

NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE FULL COUNCIL AT ITS NEXT MEETING. SHOULD REVISIONS BE MADE, THEY WILL BE INCLUDED AS AN ITEM IN THE MINUTES OF THAT MEETING.

Minutes of the Meeting of the
COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION POLICY, RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT
Wednesday, December 11, 2002
Florida Community College at Jacksonville
Advanced Technology Center
Jacksonville, Florida

Members Present: Akshay Desai Bob Taylor
 Diane Leone Pat Telson
 Bob McIntyre

Members Absent: Philip Morgaman
 Jacob Stuart

The meeting was called to order and the Council members were welcomed.

Welcome

Ms. Susan Lehr, Vice President of Government Relations, Florida Community College of Jacksonville (FCCJ), welcomed everyone and invited the Council to take a tour of the facilities. Ms. Lehr said that the Advanced Technology Center (ATC) was built in response to a study done by the Chamber of Commerce. The study focused on the kinds of businesses they wanted to attract to North East Florida. She said that the ATC has 87 miles of cable. There are flex labs where employers, who are coming into town and building a new facility, can store equipment and begin training. When their building is ready they can move in with trained employees.

Ms. Lehr said that the facility is one of six in the world of CISCO training academies. She said they train the trainers. Ms. Lehr said that there are only 15 people in the world that CISCO recognizes to teach their highest level of CISCO network engineering, and two of those people are at FCCJ.

Dr. Steve Wallace, President, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, welcomed everyone and said that we will be able to experience the future of technical and career education by touring the facility.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the November 6, 2002, meeting were approved as circulated.

Chairman's Report

There was no Chairman's report at this time.

Executive Director's Report

Dr. William Proctor noted that he and Mr. Bob Taylor attended the Council of 100 meeting and participated with the Education Committee and its sub-committee on university funding. Dr. Proctor said he presented the funding picture for all education.

Dr. Proctor noted that he and Ms. Diane Leone attended the Leadership Jacksonville meeting. He said that the meeting focused on education and he presented a general overview of education in our state, including the potential impact of the recently passed constitutional amendments dealing with education. He said that the first question that came from the membership was, "How soon can we repeal the Class-size Amendment?"

Dr. Proctor noted that he was asked to serve on the Steering Committee of the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. He said the group advises the National Center for Education Statistics on policy and data issues.

Dr. Proctor noted that the Higher Education Funding Advisory Council met and approved the recommendations of the funding group.

Dr. Proctor noted that Dr. John Wiegman and Mr. Juan Copa will be attending the SERVE Research and Policy Symposium on Class-Size Reduction and Beyond in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. He also noted that Dr. Wiegman attended a meeting of the Florida State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Children. Dr. Proctor thanked Ms. Leone and Mr. Taylor for attending the meetings.

Dr. Proctor acknowledged Senator Stephen Wise in the audience.

Master Plan

Teaching Profession Recommendations – Mr. McIntyre reviewed the public testimony that was received by the Committee at a public hearing on the draft report that was held the previous day. He was pleased with the interest of the public in the Committee's work and the many positive comments on the report from a variety of deans, administrators and teachers from around the state.

Dr. Jon Rogers presented a brief overview of the draft report of the work of the Committee on the Status of the Teaching Profession entitled: **Florida Teachers and the Teaching Profession**. He said that, at the direction of the Committee, the report is practitioner-focused and is based on the expressions of all levels of Florida educators. The goal of this work is stated as one of the Council's five strategic imperatives for its Master Plan: *"To ensure that the critical link between the student and the system at all levels is provided by the highest quality and most motivated teachers available – in numbers sufficient to meet the needs of the system."* The Committee produced a "Data Update" which displays current data and projections on the key issues affecting teachers and the teaching profession.

