

MINUTES
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
JUNE 22, 2006

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 9:10 a.m., in the Cape Florida Ballroom, Student Union, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, June 22, 2006, with the following members present: Jorge Arrizurieta; Ann Duncan; Charles Edwards; Frank Harrison; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Frank Martin; Sheila McDevitt; Lynn Pappas; Ava Parker; Dr. Martha Peláez; Tico Perez; Carolyn Roberts; and John Temple.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held March 23, 2006

Ms. Duncan moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held March 23, 2006, as presented. Dr. Paláez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Developing a Methodology for Determining Costs, Capacity, Efficiency, and Quality

Dr. Johnson said the Committee had begun to discuss “cost per degree” in 2004. This was a challenge because the standard cost analysis by universities at the program level was cost per credit hour. “Cost per degree” was not the unit by which universities sold their product. There were also issues of methodology in determining cost per degree. The Committee had hired a consultant to assist with this project who had presented his report in Spring 2005, but there were limitations to that report.

Dr. Johnson said the question for the Board was whether the Board of Governors, and the universities, could effectively increase the number of graduates by targeting investments in specific programs. There were problems in developing this analysis; for example, the lowest cost programs were at the universities with the largest graduate programs where graduate assistants were involved in the production of undergraduate degrees. Did it make sense for the universities to expand graduate programs in order to produce undergraduate degrees? He said the model would be developed by focusing on Engineering, Nursing and Education; the model would then be tested using additional programs.

Dr. Johnson said during the development of the Board’s Strategic Plan, the Board had heard about different problems in achieving additional graduates in targeted programs. The universities had inadequate numbers of spaces to meet the demands of nursing candidates, and too little student interest for the available spaces in the

Colleges of Education. He proposed that the Board establish a working group of staff and university representatives to develop the model, to be presented at the Board's January 2007 meeting.

There was no opposition to the proposal. Mr. Dasburg recommended that the staff proceed. He added that the search for "cost per degree" was not quixotic. He said he believed there were best practices, and this exercise might lead to a foundation by which to present to Legislators and the broad public the wise use of taxpayer dollars by the universities, and minimize the cost per degree at a quality level.

3. Preparing Quality Teachers in the State University System: A Critical Need

Dr. Marshall presented his report, "A Report on the Supply of Teachers for Florida's K-12 Public Schools." He thanked Dr. Jon Rogers and Ms. Sundra Kincey of the Board staff for their assistance. He said this Report was made in response to Mr. Dasburg's request that he address teacher education and teacher supply for Florida's K-12 schools. He said this problem was urgently important because of the genuine threat to this country's ability to compete in the global marketplace. He commented that if people were familiar with Thomas Friedman's book, The World is Flat, they would appreciate the urgency of the need to improve our schools and to produce more and better teachers. He said these were issues of both quantity and quality.

He said he had begun this project by meeting with the Deans of the Colleges of Education to review programs and activities, and reported that they had a useful and productive exchange. He said the Deans had discussed the dramatic changes in the public schools, and that schools were not just preparing students for higher education and beyond, but were also providing services to the community. He said, however, that academic programs in American public education had been much slower to adapt to changing conditions; there was increasing concern that the current system was failing to prepare students to compete globally in the 21st century. He noted Dr. Friedman's warnings to America of increased global competition for jobs which could be easily outsourced, and that American students scored below average on math and science tests administered to students from 28 countries.

He said that most of the students entering the State University System were products of Florida's K-12 system, but even those who would not enter the SUS would become the workers filling jobs that had a direct bearing on the economic health of the state. He said that with the help of the SUS, Florida's K-12 system could play a helpful role in pioneering school reforms to benefit the nation. He noted that Florida had the fourth largest school system in the nation, and had six of the 20 largest school districts in the U.S., and seven districts with over 100,000 students. He said K-12 enrollment had grown and had also become much more diverse.

He reported that the Department of Education estimated that some 31,000 teachers would need to be hired for the 2006-2007 academic year. This need was occurring as many teachers in the "baby boom" generation were retiring. Adding to the demand for teachers was the timing of the more stringent provisions of the class-size amendment. He said the job of teaching in the public schools was more complex and more demanding than ever.

