

Dr. Proctor noted that the U.S. Department of Education is conducting a national survey of users of data and information in an effort to improve state education research capabilities. CEPRI was one of the groups selected for this project. CEPRI provided input to this project via a conference call.

Dr. Proctor noted that he met with Dr. Paul Nagy from the University of Florida. He said that the University of Florida is exploring with Santa Fe Community College Campus, the possibility of jointly offering targeted baccalaureate degrees.

Dr. Proctor reported that he will be with Mr. Bob Taylor and the Education Committee of the Council of 100 on Thursday and Friday, and will give a presentation on higher education funding at the meeting.

Dr. Proctor introduced Mr. Bob Cox, the newest CEPRI staff member, to the Council.

Centers and Institutes

Dr. Glenda Rabby provided an overview of the staff's nationwide literature review on university centers and institutes conducted in conjunction with the Council's study on public postsecondary centers and institutes. She noted that as part of their comprehensive review, staff contacted the governing boards of 14 states, interviewed key personnel at 13 SUS peer institutions across the nation, and reviewed numerous articles, studies, surveys and other literature to ascertain how other states created and funded C&Is and how they evaluated their productivity and cost effectiveness. Although, C&Is are integral parts of the modern university, they are not easily defined. There are no standard definitions that embrace the thousands of C&Is around the country, nor are there common categories used to classify them. Despite these variances, Dr. Rabby noted that C&Is share many common attributes including activities that advance the missions of their institutions. In addition, C&Is contribute to regional, state and nationwide economic development, and attract faculty and external research dollars that result in scientific discovery and technological advances.

The literature review revealed that while there are no standard evaluation criteria for C&Is nationwide, there is general agreement among funding agencies, accountability boards, universities and researchers that evaluations should contain both quantitative (amount of external research expenditures, potential for grant leveraging, and number of research publications), and qualitative (development of knowledge and new discoveries, collaborative efforts with other C&Is, potential for technology transfer, and educational and training opportunities for students) indicators. Dr. Rabby noted that among those governing boards contacted, only the Texas board conducts a state-level review of select, separately budgeted C&Is. Other states however, have competitive grant funds available to centers with a strong potential for commercialization. Those C&Is are reviewed as part of the grant process. The peer institution review revealed that none of those universities were required to send an annual performance report for all of their C&Is to a state governing or legislative body. At the same time however, there appeared to be considerable more institutional oversight, review and analysis of those C&Is than at Florida institutions. Dr. Rabby reviewed the specific best practices used by peer institutions for the establishment and evaluation of C&Is. Best practices included clearly written specific criteria for the establishment, dissolution and evaluation of C&Is; regular internal reviews conducted by university wide faculty committees that report to the provosts or vice presidents for research; regular external reviews, or compilation of outside reviews, by

major funding sponsors for large multidisciplinary C&Is; and, comprehensive C&I data that is kept updated and available to the legislature or governing board upon request.

Dr. Rabby compared the best practices found in the literature review with those used in Florida. She determined that while Florida is the only state that requires that C&Is submit annual reports to a state governing board, those reports do not provide specific evaluation criteria or outcomes, and are not used by universities or the Division of Colleges and Universities to evaluate, fund, continue, or dissolve C&Is. In short, annual reporting to the central office is ineffective and does not contribute to the evaluation of C&Is. She noted that while many of the SUS institutions have designed or instituted internal C&I review and establishment policies, there is currently no systematic or coordinated process of internal institution-wide C&I evaluation at most institutions. Mr. Taylor asked Dr. Rabby to provide members with a summary of findings and recommendations at the next meeting. He inquired as to whether community colleges have organized units similar to C&Is on their campuses and if not, could they benefit from such entities. Dr. Rabby said she would report on that and other issues at the December meeting.

