

Ms. Pat Telson asked whether writing was taught and the Chairman replied that writing is emphasized in English and History, but that penmanship is not covered.

Mr. Taylor asked if everything available at the school could be covered by the average dollars per FTE provided in the public schools and the Chairman indicated that it would be even less. Chairman Morgaman said there were a number of reasons for this including the physical and organizational structure of the school, and the student body. However, he suggested that while the school was probably not replicable in all situations, it was an excellent example of what is possible. He then proceeded to conduct a tour of the campus. Highlights included the Institute for Mathematics and Computer Science, a review of the school's Honor Code, which is authorized and overseen by students, and discussions with faculty and students about their experience at the school.

Mr. Taylor asked the Chairman to summarize the key decisions which contributed to the success of the school and he replied: 1) Focus investments on operating enhancements that impact what takes place in the classroom; 2) The emphasis on a "one big family" orientation; and 3) A willingness to experiment along with a readiness to adopt quickly if the experiment does not yield the expected results. Chairman Morgaman said that the school depends upon a balance between education and business interests. He said that while final decisions rest with the business people, the bottom line is the quality of the educational experience. In response to Dr. Akshay Desai, the Chairman described the decision making chain of the school. The Board is responsible for approval of the budget and any subsequent amendments. The Academic Council, consisting of the Headmaster, Department Chairs and others, meets weekly and is responsible for the ongoing operation of the school. The Council has both administrative and curriculum sub-groups. He said that the President is responsible for approving any basic policy change at the school and also deciding on any recommendations for student expulsions.

Later in the meeting the Chairman recognized Les Gordon, Assistant Headmaster, and Norma Blackman, Director of the Lighthouse Point Academy, the component of the school which serves 350 students with learning disabilities in grades K-6. Mr. Gordon said the program serves students with high average to above average IQs and mild to moderate learning disabilities. He said that, while inclusion is currently the popular approach, he is not sure it is always the most effective. He said that Lighthouse Point Academy employs a number of strategies, including small groups of no more than 12; with mainstreaming in all non-academic core courses and activities. The average student gains range between 1.4 to 1.8 years per school year. In response to Ms. Telson, he said an external evaluator verifies these results. He discussed the Honor Code and said that their students face their share of problems: divorce, absentee parents, and drug/alcohol abuse. The school operates as an extended family/community in providing preparation for life. He said starting from the sixth grade, all students participate in regular community meetings to address concerns that arise. Mr. Taylor reflected that the school, by focusing on the whole person, was providing a personal growth experience of which instruction is a part, and suggested the school has something of value to share with others. Mr. Gordon said that the goal is to meet student needs for power/recognition, fun, intimacy and choice, in positive ways. Ms. Blackman said that this environment attracts a particular type of teacher who is suited to this approach. Mr. Gordon said it is not about the courses. It is about the student interaction. Ms. Telson asked if this approach would be possible in a 3,000-student high school. The Chairman said that it probably would not, but that this raises the question of whether we have to have 3,000-student high schools.

Executive Director's Report

Dr. Proctor discussed the CEPRI presentation to the Senate on Friday, May 3, 2002, and thanked Mr. Moore for his participation. Dr. Proctor said that he recently met with the presidents of the University of North Florida and Florida Community College of Jacksonville, and that the two leaders have subsequently agreed to cooperatively offer a baccalaureate program at Florida Community College of Jacksonville, with the University of North Florida awarding the degree. Mr. Taylor noted that Edison and Florida Gulf Coast University also have reached agreement on a number of AS to BS programs locally and are also developing a proposal to address the AS transfer issue statewide. Mr. Taylor said that the key to the success of cooperative initiatives is the active involvement of the local boards of trustees. After further discussion, the Council unanimously recommended that the Chairman forward the CEPRI recommendations concerning community college baccalaureate proposals and the overall issue of baccalaureate degrees access to the chair of each board of trustees.

