



# **POSTSECONDARY ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW**

---

---

**Report and Recommendations by the  
Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission**

---

---

**OCTOBER 1996**

## **POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Ivie R. Burch, Chairman**  
Panama City

**Thomas J. Haynes**  
Tallahassee

**Karen L. Plunkett**  
Orlando

**Richard C. Alterman**  
Opa Locka

**H. Clyde Hobby**  
New Port Richey

**Maria M. Shelton**  
Davie

**Inez W. Bailey**  
Niceville

**James E. Kirk, Jr.**  
Ocala

**Edgar E. Tolle**  
Crystal River

**Sally I. Gillespie**  
New Smyrna Beach

**Ron C. LaFace, Jr.**  
Gainesville

**Mark K. Wheeler**  
St. Augustine

**William B. Proctor, Executive Director**

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, initially created by executive order in 1980, given statutory authority in 1981 (SS 240.145 and 240.147, Florida Statutes), and reauthorized by the 1991 Legislature, serves as a citizen board to coordinate the efforts of postsecondary institutions and provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature. The Commission is composed of 11 members of the general public and one full-time student registered at a postsecondary education institution in Florida. Members are appointed by the Governor with the approval of three members of the State Board of Education and subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The major responsibility of the Commission is preparing and updating every five years a master plan for postsecondary education. The enabling legislation provides that the Plan "shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs."

Other responsibilities include recommending to the State Board of Education program contracts with independent institutions; advising the State Board regarding the need for and location of new programs, branch campuses and centers of public postsecondary education institutions; periodically reviewing the accountability processes and reports of the public and independent postsecondary sectors; reviewing public postsecondary education budget requests for compliance with the State Master Plan; and periodically conducting special studies, analyses, and evaluations related to specific postsecondary education issues and programs.

Further information about the Commission, its publications, meetings and other activities may be obtained from the Commission office, 224 Collins Building, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400; telephone (904) 488-7894; FAX (904) 922-5388.

**POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION**

***POSTSECONDARY ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW***

Prepared in Response to Section 240.147, Florida Statutes  
and  
Specific Appropriation 188 of the 1996 General Appropriations Act  
Chapter 96-424, Laws of Florida

October 17, 1996

**TABLE OF  
CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... i**

**LEGISLATIVE CHARGE..... 1**

**BACKGROUND..... 1**

**REVIEW PROCESS..... 2**

**ACCOUNTABILITY SITE VISITS  
AND FINDINGS..... 4**

**PERFORMANCE FUNDING..... 5**

**APPROACHES TO PERFORMANCE  
FUNDING IN OTHER STATES..... 6**

**CURRENT STATUS OF  
PERFORMANCE FUNDING..... 7**

**ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 8**

**APPENDICES**

**A Institutional Review Schedule ..... A-1**

**B Site Visit Sample Questions ..... B-1**

**C Site Visit Findings  
Review of Institutions Not Selected for Site Visit ..... C-1**

**D Legislative Authority and Performance Funding  
for Accountability ..... D-1**

**E Analysis of Independent Institutions' Accountability  
Reports  
Summary of Independent Colleges and Universities of  
Florida Indicator 12 Summary: Constitutents'  
Assessment of Quality  
Summary of Independent Colleges and Universities of  
Florida Accountability Indicator 5: State Funding  
for Academic Program Contracts..... E-1**

**F Postsecondary Education Performance Profile ..... F-1**

In 1994, the Florida Legislature revised the Commission's statutory authority with regard to accountability, directing the Commission to:

*Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every five years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans. (Section 240.147, Florida Statutes)*

Additionally, proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 188 of the 1996 General Appropriations Act directed the Commission to continue its accountability review, assessing the degree to which institutional and system goals relate to state priorities.

In *Challenges, Realities, Strategies: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education for the 21st Century* (1993), the Commission endorsed targeting a few priorities as a strategy for dealing with the fiscal realities that constrain accountability expectations. After a review of all current postsecondary master plans in Florida and the strategic plans of the Department of Education and the Office of the Governor, the Commission identified three themes which cut across postsecondary sectors: quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. These priority areas provide the focus for the Commission's review.

The Commission's review process follows a two-tier approach. Annual reviews over four years focus on the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of both public systems. Annual review questions examine the relationship between accountability and continual improvement in a sample of state universities and community colleges diverse in size, mission, and location. A secondary purpose of the annual review is to report current public and independent sector performance on key indicators related to the statewide accountability priorities. A fifth-year summative review to be conducted in 1999 will assess system-wide progress with regard to the state priority areas.

Since initiation of the accountability procedures in 1991, increased attention has been given to performance funding. Increasing pressure for access to postsecondary education coupled with growing demands on available state resources will continue to invite public examination of how these funds are allocated and spent. Performance-based program budgeting (PBPB) repre-

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Legislative Charge**

### **State Accountability Priorities**

### **Annual and Summative Reviews**

## **ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Performance Funding**

sents a natural evolution from the Legislative demands for accountability. While PBPB can serve as a useful approach in providing a context for the overall budget, linking every dollar provided to a specific output or outcome would be a burdensome effort with questionable benefits. Incentive funding can play a complementary role by focusing a limited amount of state funds based upon the achievement of results identified as high priorities.

In addition to clarifying and strengthening the interrelationships among performance-based program budgeting, incentive funding, and accountability, the following recommendations address how these concepts can contribute to improved overall planning.

**Recommendations:**

***Performance-  
Based  
Program  
Budgeting***

***Incentive  
Funding***

***Statewide  
Measures***

***CLAST***

1. **The Commission supports performance-based program budgeting and incentives as complementary concepts:**
  - a. **Performance-based program budgeting should continue to be followed by the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents in the development of the budgets for their respective systems.** This approach should be based on a standard set of measures with necessary variation due to differences in the missions of the two sectors. The focus should be on system goals and measures, not individual institutions.
  - b. **Performance incentive funding should be maintained as a tool for rewarding desired institutional behavior related to established priorities. It should serve as the basis for allocating a limited share (between two-five percent in new money) of overall funding to individual institutions.**
2. **To the extent that existing accountability measures are reflected in either performance-based program budgeting or incentive funding procedures or are used for some other institutional purpose, they should continue to be required on a statewide basis.** All other accountability measures should be compiled and reported at the discretion of the system offices and their respective institutions.
3. **The impact of the 1995 Legislature's expanding alternatives to the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) exam should be assessed this year, and a profile and the subsequent performance of students who are no longer taking the test should be developed by the Department of Education.** This information should serve as the basis for deter-

mining the continued usefulness of the CLAST as a statewide measure of accountability and performance.

4. **While some flexibility and fine tuning is necessary, the measures selected for budgeting and funding purposes should be maintained for a reasonable period (at least five years) to provide a consistent baseline and accurate indication of progress.**
  
5. **The Commission should limit its future accountability review activities to the compilation and publication of an annual postsecondary education performance profile.** This would be based on measures selected from the data maintained by the individual systems - community colleges, state universities, independent colleges and universities - as well as a limited number of nationally comparable (e.g., consistent with the conventions of the Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting) indicators on funding, student charges, financial aid. The profile would be designed to serve as a compact barometer of the status of postsecondary education in Florida.

*Consistency and Continuity of Measures*

*Annual Performance Profile*

The 1995 Legislature directed that the *Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education* serve as the basis for development of the sector strategic plans (Chapter 95-243, Laws of Florida). The Commission believes that performance-based program budgeting and incentive funding can reinforce this planning process.

**Recommendation:**

6. **The *Master Plan* should be developed in cooperation with the sector boards, be based on common data and broad public input and outline statewide issues and conditions confronting postsecondary education.** The sector strategic plans should address these statewide issues through the development of goals and strategies and measurable objectives appropriate for their particular missions. The resulting sector strategic plans should serve as the “agency strategic plan” required by the Governor’s Office. These documents should serve as the basis for annual budget preparation and the performance measures identified should serve as the basis for annual progress reports which should also satisfy the need for accountability reporting.

*Coordination of Planning, Accountability and Performance Funding*

At present, all public postsecondary institutions are subject to a periodic review of individual programs which is coordinated at the state level. For a number of years the community college system has maintained a three level review process. The Level 1 review consists of analysis of selected indicators of performance which, if pre-specified flags are triggered, may be followed by a more thorough on-site Level 2 or 3 review. The university system does

not have a similar process in place. The Commission annually coordinates a conference involving all sectors involved in program review; with the next conference scheduled for Spring 1997. This will present an excellent opportunity to consider modifications which will provide a stronger link between performance funding and program reviews and at the same time improve the efficiency of the process.

**Recommendation:**

***Program Reviews  
and  
Performance  
Funding***

7. **The Commission, in cooperation with the sectors, should examine current program review requirements and procedures and determine the feasibility and desirability of using the performance budgeting/funding measures at the program level to identify both high and low performing programs and conducting reviews on an exception basis as needed rather than every five years or other specified period.**

***Independent  
Sector***

Based on its review of the independent sector accountability processes and reports which is contained in Appendix E, the Commission offers the following recommendations to the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) and its member institutions as they proceed with development of their 1997 Accountability Report:

**Recommendations:**

8. **ICUF should alert institutional accountability data providers to begin developing data collection mechanisms that will allow them to respond to the Limited Access Competitive Grant Program accountability measures that were set forth by the Commission in its *1995 Postsecondary Accountability Review*, Appendix E.**
9. **ICUF should work with the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR) to develop a mechanism for reporting licensure examination pass rates.** While licensure exam pass rates were one of the originally-recommended accountability measures, difficulty in coordinating with DBPR has precluded both ICUF Accountability Reports to date from including this information.
10. **Now that the indicators have been established, ICUF should work with its institutions on the annual compilation of a sector-wide ICUF Accountability Report.** This responsibility should fit well with the recently initiated ICUF Research Program.
11. **ICUF should plan to convene the institutional accountability data providers at a time sufficient to permit submission of the ICUF sector-wide report by March 31, the target date set in *Accountability Review: Progress Report (1994)*.**



- 12. ICUF should assign institutional responsibility on a rotating basis for scheduling and hosting the annual meeting of ICUF accountability data providers in a manner timely for the submission of institutional reports and compilation of the ICUF sector-wide report.**
  
- 13. ICUF should take on the responsibility of updating the ICUF Accountability Reporting Guidelines manual, incorporating the discussion at the annual data providers' meeting as well as the entries made by data providers in the "Comments" section of the prior year's manual.**

Section 240.147, Florida Statutes, directs the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to:

periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every five years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

Additionally, proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 188 of the 1996 General Appropriations Act directs the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to:

continue its review and evaluation of the accountability plans and reports in public and independent postsecondary education. This review should assess the degree to which institutional and system goals relate to state priorities. A report shall be submitted to the Legislature and State Board of Education by November 1, 1996.

The 1991 Legislature passed accountability legislation for the Community College System and the State University System with the intent of improving quality and efficiency while providing the systems with management flexibility. Commission reports addressing accountability have included:

- ***Outcomes Assessment in Postsecondary Education*** (1992) found that Florida had no established goals to determine if postsecondary education was fulfilling its mission. The report also confirmed that on-going, systematic, and comprehensive assessment for the purpose of continual improvement in institutional effectiveness had not been a priority for all colleges and universities.
- ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System*** (1993) asserted dual purposes for accountability: (1) to foster improvement at the institutional level and (2) to provide information to state-level policymakers. The Commission identified the following priority areas for accountability based on a review of Commission, State University System, and Community College System master plans: quality of undergraduate education, access/diversity, and productivity.

## INTRODUCTION

## LEGISLATIVE CHARGE

## BACKGROUND

- ***Accountability Review: Progress Report*** (1994) outlined a framework for the Commission's accountability review process consisting of a cycle of four annual reviews supplemented by a fifth-year review that tracks state-wide trends in responding to the accountability priority areas. The report advocated the use of incentive funding to promote the achievement of specified objectives relating to state priorities. The report also established accountability measures for independent institutions whose students are eligible to receive the Florida Resident Assistance Grant.
- ***Postsecondary Accountability Review*** (1995) recommended aligning accountability measures with measures required by performance-based program budgeting and incentive funding programs. Toward that end, the report recommended that accountability statutes require reporting on a certain set of issues rather than specifying a set of measures. The report also recommended incorporating site visits into the Commission's review methodology.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

In the ***Progress Report*** (1994), the Commission outlined a two-tier approach for its accountability review activities. Annual reviews over four years focus on the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of both public systems. System and institutional accountability plans and reports are the primary resource documents. Annual review questions examine the relationship between accountability and continual improvement in public institution effectiveness. A secondary purpose of the annual review is to report current public and independent sector performance on key indicators related to the statewide accountability priorities — quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity. A fifth-year summative review to be conducted in 1999 will assess system-wide progress with regard to the state priority areas.