Dr. Marshall said that for the past decade, Florida had been the laboratory for school reform, with FCAT testing and the "A+" accountability system. He said statewide testing and other reforms had enabled low-performing students and schools to make significant gains. He said, however, guarantees of smaller classes and universal voluntary pre-kindergarten in the Constitution had imposed costly requirements on the school districts. He remarked that collective-bargaining agreements extended privileges to teachers with the most seniority; beginning teachers were often assigned to the hard-to-staff, under-performing schools, with the most challenging students.

He described his meeting with the Deans and the programs they had instituted to allow undergraduates majoring in fields other than education to take the education courses required for state certification. The Deans had discussed their efforts to recruit professionals in other careers who might be interested in teaching. They had described their mentoring programs for young teachers and in-service help from experienced teachers. He said it was important not to hold the Colleges of Education unduly responsible for Florida's problems with teacher supply and teacher quality; local school districts shared a role in training teachers and in their retention. The Department of Education was responsible for teacher certification.

He commended the work of the Deans, but said their efforts were not enough. He asked the University Presidents to consider where teacher preparation ranked on their agendas for their institutions.

He noted that teacher compensation was a problem, but not an area in which the SUS had a role. He said there was no agreement on how teacher compensation should be measured and national comparisons were difficult because they were based on insufficient or unreliable data. He said that while pay was often cited in the media as a reason for teacher dissatisfaction, concerns about professional respect ranked much higher.

He said it was important to listen to teachers and to what they feel about their profession. He said the public image of teachers, that they were overworked, underpaid, and underappreciated, was the message of the organization that speaks for them, the teachers' union. He said the Florida Education Association presumed to speak for all of Florida's teachers. He commented that there was one simple truth about teachers' unions; they were in place to establish and maintain adversarial relationships

with school administrators and school boards. He said the negative portrayal of teachers as victims had a hold in the media. He noted that there was individual recognition of teachers, such as the announcement of Teacher of the Year, but there was no broad celebration of the profession of teaching.

Dr. Marshall proposed that the Board consider establishing an entity whose primary purpose would be to promote the importance and the value of the teaching profession. This entity would inform the public of the important and satisfying aspects of teaching, and would have no adversarial relationships with the unions or school administrators or any part of the school community. He said the Deans had a positive reaction to this proposal. He said editorial support would be solicited, as well as the support of broadcast media and local and regional magazines with broad readership. He said it had been suggested that the Florida Council of 100 might be a participant, as well as the Council for Education Change, an active school reform organization based in Miami.

He reported that he had spoken with Mr. Bill Montford, Superintendent of Schools for Leon County, about this proposal, as well as to express his appreciation to him for the report that teachers in Leon County would be receiving a 7.5 percent raise. Mr. Montford responded that the article about the raise seemed to imply that the raise was the result of efforts by the FEA, and gave no credit to the Superintendent and the School Board for their efforts on behalf of teachers. Dr. Marshall noted that the entity he proposed which would advocate in a clear voice on behalf of teachers and the teaching profession was sorely needed.

Dr. Marshall recited the anecdote about James Michener's invitation to dinner at the White House. Mr. Michener had declined the invitation because he had a previous engagement to honor a wonderful high school teacher. He had said that in a lifetime, one might have lived through 15 Presidents, but really only one fine teacher. President Eisenhower had responded that he understood.

Mr. Dasburg thanked Dr. Marshall for his penetrating report. Mrs. Roberts said this report should be distributed broadly. She noted that beginning teacher salaries in Marion County were discouraging. Dr. Marshall commented that the teacher unions were more concerned with senior teachers, and kept salaries low in the teachers' first five years.

Ms. Pappas said she believed that pay was a significant issue. She said perception about teachers in the community was also important. She commented that the flat management structure in the school district was not a motivational environment for teachers. She added that principals were not necessarily as well-trained to be managers. Dr. Marshall commented that the Council for Education Change in Miami had supported programs to strengthen the role of school principals trained as managers.

Dr. Peláez said there were issues for teachers far more serious than pay, such as the lack of resources in the schools. She said there were language difficulties with some students, and a lack of equipment for special education students. Mr. Dasburg said that some of these impediments should be addressed by the Legislature. Dr. Peláez said the Department of Education was addressing some of these issues. She said she was concerned that this Board was focusing on the numbers of graduates and the speed with which they were graduating, but that the quality of the education was being overlooked.