Panel discussions were held with school district superintendents, deans and directors of teacher education programs, district administrators, school principals and classroom teachers. During the development of the draft report, the Committee has been committed to "freeing up" the systems and removing constraints at the local level that deal directly with teacher recruitment,

hiring, compensation and retention, and to increasing the flexibility available to programs responsible for increasing the supply of high quality teachers. Three overarching needs emerged:

- To provide flexibility for school districts.
- To increase the supply of high quality teachers.
- To provide flexibility for teacher education programs.

Mr. Taylor requested a more succinct summary of the report that identifies a small number of top priority issues that can be immediately addressed. He also asked for additional information on the status of colleges of education and how they function within the current university structure.

The Council deferred action on the report until its January meeting in Tallahassee.

Funding Policy Options – President Steve Wallace said that it was his privilege to introduce a true luminary in the field of higher education, Dr. Dennis Jones, President of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. He recalled that when he was in Minnesota, the governance of postsecondary education was consolidated and Dr. Jones was the lead consultant in designing the funding framework for the merged Minnesota State College and University System. Dr. Wallace indicated he could think of no one better equipped to assist the Council in thinking about funding Florida's new K-20 system.

Dr. Jones discussed the briefing paper he prepared to provide the Council with a framework for addressing finance policy. He said that a major goal is to link funding to the achievement of identified state priorities. He described the flow of funding and emphasized the need to consider how all sources of support interact. For example, he said that finance starts with state economies. When they are down, individual family budgets are also strained. He noted that offsetting declining state revenue with large tuition increases, should be handled carefully to avoid unintended negative consequences. He cited a recent analysis of State Fiscal Outlooks developed by the Rockefeller Institute which ranked Florida 43rd among the states in terms of the projected shortfall between expected revenues and expenditure requirements. He said rapid growth in Medicaid costs (estimated at 10% per year) is a major contributing factor to these gaps and that these health care costs are likely to increase at an even greater rate in Florida.

With regard to higher education, he noted that Florida received a "D" for affordability in measuring up 2002, and that this is due primarily to the state's low investment in need-based aid. He said that low tuition does not equate to an affordable education. He observed that large, established institutions do not require proportionally more need-based aid because the median family income of their students is generally higher.

Dr. Jones presented a Finance Policy Matrix that addressed core capacity and use of existing capacity in terms of both institutional and student needs. He said that most issues relate to better use of what is available rather than building more capacity. Mr. Taylor asked if the new K-20 structure should be another factor in the matrix. Dr. Jones replied that the question is how should Florida use what it has to address issues across the K-20 spectrum, such as high school dropout rates, degree production, and adult literacy.

Dr. Jones said that ideally, funding policy should provide a balance among adequate institutional support that is affordable to both the state and individual students. He again noted that income profiles vary greatly among institutions and that where changes are standardized statewide, some people are getting a really good deal. Mr. McIntyre observed that a large proportion of students at the University of Florida and Florida State are paying little or no tuition due to Bright Futures. Dr. Jones said that was why tuition-supported, need-based aid should be addressed on a statewide basis rather than retained by each institution. Dr. Desai said that an effective approach would be to allow each institution the flexibility to charge market prices based on demand and then provide need-based aid as required. He then asked how higher education could best be linked to economic development needs. Dr. Jones cited forgivable loans or institutional rewards related to responsiveness to workforce needs such as in the areas of teaching and nursing. In contrast, he noted that Georgia's Hope Scholarship has not significantly changed the profile of students. It changes where they attend, but does not help the students who were not enrolling previously. He observed that the merit programs are extremely popular and difficult to change once in place. Dr. Jones said that the state is both the owner/operator of public education as well as a purchaser of services. The key is to identify three or four needs of the state and determine how educators can address these. He said initiatives along these lines were underway in Kentucky, North Dakota, and West Virginia, and addressing such challenges as increasing per capita income to the national average by 2020, reducing high school dropouts, and achieving adult literacy. Mr. Taylor asked for examples of actions taken. Dr. Jones mentioned matching funds for endowed faculty chairs and centralized oversight of literacy initiatives with incentive-based or student performance. Dr. Desai asked about specific actions in Kentucky related to the dropout problem and the need for knowledge workers. Dr. Jones mentioned that local P-16 councils are proposed that would be based on natural catchment areas with incentive funding for collaboration. He said the most effective way higher education can assist K-12 is at the local level. With regard to knowledge workers, he said that a community college system was created to provide access opportunities for all students. When considering ways to create high skills workers, he said joint relationships with industry are critical rather than simply building more facilities (the Field of Dreams approach).