Each annual review is based on a sample of state universities and community colleges diverse in size, mission, and location (Appendix A). The sampling process will allow the accountability plans and reports of all public institutions to be reviewed over a four-year period. This document reports results of the second of the Commission's annual reviews. Representatives of the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges assisted in placing their institutions in the review schedule. Institutions selected for review of update accountability reports were the University of North Florida (UNF), University of South Florida (USF), and Florida International University (FIU), Florida State University (FSU), the University of Central Florida (UCF), and the following community colleges: St. Johns River (SJRCC), Tallahassee (TCC), Manatee (MCC), Pensacola (PJC), Daytona Beach (DBCC), Miami-Dade (MDCC), and Jacksonville (FCCJ).

The following issues and questions provided an organizing framework for the current review:

1. ***Dual Purposes of Accountability*** - Site visit interviews with faculty, deans and department heads, administrators, and presidents at selected community colleges and state universities were conducted to determine the extent to which accountability data are being used at the campus level to improve institutional effectiveness. Recommendations were sought as to how the accountability process can be made more useful at the campus level.
2. ***Integration of Planning and Accountability Initiatives*** - Accountability for a postsecondary system emanates from its mission and from the goals set forth in its strategic plan. In addition to strategic plans developed on a five-year cycle, the State University System and the Community College System are subject to Section 186.022, Florida Statutes, which requires state agencies to submit annual Agency Strategic Plans to the Governor's Office in support of the Statewide Comprehensive Plan. This statute also requires that each state agency submit an annual performance report to evaluate the attainment of objectives contained in the agency strategic plan. Can current planning processes be integrated in a manner that satisfies both system and state planning needs while informing system goals for accountability and performance-based program budgeting? Can an accountability report developed pursuant to the goals contained in any of these plans satisfy all performance reporting requirements?
3. ***Accountability and Performance-Based Program Budgeting*** - With the advent of performance-based program budgeting (PBPB), what is the role and significance of the accountability reports required in statute of the State University System and Community College System? How can the State integrate reporting requirements for accountability and performance funding?

This study was assigned to the Finance/Administration Committee composed of Sally Gillespie, Chair, Rick Alterman, James Kirk, Earl Olden and Mark Wheeler. Activities included:

- Analyses of relevant accountability documents—accountability plans and reports, and documents relating to performance-based program budgeting and incentive funding—from institutions and sector boards.
- Interviews with legislative, gubernatorial, and sector board staff. Participation in legislative meetings concerning PBPB and incentive funding.
- One-day site visits to two universities and to three of the seven community colleges in the annual review cycle—University of North Florida, University of South Florida, Florida Community College at Jacksonville,

Daytona Beach Community College, and Pensacola Junior College (see Site Visit Questions, Appendix B; due to site team scheduling conflicts a site visit to Florida International University was not conducted).

- Participation in a January 1996 meeting of the independent college institutional researchers in Tampa to refine measures and standardize reporting methodologies.
- Discussion of the study at four public meetings which allowed for input from both state level and institutional representatives of the community college and state university systems and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida.

## **ACCOUNTABILITY SITE VISITS AND FINDINGS**

Complete descriptions of the site visit results as well as the other institutional reviews are contained in Appendix C. Overall findings identified during the visits were:

1. The state-level accountability measures represent only a portion of the entire institutional effectiveness process at community colleges and state universities across the State. The accountability data, however, do reflect activities that are central to Community College System and State University System missions.
2. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation drives much of the institutional effort to assess its institutional effectiveness. Faculty, in particular, seem to be much more attuned to SACS accreditation than to the State's accountability process. Most faculty and staff do not distinguish the state-level accountability indicators from their college's other institutional effectiveness indicators, but the site visit team did not necessarily see this as negative.
3. Some faculty expressed the view that accountability is something that is being done to them rather than something that could help the institution improve the teaching and learning process.
4. The level of institution-wide participation in goal-setting and goal revision varied greatly. Student participation in institutional effectiveness assessment was evident at only one institution visited. While all institutions agreed that student participation is desirable, all had difficulty in garnering student participation.
5. The campus personnel interviewed felt it was too early to isolate strategies that are effective or ineffective in contributing to the achievement of institutional accountability and effectiveness goals.

6. Institutional administrators believe they are being held accountable for things over which they have little or no control (e.g., graduation rates and job placements), a concern which takes on heightened importance with the advent of incentive funding.
7. Personnel pointed out that there were no consequences attached to the accountability measures. They believed that the move to performance incentives would have more positive results.
8. The overwhelming consensus was in favor of the State's arriving at a stable set of measures that are tracked over time and streamlining of the various accountability-related processes that are currently ongoing (accountability reporting, performance-based program budgeting, incentive funding). However, the institutional personnel interviewed were also in favor of continuing to refine the indicators being developed for performance funding in order to arrive at a set of measures that more fully reflects the system mission (e.g., adult basic education indicators for the Community College System, research and public service indicators for the State University System).

One of the perceived weaknesses of the accountability process in statute is that it is not linked directly to funding. Beginning in 1995-96, this situation began to change with an appropriation to the State University System tying incentive dollars to selected performance indicators. There are presently two major policy initiatives in Florida related to funding performance: Performance-Based Program Budgeting and Incentive Funding.

## PERFORMANCE FUNDING

### **Performance-Based Program Budgeting**

The 1994 Government Performance and Accountability Act requires all state agencies and public education entities to submit budgets based on outcomes achieved in key agency programs. The community colleges became subject to this requirement in 1996-97 while the budget currently being developed by the SUS for 1997-98 will be affected by this requirement. The law defines an outcome as "an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a program" while an "output" is an "actual service or product delivered by a state agency", Section 216.011(1), F.S.

### **Incentive Funding**

While the community colleges came under PBPB beginning with the 1996-97 budget year, the 1996 Legislature ultimately implemented this requirement in the form of \$12 million in incentive funds for AA & AS program completers. Under the plan in proviso language of the 1996 General Appropriations Act, a community college earns extra points for the following completers: students who required remediation, economically disadvantaged students, students with

disabilities, ENS or ESL students, students who passed a state job licensure exam, and students who obtained employment in their field of study. Two million of the \$12 million is to be distributed among the colleges based upon each college's pro rata share of the number of AA completers who graduate with fewer than 72 total attempted hours. (Appendix D-2)

The 1996 Legislature continued funding of the SUS Instructional Performance Incentive Program (established in 1995), which recognizes the extent to which each university has met certain teaching and degree productivity targets. A portion of the funds appropriated in 1996 are to be used to establish a Public Service Performance Incentive Fund to encourage faculty involvement in public service activities that meet critical state needs. (Appendix D-3) A summary of all accountability and performance measures currently in use in the public section is contained in Appendix D-4.

## APPROACHES TO PERFORMANCE FUNDING IN OTHER STATES

- Based on a 1995 survey of states by Caruthers and Layzell, 18 states have implemented or are planning to implement some type of performance funding program.
- There are lessons to be learned from other states that have implemented performance funding. In March 1996, the Senate Higher Education Committee convened a meeting of higher education representatives from Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states to discuss the experiences those states have had with performance funding. It is interesting to note that with the exception of Florida and South Carolina, these states all use incentive funding which represents a relatively small share of overall funding (two-five percent) rather than the broader performance-based program budgeting called for by Florida's 1994 Government Performance and Accountability Act.
- Ken Ashworth, in *Performance-Based Funding in Higher Education: The Texas Case Study* (Nov/Dec 1994 *Change*), argues against the far-reaching approach that attempts to find an ideal formula into which all of the data can be fed and out of which will come a perfect formularized distribution of resources. Among the arguments cited:
  - There is no uniform agreement on the numerical weights that would have to be included in such a formula, and data are not available within reason or within tolerable costs to support such a formula system.
  - Such an approach could result in massive redistribution of funds every year. (Without predictability of income from year to year, there can be no institutional planning.)

While the short-term effect of this narrower incentive approach would be small, the long-term effect would be significant if colleges were allowed to build performance dollars received into their core budget for the next year.

Central tenets that are common across the SREB states are:

1. Restrict the dollars awarded on performance basis to a small percentage (e.g., five percent) of the total dollars appropriated. Performance funds could be restricted to new money only, or colleges could earn back a small proportion of existing funding on a performance basis.
2. Choose performance indicators based on statewide goals for higher education. (In these current plans, PEPC and the sectors have identified three common accountability priorities as quality of undergraduate education, productivity, and access/diversity.)
3. Institutional use of these funds should be unrestricted.
4. The approach chosen must reward an institution for its own improvement, while not penalizing a high-performing institution for maintaining that level of performance.
5. Maintain simplicity in the program's elements and base it on available data.
6. Allow flexibility in measuring different kinds of institutions differently based on such factors as mission, size, and student demographics.
7. Do not attempt to tie incentives to every possible measure.

Although the State University System submitted Performance-Based Program Budgeting measures to the Office of the Governor in May 1996, these have not yet been approved. In fact, the Governor's office has authorized the SUS to temporarily delay submission of these measures until November pending the outcome of discussions regarding the measures among the Governor's Office and the legislative committees. Consequently, the Board of Regents proposed budget for 1997-98 does not reflect these measures at this time. The community colleges, although already subject to the requirements of the 1994 Government Performance and Accountability Act, have instead received incentive funding from the Legislature. The Community College System's proposed budget for 1997-98 reflects this latter approach by folding last year's \$12 million into the base and requesting an additional \$27 million in new incentive dollars.

## **CURRENT STATUS OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING**



Questions regarding the potential impact of PBPB abound:

- If funding is tied to institutionally-set goals, will these be artificially low to assure success?
- Is a poor performing institution to lose money? If so, does this punish the students?
- Is the entire base budget of an institution at risk each year? If so, what does this do to stability and long range planning?

Proponents argue that the intent of PBPB is to frame the agency budget request in terms of measurable outcomes which justify the dollars the State is investing (return on investment). The issue of performance funding was discussed at a joint meeting of the Commission, the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges in June 1996. According to Dr. Bob Bradley, Director of Planning and Budgeting in the Governor's Office, performance measures have been integrated into the budgeting process since 1970, although the budget has not been allocated on the basis of performance. The key question that continues to be debated in the Legislature and in the sectors is how closely the allocation of funds be tied to performance.

This question can be approached from two perspectives — one emphasizes accountability to make “results” the basis of the funds that are received. Another places more attention on management concerns and views performance measures as part of the budget justification process. It is the appropriate balance between these two perspectives in the budgeting system that is at issue in the current discussions among the Governor's Office, the House of Representatives, and the Senate.

## **ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Increasing pressure for access to postsecondary education coupled with growing demands on available state resources will continue to invite public examination of how these funds are allocated and spent. Performance-based program budgeting represents a natural evolution from the Legislative demands for accountability. While PBPB can serve as a useful approach in providing a context for the overall budget, linking every dollar provided to a specific output or outcome would be a burdensome effort with questionable benefits.

Incentive funding can play a complementary role by focusing a limited amount of state funds based upon the achievement of results identified as high priorities.

In addition to clarifying and strengthening the interrelationships among performance-based program budgeting, incentive funding, and accountability, the following recommendations address how these concepts can contribute to improved overall planning.