Mr. Edwards said he supported the concept proposed by Dr. Marshall, but that his home county, Lee County, was growing so fast that the district was experiencing difficulty in finding enough qualified and trained principals. He inquired whether there were programs to train teachers to be principals. President Brogan said there were non-degree programs providing this training. He said these school CEOs needed skills similar to advanced business practices. Ms. Pappas said she was familiar with the programs offered by the privately funded Schultz Center in educational leadership. President Brogan said the leadership skills for principals had changed since he had earned his degree. He said the change could not happen in the Colleges of Education acting in isolation; a coordinated approach was needed with the school districts advising the Colleges of their needs. He said the old ways were no longer working, but that it was still true that where there was a great principal, there was likely to be a great school.

Ms. McDevitt noted that the business sector also had these discussions. The issue was leadership, as opposed to administration. She said not every one could be a good leader. She added that it took time to recognize the tools to be a successful manager.

Mr. Dasburg inquired whether a principal had to be certified as a teacher. Dr. Marshall responded that the requirements were a bachelor's degree, teacher certification, and a master's degree in education. President Brogan observed that these requirements might not make sense for individuals making a mid-life career change. He said the salary schedule was similarly rigid and unbending, and only rewarded seniority and the acquisition of degrees. Mr. Dasburg said the requirement for teacher certification for principals should be addressed by a statutory change. He hoped the Commissioner would provide leadership assistance to accomplish that change.

Ms. Parker commented on the problem of attracting students to the teaching profession. She suggested the Board might support a campaign to encourage high school students to become teachers. Mr. Dasburg cautioned that they not advertise the product before it was ready to go to the marketplace. Dr. Marshall said the focus should be on how to attract worthy young people to the profession. In a proposed public relations campaign, it was important to see teachers as part of a noble profession.

He said there were billboards up in Tallahassee touting nurses as the “first person to respond, the last to leave your side.”

Mr. Temple said he would be interested to know the reasons for teachers leaving their jobs. He wondered why it was not more widely known that pay was not the only reason for separation from the profession. Dr. Rogers said the DOE did an annual survey, and there were many reasons given for leaving teaching. Mrs. Roberts said the Board had heard from the Presidents that there were empty seats in the Colleges of Education. She said starting salaries were certainly a concern as university students reviewed possible majors and made decisions regarding professions. Mr. Harrison commented that as students left college and got married, starting teacher salaries were not sufficient to support families.

Dr. Rosenberg discussed the proper role of the Board in responding to these issues. He said the previous year’s Legislative Budget Request included an initiative to support teacher production which had not received support in the Legislature.

Ms. McDevitt said any initiative could not happen in isolation. She said there should be a full panoply of options to attract students to the profession. This required collaborative efforts with the DOE and promotion of alternative methods. Mr. Arrizurieta inquired whether there were surveys of teachers at the charter schools. Mr. Dasburg said he would recommend this as a project for the State Board of Education.

Mr. Dasburg said the Strategic Planning Committee had analyzed the needs of the state for nurses, teachers, and engineers in the Board’s Strategic Plan. With regard to teachers, the Committee had found a shortage of demand for SUS resources. The Colleges of Education had space to admit more students. He said the issue now was one of administration and leadership. He commented that Dr. Marshall’s recommendation that the teaching profession needed good press went way beyond the Board of Governors. The finding that the profession was not branded in a positive way transcended this Board’s duty. He asked Dr. Marshall to continue his work with this project and to get broad distribution of his report. He suggested that he spend time with the State Board and the various Foundations and come back and tell this Board what they could do. He added that legislative changes were needed to address the curriculum requirements for school principals.

4. Request to Offer Lower Level Coursework at Off-Campus Sites, FGCU

Dr. LeMon said Florida Gulf Coast University had submitted a request to offer lower division undergraduate courses at instructional sites off-campus within the university service area, as required by a Board of Governors Regulation. He showed the members a series of maps of the State of Florida with the locations of the university main campuses, branches, instructional sites, special purpose centers and IFAS Regional Centers. He said the current regulation described the various types of campuses and

the numbers of students enrolled at them. He said it was probably appropriate to review this typology as it had been in place since the 1980's. Mr. Dasburg concurred. Dr. LeMon said the map demonstrated the SUS presence throughout the state.