He noted that North Carolina is just one notch up from Kentucky in terms of its socio-economic characteristics, but it has a world-class higher education system. Ms. Pat Telson observed that the issue of university degree production is tied directly to K-12 preparation. Dr. Jones said that, in the past, the blame game was prevalent with sectors pointing at the lack of prepared students or teachers as the problem. Now, the entire system is collectively responsible, and the most effective action is through local collaboration. He observed that structure alone is not the solution.

With regard to equity, he said this should relate to base funding, and special issues should be addressed through initiative or incentive funding or competitive grants. Dr. Jones discussed the learning center approach, which focuses on offering what is needed through collaboration rather than from a single provider. He noted that Oklahoma has assigned its universities program responsibility areas, rather than geographic service areas.

Dr. Jones displayed a national chart that focused on leaks in the pipeline at key junctures: grades 9-12, high school to college, and graduation from college. He observed that Florida produces 13 college graduates for every 100 ninth graders; somewhat below the national average of 18. Mr. Taylor observed that the people slipping out of the pipeline often need career education, which is not a cohesive, well-funded component of the overall system. Dr.

Jones observed that highly trained workers such as engineers are clearly more mobile and adaptable than that of lower levels.

In closing Dr. Jones suggested identifying the two or three major issues, which need attention, and building awareness of the public, editorial boards, and legislators of these issues. In other words, market the problems first rather than the solutions. Then, he said it would be appropriate to determine how finance, tuition, and financial aid policies should be aligned to address these problems. He mentioned that Colorado was discussing a pure voucher system, but noted that institutional and student choices do not always serve the highest public needs. He said funding can foster better collaboration, but some involvement of non-government organizations is needed to move beyond just what the traditional providers believe is needed. He said that issues should be addressed on a county-by-county basis.

Mr. Taylor thanked Dr. Jones and indicated the Council may call upon him for further assistance in the future.

Centers and Institutes

Dr. Rabby presented a summary of the final chapter as well as the conclusions and recommendations for the Centers and Institute (C&I) Study. She noted that in January Council members would receive the complete study with an executive summary and appendix. The appendix will contain brief reviews of all the C&Is that were visited as part of the site visits conducted by staff.

Dr. Rabby provided an overview of the staff activities and previous chapters contained in the C&I report. As part of the analysis of public postsecondary C&Is, staff reviewed the annual reports submitted by C&Is to the Division of Colleges and Universities (DCU); conducted a survey of the 512 centers and institutes; conducted a return on investment analysis using REMI, 2000; conducted a nationwide literature review and peer institution analysis; conducted site visits to the ten state universities, and reviewed additional C&I data and information. Dr. Rabby said that in general, the data revealed that C&Is were cost effective and productive settings for addressing many of the state's most fundamental and high priority concerns. In addition, C&Is were adept at leveraging state dollars into lucrative contact and grant funding; they respond rapidly to issues and problems across discipline boundaries; and they provide professional oriented activities for undergraduate and graduate students. The literature review revealed that Florida is unique in requiring all of its C&Is to submit an annual report to a state governing body. Those reports contain fiscal and descriptive information, but do not provide evaluative elements that can be compared or analyzed over time. These annual reports are not routinely used by universities to evaluate, fund, continue, or disband C&Is. At the same time however, the review revealed that some C&Is are not as well integrated into the "ethos of accountability" that applies to other academic units that receive greater and more systematic institutional review and evaluation. Finally, staff determined that the current C&I taxonomy (Type 1,2,3,) has become increasingly less meaningful and descriptive of C&I activities, mission and funding, particularly to external funding agencies.

Based on these findings the staff made recommendations geared to improve C&I accountability, visibility, and productivity. Highlights of the recommendations include the abolishment of Chancellor's Memorandum (CM-C-0.7-01/99). This statewide policy establishes the current classification (Type 1,2,3) and sets forth the procedures for the annual report to the DCU. In place of the current C&I taxonomy, staff recommended that, upon recommendation by the

Council for Academic Vice Presidents, all former Type 1 C&Is be reclassified as State of Florida Centers and Institutes. Additionally, all existing Type 2 and 3 Centers and Institutes in the State University System should be re-classified as University Centers and Institutes. Each university should develop and publish clearly defined polices for the establishment, evaluation and discontinuance of University Centers and Institutes. The evaluation process and specific evaluative criteria used by the universities (and by the CAVP) should consist of commonly accepted professional standards and performance-based outcomes. Staff recommended that all State of Florida and University C&Is should maintain an up-to-date website that includes minimum directory and fiscal information, the date of the most recent C&I evaluation, and a link to where the results of that evaluation may be requested and obtained. Each university should maintain an up-to-date informational/directory web site on its C&Is with links to the individual C&I web sites. In lieu of the current annual report requirement, staff recommended that, using a procedure developed by the DCU, each university provide basic descriptive and contact information to the DCU for all of its State of Florida Centers and Institutes and for all of its University Centers and Institutes by October 1 of each year. The nature of the basic descriptive and contact information should be determined by the DCU. The DCU should provide this information to the Leadership Board of Applied Research and Public Service (LBARPS) to be displayed on that board's Expert Net Website.

After a brief Council discussion, Mr. Taylor asked Dr. Rabby to be sure and incorporate the findings and reasoning behind all of the recommendations in the executive summary to be presented a the January meeting.

Equity of University Funding

Dr. Nancy McKee and Mr. Bob Cox presented the draft report on the Equity of University Funding. After hearing the proposed definition of equity, Mr. Taylor indicated that it did not comment on the role of the university in the overall K-20 system, that the funding process should be proper for each university and proper for the system. He also asked if the report could be organized to first discuss the fundamental base, those considerations that should be included in calculating equity and why, and then address those considerations that should not be included and why.

Dr. Daniel Coleman, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Planning & Institutional Effectiveness at Florida International University, expressed concern about the recommendation to keep the current funding formula for two reasons: (1) the more that an institution has to spend per student, the more funding the formula generates for new students; and (2) the formula supplants general revenue and lottery with fees collected from out-of-state students.

The Council directed staff to look at the formula's impact on the funding of out-of-state students.

Constitutional Amendments

Dr. Proctor noted that he would email information on the amendments to the Chairman. He also noted that the Governance and the Class-size amendments are the most critical.

Committee Reports

Structure – Mr. Taylor suggested that the Council provide the policy-makers with guidelines of what should be addressed. He suggested the Council address the impact of not taking action. He said that there are three major opportunities for the Council to improve things with minimum resources: 1) Early Childhood Education, 2) fully coordinated and effective career education, and 3) quality of teachers. Mr. Taylor noted that the Council's responsibility is to submit action plans. He noted that the Council should face a couple of structural changes; funding, structure of how the State governs the K-12 system, and the issue of solid long-term strategy. Mr. Taylor suggested that the Council look at these issues, and reflect them in the agenda. He also suggested that the Council comment on these issues and create a short paper that can be presented to the Governor.

Career Education and Development - Ms. Tara Goodman noted that the committee had a productive conference call after their last meeting. There were some changes made to the draft. She noted that there are still some issues that the Committee is working through.

Other Items of Interest

There were no other items of interest at this time.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 8, 2003, at the College of Medicine, Florida State University.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m. on Wednesday, December 11, 2002.



William B. Proctor
Executive Director