

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS/STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
LIVE OAK CENTER
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
DECEMBER 6, 2007

Mr. Dasburg convened the meeting of the Academic Programs/Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Governors at 9:15 a.m., in the Live Oak Center, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, December 6, 2007, with the following members present: Ann Duncan, Charlie Edwards, Dr. Stanley Marshall, Sheila McDevitt, Lynn Pappas, Ava Parker, Tico Perez, Gus Stavros, and John Temple. Dr. Zach Zachariah participated by telephone conference call. Other members of the Board also present were: Dr. Arlen Chase, Frank Martin and Carolyn K. Roberts.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held June 14, 2007

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held June 14, 2007, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Opening Remarks, Chairman Dasburg

Mr. Dasburg said that at the Board of Governors meeting held at FIU in June, the Board had discussed the issue of freshman enrollment caps. He said at the end of the discussion he had remarked that the Board ought to be cautious about the consequences of capping freshman enrollment. He noted that he had not been able to attend the July meeting at which the Board had made the decision to cap enrollment. He said the Minutes of that meeting described two actions relating to enrollment: "a. Eliminate non-critical low enrollment courses and increase class size for all faculty; and b. As a result of the 4% cutback, freeze freshman enrollment growth (at current funded levels) statewide for a three year period beginning with the Spring 2008 and Fall 2008-2009 admissions. Hold harmless community college AA transfers."

Mr. Dasburg said this Board had adopted, as a Board of Governors strategy, a focus on the SUS producing more undergraduate degrees, as Florida was low in the per capita of its population holding the baccalaureate degree. He said another focus was the production of graduate and professional degrees in certain areas, mostly teaching and some of the sciences. He commented that Florida had more graduate degrees per capita. He said it seemed to be inconsistent to adopt a strategy to focus on undergraduate education, approve a cap on freshman enrollment and then, continue to approve new Ph.D. programs. He said he was not suggesting no new Ph.D.s, but

consideration of all the issues. He said the Board had felt the crisis so severe that it had capped freshman enrollment. Was it appropriate to continue approving new doctoral programs?

He said the Board might consider rescinding its earlier motion, or amending its strategy, that freshman enrollment was not the Board's thrust. He said the Board's strategy should serve as the blueprint for going forward; capping freshman enrollment and approving Ph.D.s was inconsistent.

3. Consideration, Termination, Ph.D., International Relations, UF

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the termination of the Ph.D., International Relations, University of Florida, CIP Code 45.0901, as presented. Ms. Parker seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

4. Consideration, Implementation, New Doctoral Programs

Mr. Dasburg said the agenda had included proposals for six new doctoral programs. He advised the Committee members that as of that morning, the proposals for Ph.D. programs in Government, Sociology and History, at the University of South Florida, had been withdrawn. President Machen reported that the University of Florida was also withdrawing its proposal for the Ph.D. in Nutritional Sciences, but that he wanted to make the case for the proposals for the Ph.D. in Biostatistics and the Ph.D. in Epidemiology.

Dr. Machen said the proposals for the Ph.D.s in Biostatistics and Epidemiology were part of a larger strategy. He said that for the past four years, the College of Public Health and Health Professions had been preparing to seek accreditation from the Council on Education for Public Health. He explained that major funding opportunities were open only to accredited Schools of Public Health. He said that accreditation requirements had also changed. Previously, only one Ph.D. program was required; as of Spring, 2008, three Ph.D. programs were required for accreditation. He said the College had already made significant commitments to these programs. The College had been recruiting new faculty members, \$1 million in new state dollars had been committed to the College, and dollars within the College's budget had been reallocated. He said these efforts would have been for naught, if these new programs were not approved.

Mr. Dasburg said it was important that the universities brief the Board of Governors about their broader strategies. He said he understood from the staff analysis that there was currently a Master's program in Biostatistics with three students. Dean Michael Perri said there was currently a Master's program in Public Health with 100 students studying different areas of concentrations. Three students were Biostatistics students and 40 students were studying Epidemiology. Mr. Dasburg inquired why the

College would choose to seek a Ph.D. program in Biostatistics with only three students. Dean Perri noted that other Master's students might feed into the Ph.D. program, such as students currently in Statistics. Mr. Dasburg said he was unsure about the need for a new program with so few students in the possible feeder program. Dean Perri said that there were five areas of core study in Public Health which were complementary and integrated. For accreditation, doctorates in three of these core areas were required.

Mrs. Roberts said she understood that the University was withdrawing the Ph.D. in Nutritional Sciences because approval was not time-sensitive.

Ms. Duncan inquired whether the other Colleges of Public Health were accredited, and whether they would come back to this Board for similar program approvals. Provost Ron Berkman, FIU, said FIU's College of Public Health was fully accredited. The College had one doctorate and offered concentrations in the other core areas. He said the question would be, as the College developed, whether it would need other free-standing Ph.D. programs. Dr. Berkman said the plan was to address additional Ph.D. programs in 2011-2012. Dr. Ammons said the Ph.D. in Public Health was offered at FAMU. The University would have to add faculty in biostatistics and epidemiology to shore up the school for accreditation. Provost Ralph Wilcox, USF, said USF's College of Public Health was fully accredited with three full Ph.D. programs. He said the College would meet the new accreditation standards.