University Funding Equity

Dr. Nancy McKee presented the universities' responses to the equity funding survey. All universities had responded in a timely manner, and the responses had been shared with staff from the Governor's Office, the Department of Education, the Legislature, and the universities. While all universities indicated that an equity problem existed, there was no consensus on the causes of inequity. Most of the universities indicated that it was reasonable to expect universities to receive varying levels of funding, but there was no consensus on the reasons for which differential funding should be provided.

Mr. Taylor said that in the report, there needs to be a qualifier indicating that we are responding to the assignment within the context of what is today, but what is today may not be what it needs to be tomorrow. He indicated that funding K-20 is the bigger issue, and that we are dealing with just a piece of it here. He said that we need "wiggle room" to fix it later, in case a different system of funding needs to be in place. Mr. Taylor also said it would be a challenge to develop a set of principles on which we are grounding our recommendations.

Master Plan

Teaching Profession Report - Committee Chairman Mr. Ed Moore presented a 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 considerable input on the issues of the report was gained during a series of open hearings during the past three months. 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. Responding to a question by Mr. Taylor, Mr. Moore identified the following key issues: 1) improving recruitment through higher entry-level teacher salaries and career ladders for teachers, 2) greater flexibility for the colleges of education in program development and delivery, 3) methods to entice former

teachers to return to the classroom, and 4) programs to retain strong teachers, like additional retirement options.

Mr. Moore concluded by stating that a public hearing will be scheduled to formally review the draft report and gain additional feedback from all interested parties.

Workforce Development Report - Ms. Tara Goodman presented the draft of the Master Plan Committee on Workforce Development. Mr. Taylor suggested the following to improve on the Committee's work: 1) a strong problem statement in the introduction; 2) addressing the funding situation for workforce development programs; and 3) consider specific solutions to address defragmentation in the workforce development system. Ms. Goodman indicated that these issues would be discussed in the Committee meeting that was set to convene following adjournment of the full Council meeting.

K-20 Structure Report - Mr. Taylor noted that there are a number of figures in the report that need verification. Mr. Taylor noted that the first page of the report is basically saying that we are about ready to implement the K-20 System. He said if it is successful, there would be a new model to look at nationwide. He said, the report comments that the new system is replacing the historical structure of the three separate systems we have talked about. Mr. Taylor noted that there are some major roadblocks. He said that everyone got mobilized and fired up to do something, billions of dollars were invested in education, countless hours of time and energy invested, and the fact is, nothing much has happened. He said that the major structural obstacles are still in place as a result of special interest groups, who have a very strong interest in maintaining a status quo. Educational leaders have focused people's interviews on secondary issues and not the major ones. As a result, people get involved and do something, which doesn't amount to much, and then they go away. He said certain issues have been too hard to deal with. There has been a lack of public or political will to take on certain issues.

Mr. Taylor said that those that have been involved in reform are starting to throw up their hands and say this is not working, I'm wasting my money and energy, and I'm going to go do something else. Mr. Taylor noted that this is exactly what we don't need to happen. He said, if we continue to focus our efforts on secondary issues and not the "big stuff," then those efforts will continue to fail, and we will be in the same situation we've been in. He said, we won't take the actions we need to take and we'll continue to say that education is important, but we won't get where we're going. Mr. Taylor noted that this is the case and we need to accept that with 20 years of history and a lot of energy expended, we have very little results to show for it. He did say there are a number of things in place that are starting to work. But these too, will not work if we don't get some of the "big stuff" out of the way.

Mr. Taylor noted what's needed to fix the major obstacles. These are: 1) high quality leadership, 2) move away from elected superintendents, 3) change certain provisions in the Sunshine Law, and 4) the need for key leverage points, that include: a) focus on early childhood education, b) stronger and better coordinated focus on a career education workforce, and c) ensuring the quality of teachers.

Mr. Taylor noted that the leadership of educational institutions is going to respond very strongly to the manner in which money flows. Mr. Taylor noted that there is a need for clear and consistent focus.

Other Items of Interest

There were no other items of interest at this time.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 11, 2002, at the Advanced Technology Center, Florida Community College in Jacksonville.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 6, 2002.

William B. Proctor
Executive Director