

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, October 9, 2002
Broward Community College Center
Pembroke Pines, Florida

Members Present: Akshay Desai
Bob McIntyre
Robert Taylor

Members Absent: Diane Leone Jacob Stuart
Ed Moore Pat Telson
Philip Morgaman

The meeting was opened and the Council members were welcomed.

Welcome

Broward Community College (BCC) President, Dr. Will Holcombe, welcomed the Council and introduced Dr. Jeff Allbritten, Director of the Pines Center. He discussed the history of the Academic Village, which is a K-20 resource in partnership with the City of Pembroke Pines as well as a regional library. He noted the role played by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission in recommending the Broward Community College Center four years ago. Dr. Holcombe discussed the role of the community colleges as the primary access point to postsecondary education. He said because funding has not kept the pace with enrollment growth, class schedules have been limited. In response to Vice Chairman Akshay Desai, he said that career programs at the college are designed to respond to employer needs. The State Board of Nursing has recently authorized an increase in the college RN Program. In spite of limited funds, the college has developed an on-line component for the program to assist in serving this increased enrollment.

Vice Chairman Desai asked about barriers to meeting identified needs. Dr. Holcombe noted that the colleges receive no local funding. They depend primarily on the State and tuition (which has been kept within a close range by the State) for support. He said that a State authorized matching gift program has been successful in generating additional resources (the BCC foundation endowment has increased from \$500,000 to \$50 million during his tenure) but it has not been funded for the past two years. He also noted the decline in overall workforce funding and the lack of funding for Horizon and Critical Jobs after proposals had been developed with employers. Mr. Robert Taylor asked what would be done differently in the K-20 system. Dr. Holcombe noted that he had served on the Articulation Coordinating Committee since the 1980's and the focus of this group has always been K-20. He said if the system places a focus on student progress, particularly at key transition points within public schools and between the sectors, it could make a difference. He said we should act on what we know. He said that in the area of teacher education last year, the county required more than twice the number of

teachers produced by area postsecondary institutions. While he understood a reluctance not to extend four-year program authority to more colleges at this time, he said it did not make sense to exclude community colleges from participation in alternate teacher preparation programs.

Mr. Taylor asked why funding was limited for the colleges given the vital role they play. Dr. Holcombe said that the State has never fully committed to funding performance. He also noted that it is not a question of diverting limited resources from other education sectors, but because of the relative size of the community college budget, it would not take much additional funding to make a difference. Dr. William Proctor noted that workforce funding represents less than 4% of the public schools budget, while it is over 30% in the community colleges. He thanked Dr. Holcombe for his comments and many contributions to the community colleges and education overall. Vice Chairman Desai thanked Dr. Holcombe and Dr. Allbritten for hosting the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 18, 2002, meeting were approved as circulated.

Chairman's Report

There was no chairman's report at this time.

Executive Director's Report

Dr. Proctor noted that he spoke at the Envisioning Conference in California. This year the topic was dealing with the Master Plan for all education and the impact on higher education. Dr. Proctor noted that a joint legislative committee wrote the California Master Plan. He noted that student articulation is problematic in California. He also said that you couldn't transfer from one community college to another and have your credits count, much less go from a community college to a state university, and have a guarantee that your credits will transfer. Dr. Proctor said that Florida may not have the best system, but we've chose wisely for our students.

Dr. Proctor noted that he attended the Council for Educational Leadership in Denver. He said that the charter school issue is running into some rough times because of the lack of accountability in some states, and some states have weak laws on charter schools. He said the perception of the charter school folks is that they want to be left totally alone and do their own thing. He said they are advocating that we should be accountable; otherwise, the whole concept of charter schools is going to crumble under criticism that we're not particularly accountable.

Mr. David Wright presented, for viewing, the cohort study on the bachelor's degree web tool. Dr. Proctor said that CEPRI sent the study to other SHEEO agencies throughout the country. Dr. Proctor said that Mr. Wright, Ms. Tara Goodman, and Mr. Juan Copa presented the study at the Florida Association of Institutional Research, and they are presenting it at the Southern Association of Institutional Research.

Dr. Proctor noted that he would meet with the Jacksonville City Council's Task Force on Education on October 10, 2002. He said they are looking at involving the city in addressing education problems in the City of Jacksonville. Dr. Proctor said he is to give a presentation on school and class size. He said the task force wants to also talk about financial aid.

Centers and Institutes

Dr. Rabby gave a brief update on the Centers and Institutes Study. She reminded members that part of the Council's Legislative charge was to assess the return on the state's investment in C&I activities. Staff had approached this directive from several different approaches some of which had been previously discussed. Dr. Rabby explained that to ascertain the full extent of the impact and benefits of C&I expenditures, it was necessary to conduct an economic input/output analysis using a well-accepted economic modeling tool. Consequently, staff asked economists Dr. Tim Lynch, and Dr. Julie Harrington, directors of FSU's Center for Economic Forecasting and Analysis, to use the REMI, 2000 economic model to measure the impact of C&Is on Florida's economy. Dr. Rabby introduced Dr. Lynch who provided a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the findings of the analysis. Dr. Lynch noted that the REMI model measures the increase in employment and economic output generated by C&I activities across the broader statewide economy. C&I expenditures were put into a Florida regional input-output model that included cross linkages between every sector of the full Florida economy. Dr. Lynch explained that the definition of C&I economic impact is the difference between existing economic activity in Florida and the level of economic activity that would exist in the absence of university C&Is. The results of the economic analysis using the expenditure approach model indicated that C&Is perform a significant role in the state of Florida economy. The economic benefits extend to job creation, GRP, personal income and state taxes, for all types of C&Is. Some highlights included:

- For every \$12,768 spent on C&Is, one job is created;
- For every dollar of state support spent on C&Is, GRP increases \$3.03;
- For every dollar of state support spent on C&Is, income increases \$2.75;
- Given the state investment, C&Is contribute an additional \$18 million in tax revenues;
- The return on investment of C&Is to the State of Florida is 240%;
- The benefits to cost ratio for US C&Is is 2.43; and;
- The benefits of SUS C&Is are substantially greater than the state of Florida investment cost.

Dr. Rabby noted that at the next Council meeting, the staff report will include the results of the review of how other states and peer institutions create, fund and evaluate university centers and institutes.

Master Plan

Committee Reports – Dr. Proctor reported on behalf of Mr. Ed Moore that the Teaching Profession Committee has received testimony from educators and administrators from the Department of Education and around the State, including school superintendents and college of education deans. He said the committee will focus on teacher workforce, preparation and state-level issues, minimum teacher salaries, career ladders, and alternate certification are among the specific issues to be addressed. The next committee meeting will be held in Tallahassee on October 17, 2002.

Funding Committee Report - Dr. Nancy Mckee presented an overview of education funding using a PowerPoint presentation. She demonstrated how state, federal, and local funds flow to institutions within the delivery systems. She presented Education's share of total funds in the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and of General Revenue funds in the GAA, then showed the total funds appropriated to each of the delivery systems. Information was presented on each of the delivery systems to show some of the challenges they face. Dr. McKee explained the

funding process used in each delivery system, and then discussed how funds had been expended by program and by function. She reviewed policy issues related to funding, indicating that these questions were included in the funding papers in the agenda packet.

During the discussion on workforce fund, Mr. Taylor asked whether the Workforce Committee would take up discussion of the workforce funding formula, since it has measurable outcomes and maybe this is the approach that we need to take with funding. Vice Chairman Desai suggested that the Workforce Committee put the item on its agenda in order to make recommendations to the Funding Committee of the Whole.

During the discussion on university funding, Mr. Taylor requested staff to obtain data on funding in other states, particularly surrounding states, to get some benchmarks related to the split between taxpayer contributions and student contributions. Also, he said that if students are funded for "extended stays," there is no incentive for universities to make sure that classes are available so the students can graduate.

Vice Chairman Desai indicated that the Committee should have recommendations related to strategic prioritizing for universities, saying that everybody cannot be everything. At the state resource allocation level, there is no incentive for strategic prioritizing. Mr. Taylor indicated that universities needed incentives or rewards to teach, to make teaching more attractive to the local boards of trustees than becoming a research institution.

Mr. Taylor stated that in K-12, we should focus on the big pieces and see how they work. Do they do what we intend them to do? He also indicated that we should get community college and workforce funding "right." The incremental amount it would take to do that would be unnoticed in the other two systems; the impact of an incremental amount should not be something we forget about.

Mr. Taylor stated that we should assume there is no funding program, and that we had to design one for the new K-20 system. Since we have never had a K-20 system before, there needs to be a new approach for funding it.

Charter Schools

Dr. Pat Dallet noted that charter schools are a rapidly growing component of the K-20 system. This past year in Florida, 230 charter schools served over 51,000 students. An additional 25,000 spaces have been authorized this year. He said that the schools vary dramatically ranging from as small as three students (Pasco County) to as many as 1,400 - 1,500 (Coral Springs Middle/High School, Florida State University Development Research School). The types of charter schools include small "grass roots" independent schools, schools operated on a contractual basis with a corporation, schools operated in partnership with another governmental entity, and conversion charters through which existing public schools convert to charter status. He said that Secretary Jim Horne recently announced a three year \$76 million grant, which will be used to support start up costs for first or second year charter schools. He also noted that Florida is one of three states that provide capitol outlay support for charter schools.

In response to a question by Vice Chairman Desai, it was noted that 75% of the new spaces authorized for would be for corporate managed charter schools. Dr. Amalia Pares-Pomerantz, Principal of the Pembroke Pines Charter High School, said that she had over 20 years experience in the county system including three years as principal of Nova High School, the

research and development school for the county. She said that many of the barriers present in public schools such as unions, excessive meetings, and bureaucracy, are not present. Classes in her high school are capped at 25. She said that such approaches as teachers as advisors, Socratic discussions, and cooperative learning are working well. Beginning teachers are able to use these and other approaches that would have taken teachers in her previous schools, 7 to 10 years to be able to try. She said that because the city does not require her attendance at many meetings, she is able to devote her full attention to the school.

In response to a question, she said she reports directly to the City Manager and is paid through the City. Her school receives 95% of the per student funding provided to the Broward School District. She said there are more than 4,000 students on the waiting list for charter schools in Pembroke Pines. She noted that Florida law limits the number of charter schools per district, but that this number has increased over time.

Dr. Nora Hendrix, Dean for Workforce Education and Development of Miami-Dade Community College, said that she serves on the Charter School Review Board in Dade County, and emphasized that there is a wide variation in the scope and quality of charter schools. She said that if this movement is to continue to grow, more accountability is needed. Both Dr. Hendrix and Dr. Pares-Pomerantz questioned the amount of management fees (approximately 15%) charged in corporate charter schools. Dr. Hendrix said that the key to success in both public and charter schools is to be able to trust that the administrators and educators involved know what to do and how to do it.

Dr. Pares-Pomerantz closed by saying that the accreditation review team that visited her school saw in practice what was on paper; a focus on student learning rather than on institutional maintenance.

Other Items of Interest

There were no other items of interest at this time.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the University of South Florida, New College in Sarasota, Wednesday, November 6, 2002.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m. on Wednesday, October 9, 2002.

William B. Proctor
Executive Director