Faculty Productivity Issues in the State Universities

Dr. Jon Rogers presented a draft memo intended to accompany the consultant's report on Faculty Productivity. The memo provides context to the study by recognizing the new education governance structure and, specifically, the devolution of decision-making down to the campuses and local boards of trustees. The memo also identifies CEPRI's role in the development of a K-20 Performance Plan that will include a broad series of performance measures.

Mr. Morgaman expressed the view that the consultant report is a research report that does not include an analysis of alternate approaches to increase productivity. Mr. Taylor concurred that the report fails to say what ought to be done. Mr. Morgaman recommended that the final report include a second section that provides a discussion of the use of the planned K-20 Performance Plan and the role of the new university boards of trustees. He asked Mr. Taylor and Mr. Moore to assist staff in the development of the new section.

Dr. Tom Auxter, President of the United Faculty of Florida, discussed his views on how faculty productivity should be defined and measured. Mr. Morgaman invited Dr. Auxter to propose an amendment to the report that addresses how to measure faculty productivity and how to examine institution comparisons. These work products will be presented to the full Council at its next meeting.

Student Progression Cohort Analysis

Ms. Tara Goodman and Mr. David Wright presented an annual update of the Council's longitudinal cohort study. A progress report is submitted annually to the Governor, Legislature, and Board of Education in response to proviso directing the Council to continue its longitudinal cohort study of the progression of public high school graduates as they enroll in, advance through, and graduate from the state's postsecondary education delivery system and enter the workforce. The current status report documents the postsecondary progress of the cohort through the spring term of 2001, or seven years after high school graduation.

The two major outcomes addressed in this progress report were the likelihood of baccalaureate degree completion and the time students in the cohort took to earn their first bachelor's degree. Analyses examined the relationship between these outcomes and a variety of pre-college

student attributes, college student experiences, and institutional characteristics. First and foremost, the study results reinforce the importance of academic preparation and achievement at the high school level. Additionally, starting at a state university, full-time continuous enrollment, and postsecondary grade point average were the postsecondary factors with the strongest effect on the likelihood of earning the degree within the time period analyzed. However, the negative relationship between the likelihood of baccalaureate degree completion and variables such as community college matriculation and part-time attendance was mitigated for students with stronger high school academic backgrounds.

The time students took to earn the first baccalaureate degree was decreased most by the student's high school grade point average. Conversely, it was increased most by two variables: pursuit of a longer-than-average academic major and the number of "stopouts" in enrollment within the tracking period. For students enrolled in baccalaureate degree programs requiring more than 128 semester hours, the estimated time to degree increased by 1.8 semesters. Likewise, for each fall or spring term a student was not enrolled in classes, the time to degree increased by 1.2 semesters. After controlling for other factors, time to degree decreased by just over half a semester for students who initially enrolled at a state university as opposed to a community college.

Ms. Goodman pointed out several of the study's limitations, such as reliance on student social security numbers for tracking, the exclusion of data on private high school graduates, and limited postsecondary data from independent and career institutions. She also presented contrasts in the profiles of matriculants to community colleges, independent institutions, and state universities in terms of their demographic, pre-collegiate, and postsecondary experiences and behaviors.

Mr. Wright presented seven-year bachelor's degree attainment rates for a number of student characteristics. He cautioned, however, that focusing on one variable at a time can be misleading. Therefore, the staff also utilized statistical techniques that enabled them to estimate statistical models for "likelihood of completion" and "time to degree" that controlled for the presence of other predictor variables.

Council member Mr. Ed Moore thanked staff for the report and asked that, in the future, progression and graduation rates be calculated for individual institutions. He also requested an analysis that compares the state university grade point averages of community college AA transfers to only the *upper division* GPA of SUS native students. He pointed out that the statewide Articulation Report published by the Department of Education utilizes the entire cumulative GPA for SUS native students, which does not provide the basis for a valid comparison. Finally, he directed staff to revisit the narrative in the Conclusion section of the report regarding the negative impact of transfer activity on bachelor's degree completion. He asked that the discussion include the implications of this finding relevant to the Council's consideration of community college baccalaureate degree program proposals.