**Recommendations:**

**1. The Commission supports performance-based program budgeting and incentives as complementary concepts:**

**a. Performance-based program budgeting should continue to be followed by the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents in the development of the budgets for their respective systems. This approach should be based on a standard set of measures with necessary variation due to differences in the missions of the two sectors. The focus should be on system goals and measures, not individual institutions.**

*Performance-Based Program Budgeting*

**b. Performance incentive funding should be maintained as a tool for rewarding desired institutional behavior related to established priorities. It should serve as the basis for allocating a limited share (between two-five percent in new money) of overall funding to individual institutions.**

*Incentive Funding*

**2. To the extent that existing accountability measures are reflected in either performance-based program budgeting or incentive funding procedures or are used for some other institutional purpose, they should continue to be required on a statewide basis. All other accountability measures should be compiled and reported at the discretion of the system offices and their respective institutions.**

*Statewide Measures*

**3. The impact of the 1995 Legislature's expanding alternatives to the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) exam should be assessed this year, and a profile and the subsequent performance of students who are no longer taking the test should be developed by the Department of Education. This information should serve as the basis for determining the continued usefulness of the CLAST as a statewide measure of accountability and performance.**

*CLAST*

**4. While some flexibility and fine tuning is necessary, the measures selected for budgeting and funding purposes should be maintained for a reasonable period (at least five years) to provide a consistent baseline and accurate indication of progress.**

*Consistency and Continuity of Measures*

**5. The Commission should limit its future accountability review activities to the compilation and publication of an annual postsecondary education performance profile. This**

*Annual Performance Profile*

would be based on measures selected from the data maintained by the individual systems - community colleges, state universities, independent colleges and universities - as well as a limited number of nationally comparable (e.g., consistent with the conventions of the Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting) indicators on funding, student charges, financial aid. The profile would be designed to serve as a compact barometer of the status of postsecondary education in Florida.

The 1995 Legislature directed that the *Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education* serve as the basis for development of the sector strategic plans (Chapter 95-243, Laws of Florida). The Commission believes that performance-based program budgeting and incentive funding can reinforce this planning process.

**Recommendation:**

6. **The *Master Plan* should be developed in cooperation with the sector boards, be based on common data and broad public input and outline statewide issues and conditions confronting postsecondary education.** The sector strategic plans should address these statewide issues through the development of goals and strategies and measurable objectives appropriate for their particular missions. The resulting sector strategic plans should serve as the "agency strategic plan" required by the Governor's Office. These documents should serve as the basis for annual budget preparation and the performance measures identified should serve as the basis for annual progress reports which should also satisfy the need for accountability reporting.

At present, all public postsecondary institutions are subject to a periodic review of individual programs which is coordinated at the state level. For a number of years the community college system has maintained a three level review process. The Level 1 review consists of analysis of selected indicators of performance which, if pre-specified flags are triggered, may be followed by a more thorough on-site Level 2 or 3 review. The university system does not have a similar process in place. The Commission annually coordinates a conference involving all sectors involved in program review, with the next conference scheduled for Spring 1997. This will present an excellent opportunity to consider modifications which will provide a stronger link between performance funding and program reviews and at the same time improve the efficiency of the process.

**Recommendation:**

7. **The Commission, in cooperation with the sectors, should examine current program review requirements and procedures and determine the feasibility and desirability of using the performance bud-**

*Coordination of  
Planning,  
Accountability and  
Performance  
Funding*

*Program Reviews and  
Performance  
Funding*

**getting/funding measures at the program level to identify both high and low performing programs and conducting reviews on an exception basis as needed rather than every five years or other specified period.**

Based on its review of the independent sector accountability processes and reports which is contained in Appendix E, the Commission offers the following recommendations to the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) and its member institutions as they proceed with development of their 1997 Accountability Report:

***Independent  
Sector***

**Recommendations:**

- 8. ICUF should alert institutional accountability data providers to begin developing data collection mechanisms that will allow them to respond to the Limited Access Competitive Grant Program accountability measures that were set forth by the Commission in its 1995 Postsecondary Accountability Review, Appendix E.**
- 9. ICUF should work with the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR) to develop a mechanism for reporting licensure examination pass rates.** While licensure exam pass rates were one of the originally-recommended accountability measures, difficulty in coordinating with DBPR has precluded both ICUF Accountability Reports to date from including this information.
- 10. Now that the indicators have been established, ICUF should work with its institutions on the annual compilation of a sector-wide ICUF Accountability Report.** This responsibility should fit well with the recently initiated ICUF Research Program.
- 11. ICUF should plan to convene the institutional accountability data providers at a time sufficient to permit submission of the ICUF sector-wide report by March 31, the target date set in *Accountability Review: Progress Report* (1994).**
- 12. ICUF should assign institutional responsibility on a rotating basis for scheduling and hosting the annual meeting of ICUF accountability data providers in a manner timely for the submission of institutional reports and compilation of the ICUF sector-wide report.**
- 13. ICUF should take on the responsibility of updating the ICUF Accountability Reporting Guidelines manual, incorporating the discussion at the annual data providers' meeting as well as the entries made by data providers in the "Comments" section of the prior year's manual.**

In reviewing any inter-institutional data it must be remembered that different colleges and universities have different missions and this will affect the number reported. As such, it is important that data reported here are not taken out of context.

Universities that have a research mission along with their teaching mission will exhibit a lower teaching load for their faculty, as faculty will be involved in both funded and non-funded research. Universities grant the faculty members time release in order to undertake this research. Further, universities with graduate programs will exhibit lower teaching loads for undergraduate courses due to the faculty's involvement in graduate level education.

The category of "Instructor/Lecturer" needs to be understood as well. Faculty who are Visiting Professors from other universities as well as those with the title of Distinguished Lecturer or Emeritus Professor would be included in this category. It should be noted that these individuals are oftentimes among the most distinguished in their field, with national and international reputations, but given the methodology of the report, would not be included as Assistant, Associate, or Full Professors.

The Commission will continue to work with the public and independent sectors in refining their respective indicators and measures of performance and accountability and in using this information to improve the overall quality of Florida postsecondary education.

**APPENDIX A**

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SCHEDULE**

**STATE UNIVERSITIES  
ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE**

1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
FSU (I, Large, Res I)	USF (IV, Large, Res II)	UF (II, Large, Res I)	FAMU (I, Mid, MA I)	Summative Review
UCF (III, Mid, Doc II)	FIU (V, Large, Doc II)	FAU (V, Mid, Doc III)	FGCU (IV, Small, BA)	
	UNF (II, Mid, MA I)	UWF (I, Small, MA I)		

**Key:** Institution Name  
(Region, Size, Carnegie Classification)

Region Codes: I=Panhandle, II=Northeast, III=Central & East Coast, IV=West Coast,  
V=South

Size Codes: Small (under 10,000 total headcount), Mid (10,001-25,000), Large (over 25,000)

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW SCHEDULE**

1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Lake City (II, Small, Voc)	St. Johns River (II, Small)	Chipola (I, Small, Voc)	North Florida (I, Small, Voc)	Summative Review
South Florida (IV, Small, Voc)	Tallahassee (I, 5-10)	Florida Keys (V, Small)	Lake-Sumter (III, Small)	
Gulf Coast (I, 5-10, Voc)	Manatee (IV, 5-10)	Central Florida (II, 5-10, Voc)	Edison (IV, 5-10)	
Polk (III, 5-10)	Pensacola (I, 10-20, Voc)	Seminole (III, 5-10, Voc)	Okaloosa-Walton (I, 5-10)	
Indian River (III, 10-20, Voc)	Daytona Beach (III, 10-20)	Pasco-Hernando (IV, 5-10, Voc)	Santa Fe (II, 10-20, Voc)	
St. Petersburg (IV, Large)	Miami-Dade (V, Large, Voc)	Brevard (III, 10-20, Voc)	Palm Beach (V, 10-20, Voc)	
Broward (V, Large, Voc)	Fla. CC at J'ville (II, Large, Voc)	Hillsborough (IV, Large)	Valencia (III, Large, Voc)	

**Key:** Institution Name  
(Region, Size, Offers Vocational Education)

Region Codes: I=Panhandle, II=Northeast, III=Central & East Coast, IV=West Coast,  
V=South

Size Codes: Small (under 5,000 total headcount), 5-10 (5,001-10,000), 10-20 (10,001-20,000)  
Large (over 20,000)

SOURCE: *Postsecondary Accountability Review* (1995), PEPC.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SITE VISIT SAMPLE QUESTIONS**



## SITE VISIT SAMPLE QUESTIONS

### President

1. What is your role, or to what extent are you involved, in the accountability process on campus?
2. With the advent of other accountability-related initiatives like the Performance Incentive Program (SUS) and Performance-Based Program Budgeting, what is the role and significance of the accountability report required in statute?
3. To what extent is accountability perceived on campus as integral to institutional assessment and improvement, rather than as being an “add-on” data compilation and reporting exercise? (In what ways do you provide leadership to ensure that this happens?)
4. Have state-level entities with funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability provided adequate policy guidance and fiscal support for accountability expectations?
5. Comment on the measures that are in place. In your opinion, what measures should be added or deleted in order to arrive at a set of indicators to most appropriately address the States’ priorities for accountability (quality of undergraduate education, access/diversity, productivity)?

### Director of Institutional Research, Planning, or Accountability Data Provider

1. Describe the planning and assessment processes at your institution and where the state-level accountability process fits. What campus constituencies are involved?
2. (How) are accountability data used at your institution to improve institutional performance, (specifically with regard to instruction and student learning?)
3. Are there aspects of data collection for accountability that can be simplified or improved?
4. Who on campus receives copies of reports out of your office containing institutional assessment or accountability data? How are these reports used by various aspects of the campus community?
5. How are goals for institutional improvement set with regard to the accountability measures?
6. By what mechanisms are accountability data fed back into subsequent planning? How is institutional progress documented? How is progress communicated?

Faculty Members of Institutional Planning/Effectiveness Group

1. What is the average faculty member's level of awareness of the state-level accountability process? Does it have any impact on your teaching, advising, research or service?
2. In your opinion, can accountability data inform instruction in such a way that student learning is improved? Has it done so at this institution?  
  
Has other institutional assessment data helped you improve your teaching in any way? Can you give an example?
3. (How) does your department use data provided as part of the institutional assessment and/or state-level accountability process?
4. Can you attribute change in performance on any of the measures to some strategy (or combination of strategies) your department/division has undertaken?
5. What is the best way to measure faculty productivity?

Students

1. What is your role, or to what extent are you involved, in the accountability process on campus? (i.e., do you have a role in goal-setting, in monitoring improvement, in deciding where institutional funds should be placed based on gaps pointed out by assessment data?)

Do you believe students' level of involvement should be revised?

**APPENDIX C**

**SITE VISIT FINDINGS**

**REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONS NOT SELECTED  
FOR SITE VISIT**

## **SITE VISIT FINDINGS**

### **COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

#### Daytona Beach Community College (DBCC)

June 12, 1996

The college has a highly structured, active, and participatory planning process centered around a Five-Year Strategic Plan and an Annual Plan. The Annual Plan is updated at mid-year and end-of-year assessment meetings, at which the president, vice presidents, and mid-level managers compile all the college's activities which have contributed to the achievement of the goals and objectives in the Plan. The site visit team observed the end-of-year assessment meeting and met with the president, selected faculty, and management information systems and institutional research staff.

There is a high level of integration of the accountability measures into the college's planning process. The president's enthusiasm for planning and assessment permeates the institution, and the campus administrators seem to have bought into the idea of assessment for continual improvement in institutional effectiveness. Faculty seemed less clear about the institution's accountability and effectiveness goals and strategies, leading to the impression that to some extent, planning is being done from the top down rather than the bottom up.

The college reported that some of the older data contained in its management information system were unreliable, which has rendered meaningless the data from the state accountability measures that involve cohort tracking. As of Fall 1994, the college's data was of acceptable quality. However, since cohorts are tracked for four years for the AA and AS retention and success measures, the college will not receive the benefits of the Division of Community Colleges tracking system until 1998. Information systems personnel mentioned that the data requirements for performance-based program budgeting could be better planned for if they are routed through the Community College System's Management Information System Advisory Task Force (MISATFOR).

#### Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FCCJ)

June 18, 1996

FCCJ is a multi-faceted, multi-campus institution that is serving a large number of students in a great many ways. FCCJ is state leader in the provision of adult basic education and in utilizing technology to enhance access to postsecondary education. The productivity of the institution's vocational programs is evidenced by its favorable performance with regard to performance-based incentive funding targeted to such programs.

FCCJ's primary focus in terms of accountability seems to have been driven by SACS accreditation. The extent to which accountability measures are incorporated into institutional effectiveness efforts by FCCJ does not appear particularly intentional. Beginning in 1989, the institution, with input from its Board of Trustees, developed 25 indicators of effectiveness. In 1991, FCCJ's current planning model, Pathway 2000, was implemented. When the State's

accountability initiative was introduced, any goals and measures not already included in FCCJ's planning processes were folded in. FCCJ personnel seemed to find it difficult to identify which goals/measures are the State's and which are the institution's.