Chancellor Rosenberg noted that in the 2010-2011 year, the Board would see requests for additional Ph.D. programs at the existing schools to meet new accreditation requirements. Previously, having one doctorate with three separate tracks was viable. Mr. Dasburg inquired why the University had not selected the option of one doctorate with three tracks, rather than two new stand-alone programs. Dr. Machen said the accreditation exercise had not yet taken place; it was scheduled for March 2008. He commented that the accreditation exercise could be postponed a year or two. He said this delay, however, might reduce the potential for attracting external funding.

Ms. Pappas said she understood that the basic degree in Public Health was initially a master's program and that master's students studied in five concentration areas. Graduates were expected to have taken courses in these various areas. She inquired why UF was exploring the addition of two new doctoral programs rather than one doctorate with three tracks of study. She also inquired about timing and whether these new programs were critical to the strategy of the University. She asked how these particular requests were not related to the Board's cap on undergraduate enrollment. She said she understood growth and the need to address larger state needs.

Dr. Machen said this was a four year project that had been underway since 2005. He said the College needed programs with enrolled students prior to being considered for accreditation by the Council on Education for Public Health. He said if the programs were not approved, students could not be enrolled, and the College could not

proceed to seek accreditation. Dean Perri added that if one looked at AAU schools with Schools of Public Health, 80 percent had the full complement of Ph.D. programs. He added that it was competitive within the discipline to have these Ph.D. programs and there were also cost efficiencies. He explained that the program in Epidemiology would be a joint program with the College of Medicine.

Ms. Pappas said she did not understand the built-in cost efficiency. Dean Perri explained that the faculty would be across two departments; this reduced the need for additional faculty.

Mr. Perez said he appreciated Mr. Dasburg's concern about the freshman enrollment caps, but that he also recognized the different missions of the universities and the need to add new Ph.D. programs. He said he viewed the presentation of a new Ph. D. program coming forward as a rebuttable presumption. The Board's initial response would be a "no," but the university making the request could rebut the presumption. He said the University of Florida had made its case for these programs through economic viability and need. He said he could support these programs. He said he was not fully informed about the universities' strategies and that it would be helpful to hear from all the universities about their longer-term plans.

Mr. Temple said he needed to hear a clear and compelling case before he could vote to approve a new doctoral program. He said he did not believe the case had been made for these two new programs. He said that going forward, this Board needed to decide about the number of AAU institutions in Florida, and about the number of Schools of Public Health, before approving these new Ph.D. programs.

Mr. Stavros said it was more than deciding whether to approve the new programs or not. He said the Board had to assure fairness to all the universities when the universities were able to show need for these new programs.

Dr. Rosenberg said he had conflicting thoughts about these requests. One was a decision on the merits of the program in the context of the institution's strategy; the opposing issue was his concern for the System, as a whole. He said he was comfortable with the notion of postponing all six Ph.D. proposals. He said he was concerned about the view of the Board in the larger arena and its credibility as to its purpose and focus. He said there were so many areas where the universities were suffering as a result of tight and constrained budgets. He said he understood faculty had worked hard to prepare these proposals, and had engaged in serious planning. He said in the larger context, the University System was slipping badly. He said the Board had a fiduciary responsibility to the System, and much was at risk.

Mr. Dasburg said at the micro level, the Board had in place its criteria for new Ph.D. programs. If the university met these criteria, then barring other constraints, the Ph.D. would be approved. He commented that a few of the criteria were judgmental:

did the program meet the institution's core mission; did the program represent wasteful and unnecessary duplication. He said these programs represented targeted duplications. He said he disagreed that the cap on undergraduate enrollment did not mean limiting Ph.D. programs. He said the Board staff presented the data to the Board about the proposal and how it met the criteria; the Board decided whether to approve or not approve.

Dr. Chase said that of the nine universities in the University of California system, six were AAU institutions. There was duplication of programs in these institutions. He said that Ph.D. programs should be driven by the institutions as a means to achieve greater quality. He said faculty members were investing time and effort in developing Ph.D. proposals. He said he was concerned with the low enrollment numbers in the proposed programs. He said there was nothing wrong with duplication; it was not always wasteful. Mr. Dasburg noted that the language in the Constitution did not preclude duplication.

Mr. Moseley said he would be interested to know how many programs had been sunsetted over the past 10 years.

Ms. Parker said she did not understand the implications of postponing a decision on these programs. She inquired what would happen if the Board postponed this decision three or four months, or a year. Dr. Rosenberg said the College would not lose accreditation; these programs were being sought to achieve accreditation. The timetable would be extended a year or two. He noted that the College had to have enrolled students in these programs prior to an accreditation visit. The College was preparing for an accreditation visit in March or April, 2008. He said it was his instinct that the Board could postpone this decision for one year. He said he anticipated that the budget would get worse. A "no" would send the message that the Board could say "no." He said he was concerned with broader financial issues in the coming years.