Dr. Patricia Windham, Director of Student Success and Accountability for the Division of Community Colleges, provided public testimony. Dr. Windham reiterated the differences between students who generally enroll in the open door community college system and the competitive state university system. She added that the application of statistical controls to any comparisons that are made does not imply that students from the two groups are alike in all respects. She assured the Council that community colleges are doing a good job with the

population of students they serve. Chairman Morgaman agreed and thanked Dr. Windham for her comments.

The Council unanimously accepted the report.

Public Postsecondary Centers and Institutes

Dr. Glenda Rabby presented an overview of the Council's study on state university research centers and institutes. The purpose of the study is to review the activities of public postsecondary research centers and institutes and analyze the benefits derived by the state and people of Florida from those activities. As part of her presentation, Dr. Rabby provided data on the funding and activities of the 416 centers and institutes located at the 10 state universities. She noted that the ongoing analysis will be based on a wide variety of sources including an electronic survey and other data requests submitted to the C&Is and university financial officers; site visits to the 10 state universities; a return on investment analysis of centers and institutes using the Economic Impact Model (REMI); and an extensive literature review of available information regarding center and institute activities.

Findings presented in Dr. Rabby's report included expenditure data that revealed that almost three quarters (72%) of total C&I expenditures in 2000-01 were generated by external (non-state) dollars. Concomitantly, C&Is expended approximately 25% of all SUS externally generated research expenditures and 27% of all SUS (state) appropriated research expenditures that year. A more detailed analysis of the annual reports submitted by the C&Is to the Division of Colleges and Universities revealed that 147 C&Is reported \$0 expenditures in 2000-01. Mr. Moore asked Dr. Rabby if that meant that the universities were expending money that the Legislature had earmarked for C&I activities. Dr. Rabby noted that the C&Is with no expenditures in 2000-01 were type 2 or 3 centers, not type 1 centers that have received a direct appropriation from the Legislature. Type 2 centers expend SUS appropriated dollars that are distributed from a lump sum legislative appropriation to the university. The decisions to allocate those dollars to C&Is are made at the dean or departmental level. Type 3 centers and institutes expend only externally generated dollars. Dr. Rabby noted that 98 of those 147 C&Is did not expend funds the year before. This has prompted discussion that a more thorough review process (one that includes a provision for center dissolution) should be enacted at the campus level.

Dr. Rabby told council members that as the study progresses, she will invite faculty and administrators from the state universities to present information and recommendations for consideration at future council meetings. Dr. Thomas Breslin, Vice President of Sponsored Research at Florida International University, told council members that C&Is provide an important mechanism for faculty to conduct leading edge interdisciplinary research as well as for attracting crucial external funding and support. He noted that research activities at the larger C&Is, including those type 1s with a statewide mission, foster economic development technology transfer, and important scientific discovery and application.

Constitutional Amendments

Dr. Nancy McKee presented the following information on proposed constitutional amendments related to education: 1) Revisions to the paper on Class Size; 2) Brochures on Class Size and Governance; and 3) A draft of the Pre-Kindergarten paper. After discussion by the Council, changes were made to each item.

Other Items of Interest and Member Concerns

There were no other items or concerns.

Public Comment

Mr. Tom Green from Broward Community College provided his views on the progression study. He stated that, for some community college students, the declared degree intent might not be a reliable indicator of whether they eventually seek a credential or the credential they seek. Ms. Goodman agreed and responded that for this reason, Council staff elected to combine an indicator of student intent with actual enrollment history. This is similar to the method used by community colleges in their cohort-based accountability measures for retention and success.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held in Tampa on Thursday, July 11, 2002.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m. on Tuesday, May 7, 2002.

William B. Proctor
Executive Director