As a multi-campus institution, FCCJ ensures that the needs and contributions of each campus are reflected in planning, goal-setting, and the evaluation of results by having each campus represented by its campus president on the college-wide planning council. However, there is not indication that the faculty, staff, or students at large are intimately involved in identifying strategies for improvement based on accountability results.

It was reported that the district Board of Trustees tends to focus more on administrative issues and has had little involvement in the accountability process. The site visit team felt that the Board should provide more leadership in the setting of institutional targets for performance indicators, rather than just rubber stamping the institution's accountability plan and goals.

Interviewees at FCCJ indicated that a uniform set of measures for the State's accountability program, performance-based program budgeting, and incentive funding would reduce duplication of effort.

#### Pensacola Junior College (PJC)

July 9, 1996

The site visit team found PJC's integration of accountability with the institution's ongoing assessment of its effectiveness to be exemplary. In most cases, PJC had already been collecting data on the accountability measures before the State adopted them. With the advent of accountability legislation in 1991, PJC simply needed to begin collecting or reporting the data in a slightly different manner.

PJC has embraced the State's accountability measures and has fully incorporated them into the college's planning and evaluation process. The site visit team heard testimony about the extent to which accountability information is used across the campus in various ways--e.g., in recruiting, in designing college preparatory programs, and in program evaluation. Additionally, PJC has successfully involved students and the district Board of Trustees in goal-setting and in identifying strategies for improvement. The Board of Trustees is actively involved in setting institutional performance targets on each of the accountability indicators and is updated annually on the institution's performance in relation to the institution's accountability goals.

#### STATE UNIVERSITIES

##### University of North Florida (UNF)

June 19, 1996

UNF's focus in terms of accountability is clearly SACS accreditation. The State's accountability initiative is tolerated but is not considered a priority. As noted by one of the deans, UNF's internal focus is on quality rather than the State's measures, which he considered to be primarily

efficiency measures. President Herbert argued that the state universities are too diverse to be compared using a single, generic set of accountability measures. In his opinion, SACS institutional effectiveness guidelines are relevant for all institutions and, therefore, should be at the core of any accountability process.

While UNF's institution-wide focus on institutional effectiveness appears to be fairly recent and driven primarily by upcoming SACS reaccreditation, it is apparent that individual departments and colleges have undertaken planning and assessment activities, with a focus on providing a quality education for their students. The professional schools have long used pass rates on licensure exams as a quality indicator. Such planning and assessment, however, has been diffuse and uneven. Also, the extent to which staff and students have been involved in these efforts is not clear. The relatively new Vice President for Planning and Effectiveness, who is attempting to raise institutional awareness about the need for and benefit of planning and assessment, reports that the process of overcoming institutional inertia and resistance has been slow. The institution could benefit from greater cooperation by administrators in sharing assessment tools with colleagues and in participating in a coordinated planning approach that incorporates the State's accountability mandate.

#### University of South Florida (USF)

August 21, 1996

USF is a comprehensive metropolitan research institution with a large number of non-traditional and part-time students. The accountability legislation was credited with contributing to consciousness raising on campus. It was also criticized for not providing consequences for non-performance and for encouraging inappropriate institutional comparisons. The current initiatives related to performance funding were supported by all faculty and administrators interviewed. The response to these later initiatives have reflected broad campus participation USF priority and improved communications links. A member of the faculty serves as a special assistant to the President and serves as an important communication link. In developing strategic plans for improving teaching productivity the Provost and Deans worked directly with Departmental Chair, Directors, and faculty. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning plays a supportive role in measuring progress toward institutional goals, it has also prepared concise documents which clearly describe university resource and expenditure patterns and strategic priorities.

The Center for the Enhancement of Teaching at USF actually predated the accountability legislation by one year. However, this legislation and subsequent policies focused on improved performance have clearly heightened interest and participation in the center, which assists in both the assessment and improvement of teaching. A portion of the university's incentive funding allotment has been used for equipment, courseware and other aids for participating faculty.

The site team and some interviewees questioned whether the established performance goals are an accurate reflection of the institution's aspirations.

Institutional representatives suggested the need to avoid micro management at the state level but did support the use of several broad measures of performance which take into account individual

institutional missions and characteristics. While there was general agreement that the Teaching Incentive Program(TIP) has had a direct impact on teaching performance some concern was also expressed about possible unintended consequences in the TIP in terms of perceived salary inequities which have occurred as a result of the TIP awards.

#### Findings Across All Five Site Visits

1. The state-level accountability measures represent only a portion of the entire institutional effectiveness process at community colleges and state universities across the State. The accountability data, however, do reflect activities that are central to Community College System and State University System mission.
2. Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation drives much of the institutional effort to assess its institutional effectiveness. Faculty, in particular, seem to be much more attuned to SACS accreditation than to the State's accountability process. Most faculty and staff do not distinguish the state-level accountability indicators from their college's other institutional effectiveness indicators, but the site visit team did not necessarily see this as negative.
3. Some faculty expressed the view that accountability is something that is being done to them rather than something that could help the institution improve the teaching and learning process.
4. The level of institution-wide participation in goal-setting and goal revision varied greatly. Student participation in institutional effectiveness assessment was evident at only one institution visited. While all institutions agreed that student participation is desirable, all had difficulty in garnering student participation.
5. The campus personnel interviewed felt it was too early to isolate strategies that are effective or ineffective in contributing to the achievement of institutional accountability and effectiveness goals.
6. Institutional administrators believe they are being held accountable for things over which they have little or no control (e.g., graduation rates and job placements), a concern which takes on heightened importance with the advent of incentive funding.
7. Personnel pointed out that there were no consequences attached to the accountability measures. They believed that the move to performance incentives would have more positive results.
8. The overwhelming consensus was in favor of the State's arriving at a stable set of measures that are tracked over time, and streamlining of the various accountability-related processes that are currently ongoing (accountability reporting, performance-based program budgeting, incentive funding). However, the institutional personnel interviewed were also in favor of continuing to refine the indicators being developed for performance funding in order to arrive at a set of measures that more fully reflects the system mission

(e.g., adult basic education indicators for the Community College System, research and public service indicators for the State University System).

### **Review of Institutional Accountability Plans: Community Colleges Not Selected for Site Visit**

#### ***1. Are the community college's accountability goals articulated within the context of the systemwide planning goals and the statutory mission for the community college system?***

Miami-Dade Community College provided a detailed summary describing how its specific institutional goals are related to the statewide master plan for community colleges. For example, in addressing the statewide master plan goal (number 7) to renew Florida's commitment to continuing college fiscal stability, Miami-Dade Community College plans to develop and implement a five-year plan to increase, to no less than \$25 million annually, the revenue in support of the operating budget from sources other than state appropriations and student fees. Miami-Dade has also demonstrated great efforts to increase the participation of minorities and women in all aspects of college business affairs (related to statewide master plan goal number 4).

St. Johns River Community College and Manatee Community College both provided a thorough list of institution-specific accountability measures and performance goals. For St. Johns River Community college, specific institutional performance goals were related to all statewide master plan goals except 3, 4, and 5. Manatee Community College related its institution-specific goals only to statewide master plan goals 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Tallahassee Community College related its institution-specific goals to the goals in the master plan for Community Colleges. The report explained that, due to the college's heavy emphasis on Advanced and Professional courses, the tie between the institution-specific goals and statewide master plan goals is not particularly strong for *Master Plan* goal number 4: Establish partnerships for economic development. However, the college is currently expanding its services in the area of workforce development and has developed institutional goals for this area for 1996-97.

#### ***2. Who participates in goal setting?***

Each of the community colleges reported that faculty, administration, and students participate in goal setting.

St. Johns River Community College provided a detailed explanation of who is involved in goal setting.

- 1) Instructional planning issues are addressed by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (consisting of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans of Business and Technology Education, General Education and Adult Education, Director of Library Services, and faculty representatives).



- 2) Student performance planning issues are addressed by the Student Achievement Committee (consisting of Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Academic Affairs, instructional deans, and representatives from faculty and student affairs).
- 3) Student affairs and student services planning issues are addressed by the Student Development Committee (consisting of Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean of Student Services, Dean of Student Development and Articulation, and counselors and faculty).

Miami-Dade Community College reports that planning and decision making take place in four major domains: Administrative Services, Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Financial Planning.

Manatee Community College has divided planning and evaluation into eight organizational units: Academic Affairs, Business Services, Information Resources, Institutional Advancement, Human Resources, Open Campus, Community Relations, and Student Services. All have developed objectives upon which departments generate action plans.

Tallahassee Community College's accountability goals are developed within the context of the institution's Planning and Evaluation Program (PEP). The outcome measures prescribed by the State are supplemental to measures which are used to evaluate institutional effectiveness. A broad cross section of faculty, staff, and students participate annually in the formulation and refinement of PEP. Therefore, goals are set and annually reviewed by the appropriate unit, standing committees, and the president. These are ultimately reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

***3) Are the strategies identified to achieve institutional accountability goals - appropriate? specific? realistic?***

All community college accountability plans appeared to have established appropriate, specific, and realistic strategies designed to address the state accountability goals. Details are provided in each institution's accountability plan about specific activities and strategies. It is in the activities that implement these strategies that the broadest cross-section of campus personnel--from the President, to faculty, to staff, to advisory groups external to the campus--become involved in the work of helping the institution meet its goals for institutional effectiveness and accountability. Miami-Dade Community College gave a particularly detailed explanation of each institutional goal, related objectives, intended outcomes, and indicators of excellence to assess whether the goals have been met.

## **APPENDIX D**

### **LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND PERFORMANCE FUNDING FOR ACCOUNTABILITY**

## Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (240.147, Florida Statutes)

### 240.147 Powers and duties of the commission.—

The commission shall:

(1) Serve as a citizen board to coordinate the efforts of postsecondary institutions in this state and provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

(2) Prepare and submit to the State Board of Education a master plan for postsecondary education. The plan shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated, and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs. The master plan shall serve as the basis for the development of strategic plans by the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. Development of the sector strategic plans shall be initiated following completion of the master plan to ensure coordination in addressing identified needs and strategies throughout postsecondary education.

(3) Recommend guidelines for the development of institutional roles, review plans of the postsecondary boards and institutions, and relay these plans to the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

(4) Recommend to the State Board of Education contracts with independent institutions to conduct programs consistent with the state master plan for postsecondary education. In making recommendations, the commission shall consider the annual report submitted by the Board of Regents pursuant to s. 240.209(3)(r). Each program shall be reviewed, with the cooperation of the institution, every 5 years.

(5) Recommend to the State Board of Education rules concerning the planning and coordination of postsecondary educational programs. These rules shall provide for the sector boards to assure that:

(a) Program reviews are conducted statewide.

(b) Every major program in public postsecondary education is reviewed every 5 years.

(c) Budget requests reflect program review results.

(d) Program decisions lead to the distinctive roles established for public universities and community colleges.

(6) Advise the State Board of Education regarding the need for and location of new programs, institutions, campuses, and instructional centers of public postsecondary education.

(7) Recommend to the State Board of Education for adoption criteria for the establishment of new community colleges and state universities, which criteria shall address:

(a) Proximity to existing institutions and assessment of the impact on existing institutions.

(b) Potential program duplication.

(c) Regional demographic characteristics.

(d) The efficient use of resources.

(8) Recommend to the State Board of Education and the Legislature the establishment of additional branch campuses of public postsecondary educational institutions. No branch campus may be established without a review by the commission and formal authorization by the Legislature. Any community college branch campus established to provide only exploratory, occupational proficiency, job-preparatory, and supplemental vocational and technical instruction must be reviewed and recommended again by the commission and receive specific authorization by the Legislature before expanding its instructional offerings to the college parallel program area.

(9) Review the establishment of those instructional centers which require approval by the Board of Regents or the State Board of Community Colleges.

(10) Review public postsecondary education budget requests for compliance with the state master plan before submission to the State Board of Education.

(11) Assist the State Board of Education in the conduct of its postsecondary educational responsibilities in such capacities as the state board deems appropriate.

(12) Update the state master plan for postsecondary education every 5 years.

(13) Conduct studies and planning activities related to the overall improvement and effectiveness of postsecondary education in this state.

(14) Review implementation of the state master plan and annually report to the State Board of Education and the Legislature the progress towards implementation.

(15) In consultation with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, recommend to the Legislature accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions that participate in the Florida resident access grant program. The process shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments. The process shall provide for an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida resident access grant program in providing state residents with access to 4-year college programs and with the successful completion of a baccalaureate degree. The commission shall provide oversight of this accountability process.

(16) Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

**History.**—ss. 4, 6, ch. 81-162; ss. 1, 4, ch. 82-46, s. 2, ch. 83-265, s. 8, ch. 83-325, s. 6, ch. 84-94; s. 27, ch. 89-381; s. 84, ch. 90-201; s. 27, ch. 91-5; ss. 1, 2, 3, ch. 91-8; s. 4, ch. 91-55; s. 5, ch. 91-429; s. 21, ch. 94-230; s. 11, ch. 95-243; s. 22, ch. 95-392.

**Note.**—Redesignated as s. 240.209(3)(s) by s. 4, ch. 94-322.

**State University System (240.214, Florida Statutes)**

**240.214 State University System accountability process.**—It is the intent of the Legislature that an accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing evaluation of quality and effectiveness in the State University System. It is further the intent of the Legislature that this accountability process monitor performance at the system level in each of the major areas of instruction, research, and public service, while recognizing the differing missions of each of the state universities. The accountability process shall provide for the adoption of systemwide performance standards and performance goals for each standard identified through a collaborative effort involving the State University System, the Legislature, and the Governor's Office. The accountability process shall result in an annual accountability report to the Legislature.

(1) The annual accountability report shall include goals and measurable objectives related to the systemwide strategic plan pursuant to s. 240.209. The plan must include, at a minimum, objectives related to the following measures:

- (a) Total student credit hours;
- (b) Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level;
- (c) Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution;
- (d) Institutional quality as assessed by followup, such as analyses of employment information on former students, national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers;
- (e) Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree;
- (f) Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and gender;
- (g) Student course demand;
- (h) An analysis of administrative and support functions;
- (i) Every 3 years, beginning 1995–1996, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students; and
- (j) An evaluation of the production of classroom contact hours at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.

(2) By December 31 of each year, the Board of Regents shall submit the annual accountability report providing information on the implementation of performance standards, actions taken to improve university achievement of performance goals, the achievement of performance goals during the prior year, and initiatives to be undertaken during the next year. The accountability reports shall be designed in consultation with the Governor's Office, the Office of the Auditor General, and the Legislature.

(3) The Board of Regents shall recommend in the annual accountability report any appropriate modifications to this section.

**History.**—s. 5, ch. 91-55; s. 23, ch. 94-230; s. 14, ch. 95-243; s. 25, ch. 95-392.

**Community College System (240.324, Florida Statutes)****240.324 Community college accountability process.—**

(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that a management and accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System. Accordingly, the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System. This plan must address the following issues:

(a) Graduation rates of A.A. and A.S. degree-seeking students compared to first-time enrolled students seeking the associate degree.

(b) Minority student enrollment and retention rates.

(c) Student performance, including student performance in college-level academic skills, mean grade point averages for community college A.A. transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure examinations.

(d) Job placement rates of community college vocational students.

(e) Student progression by admission status and program.

(f) Vocational accountability standards identified in s. 239.229.

(g) Other measures as identified by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and approved by the State Board of Community Colleges.

(2) By January 1, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a plan for addressing these issues. The plan must provide a specific timetable that identifies specific issues to be addressed each year and must provide for full implementation by December 31, 1994. Beginning December 31, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit an annual interim report providing the results of initiatives taken during the prior year and the initiatives and related objective performance measures proposed for the next year. The initial plan and each interim plan shall be designed in consultation with staff of the Governor and the Legislature.

(3) Beginning January 1, 1993, the State Board of Community Colleges shall address within the annual evaluation of the performance of the executive director, and the boards of trustees shall address within the annual evaluation of the presidents, the achievement of the performance goals established in the community college accountability plan.

**History.—**s. 12, ch. 91-55, s. 53, ch. 92-136, s. 7, ch. 95-411.

## Performance-Based Program Budgeting

### **216.0166 Submission by state agencies of performance-based budget requests, programs, and performance measures.—**

(1) Prior to October 15 of the fiscal year in which a state agency is required to submit a performance-based program budget request pursuant to s. 216.0172, such state agency shall identify and submit to the Executive Office of the Governor a list of proposed state agency programs. Such identification shall be conducted after discussion with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees and shall be approved by the Executive Office of the Governor. State agencies selected by the Governor pursuant to s. 216.0172(1) shall submit such lists prior to May 15, 1994. The Executive Office of the Governor, after discussion with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees, shall review the list, may make any changes, and shall approve or disapprove a list within 30 days of receipt, to be used in the preparation and submission of the state agency's final legislative budget request pursuant to s. 216.023(5). The Executive Office of the Governor shall provide the approved program list to the Legislature.

(2) The following documentation shall accompany the list of proposed programs submitted by the state agency:

- (a) The constitutional or statutory direction and authority for each program.
- (b) Identification of the customers, clients, and users of each program.
- (c) The purpose of each program or the benefit derived by the customers, clients, and users of the program.
- (d) Direct and indirect costs of each program.
- (e) Information on fees collected and the adequacy of those fees in funding each program for which the fees are collected.
- (f) An assessment of whether each program is conducive to performance-based program budgeting.
- (g) An assessment of the time needed to develop meaningful performance measures for each program.

(3) The Executive Office of the Governor, after discussion with legislative appropriations committees, appropriate substantive committees, and the Legislative Auditing Committee, shall jointly develop instructions for the development of performance measures for each program on the list approved pursuant to this section and shall submit such instructions to the state agencies prior to December 1 of the fiscal year preceding the year in which a state agency is required to submit a performance-based program budget request pursuant to s. 216.0172.

(4) Prior to June 1, each state agency is required to submit to the Executive Office of the Governor performance measures for each program on the approved list required pursuant to subsection (1). State agencies shall also identify the outputs produced by each approved program, the outcomes resulting from each

approved program, and baseline data associated with each performance measure. Performance measures shall be reviewed, after discussion with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees and the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, revised as necessary, and approved or disapproved by the Executive Office of the Governor within 30 days of receipt. For those state agencies selected by the Governor pursuant to s. 216.0172(1), performance measures, outputs, outcomes, and baseline data shall be submitted prior to July 1, 1994.

(5) Notwithstanding the programs, performance measures, and standards requested in each state agency's final legislative budget request or the Governor's budget recommendations, the Legislature shall have final approval of all programs, performance measures, and standards through the General Appropriations Act or legislation implementing the General Appropriations Act.

(6) Each state agency shall submit documentation to the Executive Office of the Governor regarding the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of each performance measure. In addition, each state agency shall indicate how the performance measure relates to its strategic plan and how it is used in management decisionmaking and other agency processes.

(7) Annually, no later than 45 days after the General Appropriations Act becomes law, state agencies may submit to the Executive Office of the Governor any adjustments to their performance standards based on the amounts appropriated for each program by the Legislature. When such adjustment is made, all performance standards, including any adjustments made, shall be submitted to and reviewed and revised as necessary by the Executive Office of the Governor, and, upon approval, submitted to the Legislature pursuant to the review and approval process provided in s. 216.177. The Executive Office of the Governor shall maintain the official record of adjustments to the performance standards as part of the agency's approved operating budget.

(8) A state agency operating under a performance-based program budget pursuant to s. 216.0172 shall not have the authority to amend or establish programs or performance measures. However, a state agency may propose a revision to the list of approved programs or performance measures used in its legislative budget request. Such revision is subject to review and approval by the Executive Office of the Governor and the Legislature and shall be submitted to the Executive Office of the Governor prior to April 15 of the year in which the state agency intends to incorporate these changes into its legislative budget request. The Executive Office of the Governor shall have 30 days to act on the proposed revisions. Revised performance measures, standards, and baseline data shall be submitted along with the preliminary legislative budget request.

History.—s. 4, ch. 94-249.

## Performance-Based Program Budgeting (Continued)

**216.0172 Schedule for submission of performance-based program budgets.**—In order to implement the provisions of chapter 94-249, Laws of Florida, state agencies shall submit performance-based program budgets for programs approved pursuant to s. 216.0166 to the Executive Office of the Governor and the Legislature based on the following schedule:

- (1) By September 1, 1994, for the 1995-1996 fiscal year, two state agencies selected by the Governor, subject to the review and approval process pursuant to s. 216.177.
- (2) By September 1, 1995, for the 1996-1997 fiscal year:
  - (a) Department of Education (Community Colleges).
  - (b) Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Mental Health).
  - (c) Department of Labor and Employment Security.
  - (d) Department of Law Enforcement.
  - (e) Department of Management Services.
  - (f) Division of Retirement.
- (3) By September 1, 1996, for the 1997-1998 fiscal year, by the following:
  - (a) Agency for Health Care Administration.
  - (b) Department of Education (State University System).
  - (c) Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.
  - (d) Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles.
  - (e) Department of Revenue.
  - (f) Department of State.
  - (g) Department of Transportation.
- (4) By September 1, 1997, for the 1998-1999 fiscal year, by the following:
  - (a) Department of Banking and Finance.
  - (b) Department of Corrections.
  - (c) Department of Education (Public Schools).
  - (d) Department of Environmental Protection.
  - (e) Executive Office of the Governor.
  - (f) Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.
  - (g) Department of Legal Affairs.
- (5) By September 1, 1998, for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, by the following:
  - (a) Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.
  - (b) Department of Commerce.
  - (c) Department of Elderly Affairs.
  - (d) Department of the Lottery.
  - (e) Department of Military Affairs.
- (6) By September 1, 1999, for the 2000-2001 fiscal year, by the following:
  - (a) Division of Administrative Hearings.
  - (b) Department of Business and Professional Regulation.

- (c) Parole and Probation Commission.
- (d) Public Service Commission.
- (7) By September 1, 2000, for the 2001-2002 fiscal year, by the following:
  - (a) Department of Citrus.
  - (b) Department of Community Affairs.
  - (c) Department of Insurance.
  - (d) Department of Veterans' Affairs.
- (8) The schedule set forth in subsections (2) through (7) may be amended by the Legislative Auditing Committee, the General Appropriations Act, or upon the recommendation of the Governor, which recommendation is subject to the review and approval process provided in s. 216.177.

**History.**—s. 7, ch. 94-249; s. 5, ch. 96-327.

Community College System Performance Funding (Chapter 96-424, Laws of Florida)

COMMUNITY COLLEGES, DIVISION OF

172A AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	
PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES	
FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	12,000,000

Funds in Specific Appropriation 172A shall be distributed by the State Board of Community Colleges as follows:

A. The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be distributed among the colleges based upon each college's pro-rata share of the total absolute number of Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degree completers and one half of the total number of certificate completers for the 1995-96 academic year.

B. The sum of \$5,000,000 shall be distributed among the colleges based upon each college's pro-rata share of the number of completers counted in A above who: required remediation based on the College Placement Test results (one point for each subject area requiring remediation); each completer who qualified as economically disadvantaged under federal qualifications; was reported as disabled in a federal classification of disabled; tested into ENS or ESL; has passed a state job licensure exam; and/or has been placed in a job as identified through using the state FETPIP data. Students may be counted in more than one category.

C. The sum of \$2,000,000 is to be distributed among the colleges based upon each college's pro-rata share of the number of Associate of Arts completers who graduated with fewer than 72 total attempted hours. In calculating hours attempted, the following courses would be included:

1. Any course which a student enrolls in at a Florida public college or university and which is not a remedial level course, would count as attempted credit hours;
2. Any credit hours accepted by the college as transfer credit toward a degree from a Florida private college or university or an out-of-state college or university would be counted as an attempted credit;
3. Any Advanced Placement, dual enrollment, International Baccalaureate, CLEP, departmental credit, or life experience credit which is counted toward the AA degree;
4. All credit hours over 12 hours of "English for Non-Speakers (ENS)" or any ENS hours counted toward the degree.



State University System Performance Funding (Chapter 96-424, Laws of Florida)

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL ACTIVITIES

The funds in Specific Appropriations 190, 191, 192, and 193 include \$34,938,334 for fee waivers.

189	LUMP SUM	
	INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FUND	
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	10,055,052

From the funds in Specific Appropriation 189, the Board of Regents shall allocate to each university its proportionate share of \$5 million provided for a new performance incentive program. Pursuant to criteria developed and adopted by the Board of Regents, each university shall budget and expend these funds in 1996-1997 to implement its plan for increased performance efficiency. By January 1, 1997, the Board of Regents shall report to the Legislature the performance incentive plan for each university and the amounts budgeted for each component of the plan. No later than September 1, 1997, the Board of Regents shall determine the performance efficiencies realized as a result of the 1996-1997 performance plans. The Board of Regents shall adjust the 1997-1998 instruction and research budget of any institution that did not realize its performance plan. This reduction must be based on the 1996-1997 performance-plan budget and the proportion of the plan not achieved. Any funds reduced from the instruction and research budget shall be transferred to the Challenge Grant Matching Trust Fund.

From the funds in Specific Appropriation 189, \$3.0 million shall be used to continue the Instructional Performance Incentive Fund established by the 1995 Legislature. The funds shall be used to recognize the extent to which each university has met or exceeded the teaching-and degree-productivity targets established for the 1995-1996 year for the following measures:

- a. Course sections per faculty person-year
- b. Course sections per faculty headcount
- c. Class size
- d. Student credit-hour productivity per faculty person-year
- e. Baccalaureate degrees per faculty person-year

The Board of Regents shall reserve a proportionate share of the \$3.0 million for allocation to each university. Each university shall earn up to the full amount of its share by documenting the extent to which it has achieved the 1995-1996 targets. By November 1, 1996, the Board of Regents shall report to the Legislature on the allocation of these funds. Any funds remaining unearned by any university must be transferred to the Challenge Grant Matching Trust Fund and used to match major gifts for scholarships. In determining the extent to which targets have been achieved for each measure, a point system shall be used. On each measure, a university may earn, for each target achieved, one point, plus or minus 0.1 of a point for each percentage point by which the

**State University System Performance Funding (Chapter 96-424, Laws of Florida),  
Continued**

**SPECIFIC  
APPROPRIATION**

target is exceeded or not fully met. The points earned for each measure shall be summed. A university earning a total of 5 or more points shall receive the full amount of its reserved incentive funding. If a university earns less than 5 points, it shall be allocated a portion of its reserved amount equal to the percentage of the 5 points that it actually earned.

From the funds in Specific Appropriation 189, \$2,055,052 shall be used to establish a Public Service Performance Incentive Fund to encourage faculty involvement in public service activities that meet critical state needs. On July 1, 1996, each university shall receive its proportionate share of these incentive funds. By October 1, 1996, each university shall report to the Board of Regents how these funds were allocated. The reports shall include the following:

- a. Specific activities or projects established as university public service priorities.
- b. A description of procedures used to allocate funds to specific faculty activities and projects.
- c. A description of the process to be used to monitor and evaluate these activities by September 1, 1997.

**Performance Indicators by Sector and Accountability Process**

	Accountability	Performance-Based Program Budgeting	Incentive Funding
Employment rate of SUS grads employed in Florida.		SUS	
Median annual earnings of SUS grads employed in Florida.		SUS	
Number and percent of Florida employers satisfied with SUS grads.		SUS	
Number and percent of former SUS grads satisfied with academic preparation for economic, educational, and quality of life conditions.		SUS	
Number and percent of grads passing licensure and certification exams.		SUS	
Number and percent of SUS grads who go on to graduate school.		SUS	
Economic impact of SUS institutions on surrounding communities and the state.		SUS	
Dollars infused into economy due to multiplier effect of SUS research (Dept of Commerce data).		SUS	
Ratio of externally funded research expenditures to total state-funded faculty.	SUS	SUS	
Number of scholarly publications by IFAS faculty and staff (IFAS).		SUS	
Economic impact of IFAS research on surrounding communities and the state (IFAS).		SUS	
Dollars infused into the economy due to the multiplier effect of IFAS research (IFAS).		SUS	
Citations of scholarly works.		SUS	
Measure of public satisfaction with public services provided.		SUS	
Percent of extension customers applying information which improves economic, environmental, or social well-being (IFAS).		SUS	
Percent of extension customers reporting extension programs helped meet a need or solved a problem (IFAS).		SUS	
Percent of extension customers who became certified (e.g., pesticide applicator training, day care providers) (IFAS).		SUS	
Average class section size.	SUS		SUS
Student credit hour productivity per ranked faculty personyear.	SUS		SUS
Course sections per ranked faculty personyear.	SUS		SUS
Planned enrollment compared to actual enrollment.	SUS		
Qualified FTIC applicants admitted.	SUS		
Florida community college AA applicants to SUS compared to those admitted.	SUS		
Limited access program applicants.	SUS		
Undergraduate retention and graduation rates.	SUS		
Percentage of students granted degrees in programs of 120 credit hours.	SUS		
Average number of credit hours taken beyond degree.	SUS		
Number of undergraduate degrees granted per state funded ranked faculty personyear.	SUS		
Number of undergraduate degrees granted in the various disciplines.	SUS		
Public service activities of the state universities.	SUS		
Average state funds expended for service by state universities.	SUS		
Institutional support from sources other than lottery and general revenue.	SUS		
Course sections per faculty headcount.			SUS
Baccalaureate degrees per faculty personyear.			SUS
AA, AS, and certificate completers.		DCC	DCC
Completers who are economically disadvantaged, disabled, ENS or ESL, passed a state job licensure exam, or were placed in field.		DCC	DCC
AA grads who completed with fewer than 72 total attempted SCH.		DCC	DCC
AA, AS, and certificate program retention and success rates.	DCC		
GPA performance of AA grads in the SUS.	DCC		
State licensure pass rate.	DCC		DCC
Job placement of vocational grads.	DCC		DCC
College Prep success -- reading, writing, and math.	DCC		
CLASS pass rates.	DCC		

**APPENDIX E**

**ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS'  
ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS**

**SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA  
INDICATOR 12 SUMMARY: CONSTITUTENTS'  
ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY**

**SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA  
INDICATOR 5: STATE FUNDING FOR ACADEMIC  
PROGRAM CONTRACTS**

**TABLE 1**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**FULL TIME FACULTY TEACHING LOAD, FALL 1995**  
**(One Term Only)**

	< 3 hrs.		3-5 hrs.		6-8 hrs.		9-11 hrs.		≥ 12 hrs.		Total
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	
Barry University	9	5%	16	9%	37	21%	64	36%	53	30%	179
Bethune-Cookman College	1	1%	4	3%	11	9%	19	15%	91	72%	126
Clearwater Christian College	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	23%	20	77%	26
Eckerd College	0	0%	3	3%	11	13%	66	75%	8	9%	88
Embry-Riddle University	2	1%	20	11%	46	26%	44	25%	63	36%	175
Flagler College	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	8	17%	38	79%	48
Florida Memorial College	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	18%	47	82%	57
Florida Southern College	2	2%	5	5%	5	5%	11	12%	70	75%	93
Florida Institute of Technology	13	8%	28	17%	37	22%	44	26%	47	28%	169
Jacksonville University	3	3%	8	7%	9	8%	20	18%	70	64%	110
Lynn University	0	0%	3	7%	4	10%	8	20%	25	63%	40
Nova Southeastern University	0	0%	7	12%	7	12%	6	10%	41	67%	61
Palm Beach Atlantic College	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	76	100%	76
Ringling School of Art & Design	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	34	87%	0	0%	39
Rollins College	0	0%	4	4%	18	16%	61	54%	29	26%	112
Saint Leo College	0	0%	3	7%	3	7%	8	18%	31	69%	45
St. Thomas University	0	0%	5	8%	11	18%	13	21%	34	54%	63
Stetson University*											
University of Miami	57	9%	145	24%	243	40%	102	17%	60	10%	607
University of Tampa	2	2%	8	6%	12	9%	21	16%	85	66%	128
Warner Southern College	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	16%	15	79%	19
Webber College	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	100%	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>2273</b>

Notes: \* Data were not reported.

Summary: In more than half (14) of the reporting institutions a majority of full-time faculty teach an average load of 12 hours or more.

However, among all full time faculty only 40 percent teach an average load of 12 hours or more, although this is still the largest category.

Sixty-four percent of all full time faculty teach nine hours or more.



**TABLE 3**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**TENURE OF FULL TIME FACULTY BY GENDER AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1995**

	Tenured						Tenure Track, Not Tenured						Not Tenure Track						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			Male			Female			
	No.	%	Total Tenured	No.	%	Total Tenured	No.	%	Total Non-Tenured	No.	%	Total Non-Tenured	No.	%	Total Non-Tenured	No.	%	Total Non-Tenured	
Barry University*																			
Bethune-Cookman College	10	71%	4	29%	14	64	59%	45	41%	109	1	33%	2	67%	3	125	51%	122	49%
Clearwater Christian College*																			
Eckerd College	41	71%	17	29%	58	20	67%	10	33%	30	3	75%	1	25%	4	4	100%	0	0%
Embry-Riddle University	83	89%	10	11%	93	85	90%	9	10%	94									
Flagler College*																			
Florida Memorial College*																			
Florida Southern College*																			
Florida Institute of Technology*																			
Jacksonville University	48	72%	19	28%	67	23	52%	21	48%	44	2	67%	1	33%	3				
Lynn University***	27	73%	10	27%	37														
Nova Southeastern University	24	55%	20	45%	44	0	0%	0	0%	0	182	62%	113	38%	295	54	71%	22	29%
Palm Beach Atlantic College*																			
Ringling School of Art & Design*																			
Rollins College	84	74%	30	26%	114	7	33%	14	67%	21	5	31%	11	69%	16	26	67%	13	33%
Saint Leo College	30	77%	9	23%	39	9	53%	8	47%	17	1	33%	2	67%	3	37	64%	21	36%
St. Thomas University	16	80%	4	20%	20	6	55%	5	45%	11					58				
Stetson University**																			
University of Miami	715	82%	153	18%	868	160	70%	69	30%	229	442	57%	335	43%	777				
University of Tampa**																			
Warner Southern College	4		0	0%	4	10	67%	5	33%	15	0		0		0				
Webber College*																			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1082</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1358</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>1565</b>				

Notes: \* These institutions do not have a tenure program.

\*\* Data were not reported.

\*\*\* Data were reported only for tenured faculty. Data were also not disaggregated by race and sex. There actually one black and one Asian faculty member whose gender cannot be determined from data provided. Table entries refer to the total number of male and female faculty members.

Summary: At all faculty levels males considerably outnumber females, especially among tenured faculty, where they constitute 80 percent.

**TABLE 4**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE SECTIONS TAUGHT BY FACULTY RANK, FALL 1995**

	Full Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.		Instructor/ Lecturer*		Other Regular Faculty		Total Sections
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Barry University	92	10%	205	22%	248	26%	395	42%	0	0%	940
Behtune-Cookman College	51	7%	88	13%	257	37%	292	42%	0	0%	688
Clearwater Christian College	34	23%	87	58%	8	5%	20	13%	0	0%	149
Eckerd College	70	23%	70	23%	116	39%	42	14%	0	0%	298
Embry-Riddle University	167	24%	254	36%	117	17%	159	23%	8	1%	705
Flagler College	43	14%	69	22%	79	25%	117	37%	10	3%	318
Florida Memorial College	26	6%	53	13%	184	45%	118	29%	32	8%	413
Florida Southern College	188	36%	91	18%	224	43%	307	37%	13	2%	823
Florida Institute of Technology**											
Jacksonville University	158	22%	139	19%	143	20%	283	39%	0	0%	723
Lynn University	48	19%	58	23%	44	17%	104	41%	1	0%	255
Nova Southeastern University	19	8%	76	30%	100	40%	498	71%	5	1%	698
Palm Beach Atlantic College	46	12%	77	19%	142	36%	133	33%	0	0%	398
Ringling School of Art & Design***	169	88%					23	12%	0	0%	192
Rollins College	188	40%	116	25%	47	10%	116	25%	0	0%	467
Saint Leo College	50	11%	78	17%	58	12%	252	54%	29	6%	467
St. Thomas University	91	30%	46	15%	85	28%	78	26%	0	0%	300
Stetson University	160	21%	212	28%	183	24%	217	28%	0	0%	772
University of Miami	436	21%	432	21%	218	11%	784	38%	170	8%	2040
University of Tampa	152	28%	132	25%	131	24%	118	22%	6	1%	539
Warner Southern College	24	13%	45	25%	29	16%	73	41%	9	5%	180
Webber College	20	22%	29	32%	23	25%	19	21%	0	0%	91
<b>Total</b>	<b>2232</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>2357</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>2436</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>4148</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>11,456</b>

Notes: \* Includes Supplemental Faculty.

\*\* Data not reported.

\*\*\* Faculty are not ranked. All regular faculty are reported in the "full professor" column.

Summary: · Among professors, teaching duties are evenly distributed among assistant, associate, and full professors.  
· Sixty-one percent of all undergraduate sections are taught by professors.



**TABLE 5**

**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS TO GRADUATE, FALL 1991 COHORT**

	Credit Hours to Graduate		No. of Students Graduating
	Per Catalog	Actual*	
Barry University	120	131.9	67
Bethune-Cookman College	130	133.8	87
Clearwater Christian College	128	134.1	22
Eckerd College	126	132.1	171
Embry-Riddle University	126	136.0	22
Flagler College	120	121.0	133
Florida Memorial College	124	131.4	62
Florida Southern College	124	129.8	142
Florida Institute of Technology**			
Jacksonville University	128.4	135.9	119
Lynn University	124.9	125.1	58
Nova Southeastern University	123.2	122.6	27
Palm Beach Atlantic College	128	133.0	43
Ringling School of Art & Design	124	124.0	69
Rollins College	117	125.0	229
Saint Leo College	122	127.7	44
St. Thomas University	123.5	130.1	39
Stetson University	126.3	132.1	204
University of Miami	120.4	127.8	710
University of Tampa	124	128.5	90
Warner Southern College	128	128.0	5
Webber College	122	122.2	31
<b>Statewide Average</b>	<b>124.6</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>2374</b>

**Notes:** \* Entries represent weighted averages over 21 majors, weighted by the number of students graduating in each major. Data are only reported for graduates with information available by major.

\*\* Data not reported.

**Summary:**

- Average graduation requirements at the reporting institutions ranged from 117 credit hours at Rollins College to 130 credit hours at Bethune-Cookman.
- At 18 of the 21 reporting institutions students on average took more credit hours than were necessary to graduate according to their catalogs.
- However, on average they only took 4.4 extra hours.

**TABLE 6**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**AVERAGE DEBT ACCUMULATED BY 4-YEAR GRADUATES BY LOAN TYPE**  
**FOR STUDENTS GRADUATING BETWEEN JULY 1, 1994 AND JUNE 30, 1995**

	Total Unduplicated Count*		Stafford Loans		Perkins Loans		Institutional Loans	
	No. of Students with Loans	Avg. Cum. Debt	No. of Students with Loans	Avg. Cum. Debt	No. of Students with Loans	Avg. Cum. Debt	No. of Students with Loans	Avg. Cum. Debt
Barry University	18	\$ 9,383	18	\$ 9,304	8	\$ 2,181	0	\$ -
Bethune-Cookman College	58	\$ 14,974	58	\$ 14,974	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Clearwater Christian College	23	\$ 9,904	23	\$ 9,904	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Eckerd College	35	\$ 13,700	33	\$ 12,991	22	\$ 1,821	10	\$ 1,077
Embry-Riddle University	8	\$ 14,063	6	\$ 16,417	4	\$ 3,500	0	\$ -
Flagler College	34	\$ 9,662	32	\$ 10,031	2	\$ 3,750	0	\$ -
Florida Memorial College	26	\$ 10,500	26	\$ 10,500	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Florida Southern College	37	\$ 9,390	33	\$ 8,152	19	\$ 3,684	8	\$ 1,056
Florida Institute of Technology	35	\$ 2,139	12	\$ 2,159	7	\$ 1,947	16	\$ 2,208
Jacksonville University	108	\$ 11,069	91	\$ 10,948	34	\$ 2,859	18	\$ 5,667
Lynn University	5	\$ 41,626	5	\$ 38,226	2	\$ 3,400	0	\$ -
Nova Southeastern University	6	\$ 18,967	6	\$ 18,967	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Palm Beach Atlantic College	11	\$ 9,614	11	\$ 9,614	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Ringling School of Art & Design	29	\$ 25,043	29	\$ 25,043	0	\$ -	0	\$ -
Rollins College	36	\$ 11,600	34	\$ 11,451	13	\$ 1,575	1	\$ 3,805
Saint Leo College	9	\$ 38,942	8	\$ 29,572	6	\$ 9,370	0	\$ -
St. Thomas University	7	\$ 10,161	7	\$ 8,357	5	\$ 2,500	0	\$ -
Stetson University**								
University of Miami	552	\$ 11,484	389	\$ 14,705	273	\$ 2,223	8	\$ 1,513
University of Tampa	18	\$ 15,433	18	\$ 13,984	8	\$ 1,938	3	\$ 3,530
Warner Southern College	5	\$ 12,541	3	\$ 11,371	2	\$ 1,755	0	\$ -
Webber College	12	\$ 10,745	12	\$ 10,253	5	\$ 1,180	0	\$ -
<b>Totals***</b>	<b>1072</b>	<b>\$ 12,013</b>	<b>854</b>	<b>\$ 13,614</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>\$ 2,409</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>\$ 2,860</b>

**Notes:** \* Other columns may not add to total because students have more than one type of loan.

\*\* Data were not reported.

\*\*\* Average are weighted by the number of students at each institution.

**Summary:** • A vast majority of students relied on Stafford loans, and a vast majority of the total debt was also accumulated in Stafford loans.  
• At 15 of the 21 reporting institutions students relied on more than one type of loan. However, only seven institutions provided institutional loans.

**TABLE 7**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**FOUR YEAR GRADUATION AND RETENTION RATES OF FALL 1991 COHORT**

	Original Cohort Fall 1991		Graduated as of 6/30/95		Still Enrolled by Fall 1995		Graduated &/or Still Enrolled by Fall 1995	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Barry University	301	22%	67	23%	70	23%	137	46%
Bethune-Cookman College	630	14%	87	50%	317	50%	404	64%
Clearwater Christian College	97	25%	23	11%	11	11%	34	35%
Eckerd College	337	54%	181	7%	23	7%	204	61%
Embry-Riddle University	706	18%	130	34%	239	34%	369	52%
Flagler College	290	46%	133	12%	35	12%	168	58%
Florida Memorial College	525	4%	21	16%	83	16%	104	20%
Florida Southern College	352	40%	142	10%	37	10%	179	51%
Florida Institute of Technology	430	34%	147	1%	4	1%	151	35%
Jacksonville University	389	23%	88	16%	64	16%	152	39%
Lynn University	116	51%	59	12%	14	12%	73	63%
Nova Southeastern University	154	18%	27	19%	29	19%	56	36%
Palm Beach Atlantic College	228	19%	43	13%	30	13%	73	32%
Ringling School of Art & Design	120	58%	69	6%	7	6%	76	63%
Rollins College	399	60%	233	10%	30	10%	263	70%
Saint Leo College	200	21%	42	8%	17	8%	59	30%
St. Thomas University	181	22%	39	21%	38	21%	77	42%
Stetson University	474	47%	223	17%	80	17%	303	64%
University of Miami	1831	39%	710	21%	384	21%	1094	60%
University of Tampa	347	27%	93	15%	51	15%	144	42%
Warner Southern College	48	8%	4	10%	5	10%	9	19%
Webber College	73	47%	34	5%	4	5%	38	52%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8228</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>2595</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>1572</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>4167</b>	<b>51%</b>

**Summary:** · Statewide slightly less than a third of the students graduated in four years.  
 · Four of 22 institutions graduated more than half of their students in four years.  
 · Statewide almost half (49%) of all students initially enrolled had not graduated and were not enrolled for the Fall 1995 term.

TABLE 8

**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
TRANSFER STUDENT ACCESS TO UPPER DIVISION, FALL 1995 COHORT**

	<b>AA Transfers Admitted*</b>	<b>No. immediately admitted to degree program of choice</b>	<b>% immediately admitted to degree program of choice</b>
Barry University	119	112	94%
Bethune-Cookman College	N/A		
Clearwater Christian College	N/A		
Eckerd College	21	21	100%
Embry-Riddle University	N/A		
Flagler College	8	8	100%
Florida Memorial College	32	32	100%
Florida Southern College	52	52	100%
Florida Institute of Technology	24	24	100%
Jacksonville University	N/A		
Lynn University	6	6	100%
Nova Southeastern University	94	94	100%
Palm Beach Atlantic College			100%
Ringling School of Art & Design	8	8	100%
Rollins College	70	70	100%
Saint Leo College	29	29	100%
St. Thomas University	32	32	100%
Stetson University**			
University of Miami	59	59	100%
University of Tampa	24	24	100%
Warner Southern College	29	29	100%
Webber College	3	3	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>99%</b>

**Notes:** \* Includes only AA transfers from Florida community colleges with whom the institution has an articulation agreement.

\*\* Data not reported.

**Summary:** · Statewide all but seven of 610 AA transfer students were immediately admitted into the degree program of their choice, and all seven of the exceptions were at Barry University.

**TABLE 9**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**TWO AND THREE YEAR GRADUATION RATES FOR AA TRANSFER STUDENTS, 1992 AND 1993**

	Fall, 1992 Cohort*			Fall, 1993 Cohort*		
	AA Degree Transfer Students	Graduated in 2 Years		AA Degree Transfer Students	Graduated in 2 Years	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Barry University	131	55	42%	87	30	34%
Bethune-Cookman College	N/A			N/A		
Clearwater Christian College	N/A			N/A		
Eckerd College	23	12	52%	14	8	57%
Embry-Riddle University	N/A			N/A		
Flagler College	22	11	50%	22	15	68%
Florida Memorial College*	N/A					
Florida Southern College	12	7	58%	23	13	56%
Florida Institute of Technology	22	3	14%	14	5	36%
Jacksonville University	N/A			N/A		
Lynn University	3	2	67%	8	8	100%
Nova Southeastern University	51	33	65%	50	22	44%
Palm Beach Atlantic College	N/A			N/A		
Ringling School of Art & Design	4			7		
Rollins College	N/A			16	3	20%
Saint Leo College	3	0	0%	17	9	53%
St. Thomas University	81	48	59%	54	28	52%
Stetson University**						
University of Miami	75	20	27%	67	23	34%
University of Tampa	40	14	35%	34	18	53%
Warner Southern College	17	8	47%	39	29	74%
Webber College	5	1	20%	7	7	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>47%</b>

Notes: \* Cohorts include only AA transfers from Florida community colleges with whom the institution has an articulation agreement.  
 \*\* Data not reported.

Summary: · 2-year graduation rates for AA transfer students are somewhat higher than the 4-year rates for those admitted as freshman, but still less than half of transfer students graduate in the standard two year period.  
 · Retention is also higher among transfer students, given an overall three year graduation rate of 71 percent. The highest possible corresponding graduation rate for students admitted as freshman is 51 percent.

TABLE 10

**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
AVERAGE UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SECTION SIZES, FALL 1995**

	<b>Total No. Seats Filled</b>	<b>Total No. Sections</b>	<b>Mean Section Size</b>
Barry University	12,438	703	17.6
Bethune-Cookman College	7,526	495	15
Clearwater Christian College	2,975	144	20.7
Eckerd College	5,454	298	18.3
Embry-Riddle University	16,890	690	24.5
Flagler College	6,403	303	21.1
Florida Memorial College	6,852	413	17
Florida Southern College	7,836	420	18.7
Florida Institute of Technology	5,683	270	21
Jacksonville University	8,987	609	14.8
Lynn University	5,103	247	20.1
Nova Southeastern University	11,253	662	16
Palm Beach Atlantic College	10,243	609	16.8
Ringling School of Art & Design	3,867	204	18.9
Rollins College	7,759	485	16
Saint Leo College	7,283	467	15.6
St. Thomas University	4,023	241	16.7
Stetson University	8,470	581	14.6
University of Miami	38,945	1,659	23.5
University of Tampa	7,426	424	17.5
Warner Southern College	2,529	170	14.9
Webber College	2,110	102	20.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>190,055</b>	<b>10,196</b>	<b>18.6</b>

- Summary:**
- Average section size is quite small at all independent institutions, with a statewide average of less than 20.
  - Only seven institutions had an average section size over 20, and none were over 25.