Dr. Machen said he would respond differently that the issue of postponement was not critical. He said if UF waited a year, it would lose its position in the accreditation queue, likely creating a two-year lag. He said this would mean an accreditation visit postponed to 2010. He said the University had already reallocated over \$2 million to these proposed programs.

Ms. Parker said she did not view this decision as one about being able to make a tough decision. She said she was concerned with the economic realities of the present. She said it seemed in the best interest of the System to postpone this decision. Mr. Moseley inquired about the impact of postponement on the University's ability to compete for contracts and grants. Dr. Rosenberg noted that the materials contained few specifics related to the potential of the programs to obtain contracts and grants. He said he could not predict the "opportunity costs."

Ms. Duncan inquired about the cost ramifications if the programs were not approved. Dr. Machen said the start-up costs had already been paid. He said there were no cost savings in postponement.

Mr. Edwards said he was concerned about two issues, i.e., timing and dollars. He said the Board had reviewed a similar proposal two years earlier and it had been on the Board's Consent Agenda. He said he was not inclined to jeopardize the \$3.4 million already dedicated to the program. He suggested that the item be tabled to allow UF staff to meet further with Board staff and to bring back to the Board a clearer picture as to the contracts and grants information. He said he did not see this as a major economic issue, but he was interested in more specific funding information.

Ms. McDevitt inquired whether an accredited College of Public Health was part of the University's Strategic Plan. Dr. Machen responded that this was a part of the Strategic Plan of the previous administration. Ms. McDevitt inquired about the investment still to be made in the program. Dean Perri said the program should have a minimum of 25 faculty, almost 23 faculty members were already in the program. He estimated additional costs of approximately \$250,000. Dean Perri added that without accreditation, the College of Public Health was limited in its ability to seek external funding. Ms. McDevitt said incoming contracts and grants might offset continuing operating costs. She commented that the investments made should come back in the first few years. She said that Public Health currently had a much higher profile than in the past 20-30 years. Dean Perri concurred and said that there were, at present, greater needs for these public health professionals. Ms. McDevitt inquired about the graduates. Dean Perri said that the Ph.D. in Epidemiology was expected to produce five graduates, and 25 at the Master's level.

Mrs. Roberts agreed that these were difficult financial times, but that it would be distressing to waste the dollars already invested. She noted that this program move was a part of the University's Strategic Plan, and fit within the needs of the State of Florida. She said this Board would not just approve all requests for new Ph.D.s, particularly in light of the cap on freshman enrollment. She said this Board needed to be better informed about the universities' strategic plans.

Ms. Pappas said a motion to postpone this decision would make sense only in the context that new information would change the discussion. She suggested that the Board might need interim guidelines for consideration of new Ph.D.s and a format for the presentation of these proposals. She commented that this Board's Strategic Plan was very broad. It might be useful, going forward, that it address more targeted expectations.

Mr. Perez said the initial presumption to these degree proposals should be a "no." He said this Board needed to understand the institutional commitments within the context of this Board's vision. He said he was supportive of the proposals;

postponement did not make sense. He added that this was not solely an undergraduate system. He said these proposals met the model for new Ph.D. programs, even in tough times.

Mr. Edwards moved that the Committee approve the Ph.D. in Biostatistics, UF, CIP Code 26.1102, and approve the Ph.D. in Epidemiology, UF, CIP Code 26.1309, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion.

Mr. Temple inquired how many Colleges of Public Health in the SUS were accredited and how many were in the process to become accredited. Dr. Rosenberg responded that two Colleges were currently accredited, at USF and at FIU. He said FAMU awarded the Ph.D. in Public Health. He said he did not know of others who might be planning to seek accreditation. Mr. Temple said it would be helpful to know about investments made in program development early in the process.

Dr. Marshall agreed with Ms. Pappas that the Board should develop better guidelines for its consideration of Ph.D. proposals. Ms. Parker reiterated her position that it would be irresponsible in the current economic climate to approve these programs. She said the University of Florida would not be hurt by a delay of six months. Ms. Duncan said she was concerned about sending the message that a program would not be disapproved if funds had already been expended. She said showing expenditures on a program should not be the route for universities seeking program approval.

There were no further questions. The motion passed, six votes to four votes. Voting for the motion were: Mr. Edwards, Ms. McDevitt, Dr. Marshall, Ms. Pappas, Mr. Perez, and Mr. Stavros. Voting against the motion were: Mr. Dasburg, Ms. Duncan, Ms. Parker, and Mr. Temple.

5. Conversion of Existing Master's Programs to Doctorate Level: D.P.T., FAMU and D.P.T., FGCU

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the conversion of the Master's in Physical Therapy to the Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), FAMU, CIP Code 51.2308, as presented. Ms. Parker seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the conversion of the Master's in Physical Therapy to the Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), FGCU, CIP Code 51.2308, as presented. Ms. Parker seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m., December 6, 2007.

John Dasburg, Chairman

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary