. Each sub-committee will discuss and analyze proposals and feedback, and draft recommendations after discussions and subsequent meetings with additional campus representatives.

Recommendations will be documented and, where possible, estimated investment and cost savings will be provided. Comments and proposals may be submitted that exceed the immediate scope described here. The EEC may recommend that a separate ad hoc committee be established to take such comments under consideration. It is important to note that
recommendations provided may not necessarily contain projected cost savings, but rather present improved operational efficiencies and services. It is of utmost importance that the quality and excellence already existing at Florida State University be enhanced or, at a minimum, be maintained.

The EEC will also recommend a method for effectively documenting, and, where possible, capturing any monetary savings or additional revenues created, which could then be considered for reallocation. The EEC will consider the creation of a self-sustaining fund that could be used to cover the start-up costs of proposed efficiency projects and to pay incentives to employees when established criteria are met.

### ECC Composition

The EEC will consist of sixteen members and be chaired by Sam Huckaba, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. Committee members include:

1. Jennifer Buchanan (Provost’s Office)
2. Ralph Brower (Public Admin Faculty)
3. Bernie Waxman (Athletics)
4. Karen Gibson (Purchasing)
5. Allison Crume (Student Affairs)
6. Rick Burnette (Institutional Research)
7. Tom Jacobson (Env. Health & Safety)
8. Olivia Pope (Sponsored Research)
9. Caryn Beck-Dudley (Business Dean)
10. Ken Johnson (IT)
11. Mark Palazesi (HR)
12. Jim Stephens (Facilities)
13. Jim Dever (Business Faculty)
14. Judd Enfinfer (Controller)
15. Eric Algoe (Finance & Admin)

### Goal

The goal of the Committee is to identify ways of improving the general efficiency and effectiveness of the University’s operations that are in alignment with the mission of the university and that maintain our quality and excellence.

### Guiding Principles

Underlying the work of the Committee are the following guiding principles as it considers possible efficiency & effectiveness improvements:

1. Compliance with the regulatory, statutory, and policy environments under which the university operates must be respected, though changes may be suggested;
2. Academic quality must be maintained, and, if at all possible, enhanced;
3. Florida State’s reputation as a leading national public institution of higher education & research must be preserved;
4. Sound internal controls and best business practices should be sustained;
5. Investment costs must be objectively and subjectively evaluated against relative value.

Operating Guidelines

1. Explore opportunities to revised, simplify, eliminate or create policies, procedures, processes and/or practices to improve efficiencies/effectiveness in an effort to better meet the needs of the Florida State University faculty, staff and students (these may include recommendations for changes to FSU, B.O.T., or B.O.G. rules & policies as well as state statutes);
2. Explore opportunities to increase revenue;
3. Investigate opportunities to reduce employee workload or increase employee morale;
4. Develop ways to consolidate programs and services to avoid duplication of services while maintaining service to the constituents;
5. Explore opportunities for reallocation of funds, personnel and other resources, rather than reductions;
6. Examine options to outsource services for cost-effectiveness;
7. Explore opportunities to create and introduce financial incentives to encourage and recognize appropriate entrepreneurial risk taking to enhance revenue or reduce expenses.;
8. Develop ways to support and reward units for interdisciplinary collaborations and discourage unnecessary internal competition;
9. Identify methods to improve the communication and application of new policies, initiatives and procedures among the University community;
10. Find other opportunities not covered here that may be presented to the Committee for their consideration by faculty, staff, students and vendors that would increase the efficiency or effectiveness of the university.

A History of Efficiency and Effectiveness

In response to the decline in state-appropriated resources in recent academic years, Florida State University has implemented many innovative strategies to ensure that the institution upholds the high standards and quality of its academic programs, research endeavors and outreach efforts. While the institution has always pursued efforts to decrease costs and improve policies, many campus units have rededicated themselves to a zealous pursuit of optimizing efficiency and effectiveness in recent years. These strategies have resulted in better use of funds and resource allocation.
Periodically, academic and auxiliary units are asked to provide their efficiency strategies to demonstrate how they contain costs to operate more effectively. Over the past six years, budget cuts have exceeded $165 million and affected more than 800 positions. All areas of the University have been impacted by those budgetary constraints, yet they continue to find creative approaches to fulfill the institution’s mission while making progress towards achieving the University’s strategic goals.

Efficiency Committee Timeline

The work to establish the EEC along with the necessary complimentary systems and processes will span a one-year timeframe, throughout which, updates will be provided to the Committee at each regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees. A formal report of EEC recommendations will be presented to the Committee no later than April 2014.

Incentive Program for Faculty, Staff and Student Participation

With the ultimate goal of improving the level of efficiency and effectiveness, it is important to tap into and recognize a valuable resource for ideas – our collective campus community. An incentive program for employee participation would provide monetary bonuses and/or other awards to individuals or teams that identify procedures or ideas that are implemented and that result in eliminating or reducing expenditures, generating new revenues, or reallocating resources to achieve a greater efficiency while maintaining effectiveness and quality. The EEC will bring to the Committee a recommendation for such a program at FSU.

Ongoing Assessment and Documentation of Efforts

While the employee incentive program and the need to document evidence of demonstrable improvements or savings will be ongoing, the concentrated effort to conduct a campus-wide solicitation and feedback on efficiency ideas would not be as effective if repeated annually. The EEC will provide recommendations on future plans for maintaining a long term focus on efficiency and effectiveness. Additionally, the EEC will recommend a method and plan for reporting successes and progress on an ongoing basis to the Committee.
EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, MAY 28, 2013
1:00 -2:00PM
ROOM 204 LONGMIRE BLDG.

AGENDA

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME
Dean Sam Huckaba, Committee Chair

II. REVIEW OF PROPOSED WORK PLAN
Eric Algoe, Associate Vice President, Finance & Administration

III. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS
Dean Sam Huckaba, Committee Chair

IV. DOUBLE-SIDED PRINTING PRESENTATION
Elizabeth Swiman, Director of Campus Sustainability

IV. SEMINOLE GOLF COURSE PRESENTATION
Eric Algoe, Associate Vice President, Finance & Administration

V. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

VI. ADJOURNMENT
On May 13, 2013, at 1:18 PM, "Stokes, Garnett S." <gstokes@fsu.edu> wrote:

Mark, yes, I'm happy to have Eric send this on to the BOT Committee on Efficiency.

Best,
Garnett

From: Mark Hillis [mailto:markhillis64@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Stokes, Garnett S.
Cc: Algoe, Eric; Blankenship, Anne; Stokes, Garnett S.
Subject: Re: Answers to questions

Garnett,

Thank you very much for providing this information. It is very helpful. If it is ok with you I would like to ask Eric to forward your response to the members of BOT Committee on Efficiency for their review prior to our committee meeting on June 7.

Thanks again,

Mark Hillis
Cell: 850-524-2035

On May 10, 2013, at 9:38 AM, "Stokes, Garnett S." <gstokes@fsu.edu> wrote:

Good morning, Mark,

Eric Algoe forwarded several of your questions to me related to Academic Affairs for a response. I'm happy to provide the following information to you.

1. What degree programs were eliminated and/or not implemented during the past 5 academic years including year to date, and the cost savings related to each program?

Below is a list of degree programs that have been terminated. Tying cost savings to these programs is quite difficult. Often, new programs are started with few new resources. Most often, current faculty are already teaching the courses or the new program shares curriculum components of other programs. Many colleges make the best of limited existing resources by creating cutting-edge interdisciplinary degrees. Although most of those programs are successful in attracting students, as noted below, some are not.

The same is true with cost savings associated with terminated programs. Occasionally, degree programs become outmoded and newer degree programs take their place. This happens often in areas that rely on newer
technology. For example, a degree in library science was replaced with a degree in Information Technology (IT) and the digital training once offered in Graphic Design is now integrated into all aspects of the Studio Art curriculum. Usually same faculty members are qualified to teach in the new degree programs or members of the faculty have left and their replacements have expertise in the new area.

2. What degree programs are being considered to be eliminated and the projected savings?

The programs listed below also include anticipated programs. In addition, we have many degree programs that have been suspended, but not terminated. We are currently reviewing these programs to decide if the program should remain suspended, reactivated or terminated. This is also a part of the BOG Academic Program coordination project where degree programs that meet certain criteria (low enrollment, or insufficient number of degrees awarded) are reviewed by the Council of Academic Vice Presidents (CAVP) Academic Coordination Group for termination.

3. How can we push for greater use of the Tegrity software?

We are working on making Tegrity available to any interested faculty. In fact, on April 23, 2013 an announcement (see attached email) went out to all faculty regarding Tegrity. For the past couple of years, various options for lecture-capture software have been explored, with a consensus that Tegrity would be the software of choice. We have added the appropriate hardware and software in many classrooms across campus and have identified “champions” to help other interested faculty. Our Offices of Instruction Development and Instruction Technology offer courses on an on-going basis to help faculty members explore instructional design strategies, pedagogy, technologies and course media. We have made it a priority even during the very lean budget years to continue to update classroom technology each year.

I hope this information addresses your questions. If not, please do not hesitate to contact me for further information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Fiscal Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences Education (13.1308)</td>
<td>None; program had been defunct for many years and no students or faculty were associated with the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Degrees Terminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>B, M, S</td>
<td>Mental Disabilities (13.1006)</td>
<td>None; program incorporated into another degree in a reorganization of special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gerontology (30.1101)</td>
<td>None; established in 2001 with existing faculty as an interdisciplinary program and never attracted sufficient student interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Health Policy Research (51.9999)</td>
<td>None; established in 1999 with existing faculty as an interdisciplinary program and never attracted sufficient student interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Epidemiology (26.1309)</td>
<td>None; established in 2003 with existing faculty as an interdisciplinary program and never attracted sufficient student interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Graphic Design (50.0409)</td>
<td>None; no students were enrolled at the graduate level and the faculty effort was focused on teaching the undergraduate courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Music History and Literature (50.0902)</td>
<td>None; program discontinued because undergraduate student enrollment was low. No unique courses required for program; all courses still offered at graduate level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>Adult Education (13.1201)</td>
<td>None; program had been defunct for many years and no students or faculty were associated with the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Educational Evaluation and Research (13.0601)</td>
<td>None; program had been defunct for many years and no students or faculty were associated with the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Aquatic Environmental Science (26.1302)</td>
<td>None; currently offered as major within Oceanography with no curricular changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education (13.1210)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>Elementary Education (13.1202)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>English Education (13.1305)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>Multilingual/Multicultural Education (13.1306)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>Mathematics Education (13.1311)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, S, D</td>
<td>Reading Education (13.1315)</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science Education</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Disabilities</td>
<td>Resulted from reorganization of all graduate-level teacher ed. programs within one umbrella degree; will create curricular overlap and collaboration that should result in some unspecified level of cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>None; termination based on curricular change, and no changes made to faculty numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multinational Business</td>
<td>None; termination based on curricular change, and no changes made to faculty numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation, Tourism, and</td>
<td>Suspended in 2008 as a result of budget cuts; future expenditures to rebuild the graduate program have been saved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation Counseling</td>
<td>Two faculty lines eliminated in 2008 budget cuts; two remaining faculty reassigned to an active degree program (Counseling Psychology and School Psychology), resulting in approximately $48,000 savings in OPS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, M, S, D</td>
<td>Physical Education (13.1314)</td>
<td>Faculty lines eliminated during 2008 budget cuts; one reassigned to an active degree program, resulting in approximately $24,000 savings in OPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, M</td>
<td>Health Education (13.1307)</td>
<td>None; program had been defunct for many years and no students or faculty were associated with the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Bachelors  
M = Masters  
S = Specialist  
D = Doctoral

Notes:

- Many degree terminations occur because the degree has become obsolete and student demand drops below acceptable levels. This process takes place over years and is often associated with the retirement or departure of related faculty members.

- Unless an entire academic department is eliminated, the University is prohibited from laying off tenured faculty members through closure of a degree program. [See FSU BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 13.1(b).]

- Many of the programs noted above were terminated as a result of the annual review of degree program productivity (e.g., not producing an acceptable number of graduates over a five-year period). Until 2013, this review was conducted by the BOG staff, and from this point forward, it will be coordinated by the CAVP Academic Coordination Group. Preparations are under way for that review to occur in summer 2013, so the results and the implications for additional degree terminations are not yet known.