**TABLE 11**  
**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE SECTIONS IN VARIOUS SIZE RANGES, FALL 1995\***

	1 to 9 students		10 to 19 students		20 to 29 students		30 to 39 students		40 to 49 students		50 to 99 students		over 99 students		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Barry University	128	18.2%	306	43.5%	203	28.9%	55	7.8%	7	1.0%	4	0.6%	0	0.0%	703
Behrune-Cookman College	208	41.6%	142	28.4%	94	18.8%	39	7.8%	12	2.4%	5	1.0%	0	0.0%	500
Clearwater Christian College	40	29.2%	34	24.8%	33	24.1%	14	10.2%	3	2.2%	13	9.5%	0	0.0%	137
Eckerd College	59	19.8%	129	43.3%	72	24.2%	27	9.1%	5	1.7%	5	1.7%	1	0.3%	298
Embry-Riddle University	38	5.5%	163	23.6%	301	43.6%	141	20.4%	32	4.6%	15	2.2%	0	0.0%	690
Flagler College	34	11.2%	104	34.3%	97	32.0%	55	18.2%	7	2.3%	6	2.0%	0	0.0%	303
Florida Memorial College	132	34.6%	111	29.1%	85	22.3%	40	10.5%	11	2.9%	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	382
Florida Southern College	129	30.7%	112	26.7%	99	23.6%	48	11.4%	20	4.8%	11	2.6%	1	0.2%	420
Florida Institute of Technology	239	32.5%	281	38.2%	174	23.7%	29	3.9%	4	0.5%	7	1.0%	1	0.1%	735
Jacksonville University	197	32.3%	233	38.3%	132	21.7%	40	6.6%	7	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	609
Lynn University	33	13.4%	85	34.4%	83	33.6%	38	15.4%	4	1.6%	4	1.6%	0	0.0%	247
Nova Southeastern University	109	16.9%	344	53.3%	149	23.1%	35	5.4%	1	0.2%	8	1.2%	0	0.0%	646
Palm Beach Atlantic College	158	30.9%	156	30.5%	114	22.3%	40	7.8%	24	4.7%	19	3.7%	1	0.2%	512
Ringling School of Art & Design	7	3.4%	94	46.1%	88	43.1%	5	2.5%	5	2.5%	4	2.0%	1	0.5%	204
Rollins College	91	18.8%	219	45.2%	150	30.9%	21	4.3%	3	0.6%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	485
Saint Leo College	141	30.2%	163	34.9%	125	26.8%	34	7.3%	4	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	467
St. Thomas University	45	18.7%	112	46.5%	67	27.8%	17	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	241
Stetson University**															
University of Miami	323	19.5%	565	34.1%	370	22.3%	207	12.5%	86	5.2%	82	4.9%	26	1.6%	1659
University of Tampa	55	13.0%	168	39.6%	160	37.7%	40	9.4%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	424
Warner Southern College	47	27.6%	83	48.8%	30	17.6%	8	4.7%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	0	0.0%	170
Webber College	12	11.8%	34	33.3%	34	33.3%	22	21.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	102
<b>Total</b>	<b>2225</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>3638</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	<b>2660</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>9934</b>

\* Excludes independent/directed individual study, supervised research, internships, performance instruction and other individual instruction.  
 \*\* Data not reported.

TABLE 12

**SELECTED FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS SEEKING SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION  
OR RE-ACCREDITATION IN 1994-95 AND OUTCOMES**

Institution	Program(s)	Outcomes			
		Approved	Cond. Approved	Pending	Denied
Barry University	Physical Ed.		X		
Bethune-Cookman College	Continuing Ed.	X			
Clearwater Christian College	None				
Eckerd College	None				
Embry-Riddle University	Aviation Bus. Adm.	X			
	Aviation Maint. Mgmt.	X			
	Mgmt. Technical Operations	X			
Flagler College	None				
Florida Memorial College	None				
Florida Southern College*					
Florida Institute of Technology	Aeronautics	X			
	Psychology	X			
	Engineering**	X			
	Chemistry	X			
	Science Ed.	X			
Jacksonville University	None				
Lynn University	Physical Therapy Asst.	X			
Nova Southeastern University	Teacher Ed.	X			
	Legal Assistant	X			
Palm Beach Atlantic College	None				
Ringling School of Art & Design	Interior Design	X			
Rollins College	None				
Saint Leo College	None				
St. Thomas University	None				
Stetson University	Education	X			
	Business	X			
	Accounting	X			
University of Miami	Chemistry			X	
	Psychology			X	
	Architecture	X			
	Teacher Ed.	X			
University of Tampa	Sports Management			X	
	Elementary Ed.			X	
Warner Southern College	None				
Webber College	None				
<b>Total Programs</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

Notes: \* Data not reported.

\*\* Includes Chemical, Civil, Computer, Mechanical, Electrical, and Ocean Engineering.

**Summary:**

- In 1994-95 10 institutions had programs that sought specialized accreditation or re-accreditation for a total of 23 academic programs.
- Of all of these programs, none were denied. Nineteen programs were approved (one conditionally) and four applications were still pending.
- The most common programs seeking accreditation were some form of education program.



## INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

### Indicator 12 Summary: Constituents' Assessments of Quality

#### I. Accreditation

All institutions in ICUF must be accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Five of the universities listed this as a measure of quality.

Some universities also had academic programs that sought accreditation or re-accreditation during the 1994-95 academic year. Of the 20 programs in this category, 15 were approved, 1 was conditionally approved, and 4 were still pending as of the spring of 1996 (according to data provided by Indicator 11). There were no programs which were denied accreditation.

#### II. Recognition in Publications

Three ICUF institutions that submitted accountability reports did not answer Indicator 12. Of the seventeen colleges and universities that did, eight used recognition in *U.S. News and World Report's* "Outstanding Colleges in America" as a measure of quality. These institutions are listed below.

Clearwater Christian College  
Eckerd College  
Flagler College  
Lynn University  
Ringling School of Art and Design  
Rollins College  
University of Miami  
Webber College

Jacksonville University and Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University listed recognition in other publications. Four universities listed specific academic programs that had been recognized in various other publications.

#### III. Survey Results

Instructions in the ICUF Reporting Manual for responding to Indicator 12 read:

*"Results of student, alumni, or employer surveys may also be summarized. For any survey cited, please include a one paragraph description of who was surveyed, when the survey was conducted, methodology, and response rate."*

Only two institutions, Ringling School of Art and Design and St. Leo College, actually followed these directions. Three other institutions mentioned surveys as a measure that they use for accountability, but included either very few methodological details or none at all.

In general, institutions approached Indicator 12 very differently. Some other approaches institutions took highlighted their large number of accredited academic programs, their service to the community, or faculty and alumni accomplishments.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM CONTRACTS COSTS, 1994-95**

Institution	Program	# of Students	Total Amt. Awarded	Amt. Awarded per Student
Barry University	BS Nursing	27	\$ 190,952	\$ 7,072
	MSW, Miami Shores	75	\$ 193,560	\$ 2,581
	MSW, Fort Myers	23	\$ 107,316	\$ 4,666
FL Inst. of Technology	Engineering	43	\$ 401,321	\$ 9,333
	Science Education	8	\$ 79,408	\$ 9,926
FL Southern College	Accounting	14	\$ 52,808	\$ 3,772
	Elem./Early Chd. Education	21	\$ 70,456	\$ 3,355
Nova Southeastern U.	Liberal Studies	110	\$ 597,408	\$ 5,267
	Speech Pathology	53	\$ 212,093	\$ 4,002
University of Miami	Architctural Engineering	11	\$ 74,222	\$ 6,747
	MS Biomedical Engineering	45	\$ 86,185	\$ 1,915
	Ind./Manufacturing Eng.	22	\$ 80,180	\$ 3,645
	PhD Biomedical Sciences	30	\$ 362,762	\$ 12,902
	BS Nursing	53	\$ 338,003	\$ 6,377
	MS Nursing	77	\$ 295,236	\$ 3,834
	PhD Marine/Atmospheric Sci.	19	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>		<b>631</b>	<b>\$ 3,141,910</b>	<b>\$ 4,979</b>

**Florida Resident Access Grant, 1994-95\***

# of Students	Total Amount Awarded	Amt. Awarded per Student
15,928	\$ 17,322,155	\$ 1,088

\*Note: Contract participants are not eligible for the FRAG

**APPENDIX F**

**POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION  
PERFORMANCE PROFILE**

## POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PERFORMANCE PROFILE

This performance profile of the State University System (SUS), Community College System (CCS), and independent sector is organized to reflect each sector's current status and where available, progress, in addressing the statewide priorities of quality of undergraduate education, access/diversity, and productivity. The priority areas represent the common performance goals or planning priorities contained in the State Comprehensive Plan, Postsecondary Education Planning Commission's *Master Plan*, and the SUS and CCS Strategic Plans.

### Access/Diversity

**Access** - The most significant problem confronting the State University System for the period of this *Master Plan*, and even more so during the following five year period, is the diminishing capability of the System to provide Florida's citizens adequate access to higher education.

**State University System.**

**Diversity** - To maximize use of our State's human resources, postsecondary education must respond to the diversity of our population. Institutions must provide greater opportunity for all students to achieve to their fullest potential through changes in the curriculum as well as through diversification of their faculty and students.

**Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.**

Possible indicators:

- SUS:
  - Qualified FTIC applicants admitted (Accountability Objective 3a)
  - 4 and 6 year retention and graduation rates for FTIC students (Accountability Objective 7)
  - 2 and 3 year retention and graduation rates for community college AA transfers (Accountability Objective 7)
- CCS:
  - Access and Equity Measure (CCS Accountability Report, pp. 13-14)
  - Fall Headcount Enrollment History and Minority Headcount Enrollment History, (Figs. A & B, CCS Fact Book)
- ICUF:
  - Four year retention and graduation rate; can disaggregate for minority students as well (Accountability Measure #6)

### Quality of Undergraduate Education

Improvement in the quality of undergraduate education remains the Board of Regents' primary goal.

**Board of Regents.**

Strengthen the quality of programs and curricula among community colleges. Community colleges should expand postsecondary vocational and workforce training programs, strengthen the curricula and competencies in these programs to reflect up-to-date employment requirements, establish Centers of Technology Innovation in partnership with public and private entities, continue to improve the Associate of Arts programs, strengthen international and multicultural components of the curricula, and expand the use of technology in instruction.

**State Board of Community Colleges.**

Possible indicators:

- SUS:
  - Licensure exam pass rates (SUS Accountability Report)
- CCS:
  - Licensure pass rates (CCS Accountability Report, p. 12)
  - GPA performance of AA graduates who go on to the SUS (CCS Accountability Report, pp. 7-8)
  - Placement of AS completers in training-related occupation (CCS Accountability Report, p. 11)
  - Measure of CLAST success for AA students with 60+ SCH (CCS Accountability Report, p. 6)
- ICUF:
  - Undergraduate students' contact with senior faculty (ICUF Accountability Report)
  - Average section size (ICUF Accountability Report)

Productivity

Educating more students with limited resources is an essential step in dealing with the dual issues of quality and access. As claims upon state tax revenues outside the postsecondary budget increase and as the number of students seeking higher education also increases, postsecondary education needs to become productive in different ways than in the past. **Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.**

Strengthen and provide leadership in institutional effectiveness, accountability, and local control. Community colleges should support the use of effectiveness indicators developed by the Task Force on Accountability, embrace the criteria for accreditation and emphasis on institutional effectiveness as outlined by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, develop institutional effectiveness plans and use the results to develop quality improvement at the college level, and establish mechanisms to measure the achievement of *Master Plan*.

**State Board of Community Colleges.**

Possible indicators:

- SUS:
  - increase in course sections per faculty person-year, 1992-93 to 1994-95 (SUS Accountability Report)
  - increase in baccalaureate degrees per faculty person-year, 1992-93 to 1994-95 (SUS Accountability Report)

- CCS:

- AA (and/or AS) retention rate (This is defined as the number of AA-degree seeking students in cohort who had graduated or were still enrolled in good standing after four years (CCS Accountability Report.)
- Number and percent of AA degree-seeking students completing AA degree within 72 SCH (Performance Funding data)

- ICUF:

- Percent of ranked faculty teaching 12 or more credit hours per semester (ICUF Accountability Report)