He explained that FGCU sought an exception to a Board regulation that required universities to offer upper division undergraduate courses only on their branch campuses. He said this regulation was in effect as the lynchpin of the "2 + 2" system, with the community colleges as the primary entry point offering a broad array of the beginning lower level undergraduate courses in the state. He said this world was now changing, as community colleges were now being authorized to offer some selected baccalaureate degrees. He said FGCU had identified instructional sites in Collier, Charlotte and Lee Counties where it would like to offer lower division courses. He noted that any request for a branch campus would come to this Board as a formal request.

Dr. Merwin reported on the enormous growth rates of FGCU, and the booming population growth in Southwest Florida. He said it was the mission of the University to respond to students across a wide array of programs. The main campus was already cramped in its classroom space. He said while the campus sat on 760 acres, only 300 acres were developable. He said FGCU would not offer whole degree programs off-site, but that 400 students were taking courses in Cape Coral, Charlotte County and in Naples. The University was renting trailers and available office space at the proposed sites. He said this would offer access to courses for these students and save them travel expenses to the main campus. He noted that the roads in the area could not handle the heavy traffic. He said this was a very limited request to offer courses at these three sites.

Ms. Duncan said this was an important issue for this Board. She inquired about the relationship of FGCU with Edison College. Dr. Merwin said that these were courses Edison could not offer or did not choose to offer. Dr. Rosenberg added that there were other areas in the state where there were similar needs for access to university courses. Ms. Duncan said she understood the investment being made for students, but she was concerned about making commitments to these communities this Board was not yet prepared to make. Dr. Merwin said if these sites proved to be successful, he would bring the Board a formal request for a branch campus. Ms. Duncan said she wanted to be sure the expectations in the communities did not exceed the Board's strategic plans.

Mr. Edwards said he had a lot of questions about this proposal. He said he understood the proposal to offer access to lower level courses. He said he had a larger concern about courses being offered by other universities that had not been approved by this Board. He said this proposal should include a sunset provision to limit the duration of the proposal. Dr. Merwin responded that the proposal was for a two-year pilot program. He would give the Board status reports as to possible conflicts.

Ms. McDevitt said the proposal raised numerous issues for the University System. She suggested that there be some limit that within the two-year pilot program students take only some specified percentage of their required courses at these out-lying sites, not the full complement of lower level courses, but some reasonable percentage less than 50 percent of the total. Dr. Merwin said it would not be possible to take all the courses required in the General Education curriculum at the off-campus sites. In response to a question from Dr. Peláez, Dr. Merwin said FGCU would not be offering a two-year degree. Mr. Edwards said the current regulation was clearly outdated, but that these types of course offerings did require this Board's approval. Ms. Duncan said she would want assurance that these sites were just for course instruction and would not just evolve into branch campuses.

Ms. Duncan moved that the Committee approve the request from Florida Gulf Coast University to offer lower division undergraduate courses at instructional sites off-campus within the university service area, with the stipulation that it be a two-year pilot program beginning Fall 2006 and that the University advise the Board about the programs and student enrollment, as presented. Dr. Peláez seconded the motion. Mrs. Roberts emphasized that the goal was to provide access and to make it easy for students to get an education, while the Board continued to be cognizant of the need for a quality education. Mr. Arrizurieta inquired whether this was the first time for such a proposal to come before this Board. Mr. Dasburg said it was.

There were no further comments. Members of the Committee concurred unanimously in the motion.

5. Status Report from the Chair of the Committee

Mr. Dasburg reported to the Committee members that they had received copies of a proposal from the Chancellor to engage a consultant to help the Board look at the entire State University System and at issues of structure. He said the Foundation had the funds to finance this study. He said staff would begin interviews with likely consultants shortly. He said the Board's current Strategic Plan included a series of questions about structure, without answers to these questions. He said he hoped this study could be completed by November 2006. He said the consultants would be asked to look at other state university structures. He said the Board needed to agree on the proper structure for Florida's university system, and the needs of the state for universities, branch campuses, other sites, and the number of these campuses. He said the Board needed to address these issues with a clear strategy.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m., June 22, 2006.

John Dasburg, Chairman

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary