

MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA  
JANUARY 26, 2006

Mrs. Roberts, Chair of the Board, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 8:30 a.m., in the Grand Ballroom, J. Wayne Reitz Union, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, January 26, 2006, with the following members present: Dr. Akshay Desai; Ann Duncan; Charles Edwards; Joe Goldberg; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Bill McCollum; Sheila McDevitt; Lynn Pappas; Ava Parker; Dr. Martha Peláez; Tico Perez; John Temple; and Commissioner John Winn. Dr. Zach Zachariah joined the meeting by telephone. Mrs. Roberts said Mr. Dasburg had reinjured his back and was unable to participate in the meeting.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held November 17, 2005

Ms. Pappas moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held November 17, 2005, as presented. Dr. Zachariah seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. What are the Impediments to Reaching Degree Goals in the Board's Strategic Plan and How Should Those Impediments Be Addressed?

Dr. Terry Hickey, Provost, UCF, and Chair, Council of Academic Vice Presidents, reported that all 11 Provosts had engaged in discussions about the challenges to fulfilling the Board's Strategic goals. He said these issues deserved continuing discussions. He reviewed the four main goals in the Strategic Plan. He noted that the goals interacted with the others, but that the goal of increasing degree production would not necessarily result in building world-class academic programs and research capacity. The faculty the universities might recruit to provide access to students and to produce degrees and to meet statewide professional and workforce needs might not be the faculty who would be recruited to build world-class academic programs. All faculty would be expected to engage in research, but he noted that there were differences in addressing these goals. He noted that the faculty recruited to build world-class programs were usually exceptional instructors as well.

Dr. Hickey said adequate funding was crucial if the universities were to attain these goals, to recruit outstanding faculty and to prepare students. He demonstrated how the State University System had been receiving a declining percentage of the state's General Revenue over the past five years. He said the average annual tuition in Florida was \$2045; the average annual tuition in the nation, excluding California, was \$5672. In the SUS, the average cost of other fees was \$993; in the 50 largest universities, it was \$1923. He said the universities had been receiving enrollment growth funding, but that these funds were also used to pay utility increases, promotional pay increases, financial aid packages, new initiatives and technology upgrades.

Dr. Hickey said in faculty recruitment and retention, Florida's universities also lagged significantly behind other public institutions in pay for every faculty rank. He also reviewed space needs, and said that demand for classroom and laboratory space outstripped capacity. He said that without a technology fee, it was difficult to properly equip the numerous campuses within the System. He said the universities could also graduate students more efficiently with good advisers; students with clear career goals graduated sooner. He noted that graduate students also contributed to the economic growth of the state, so it was important that the universities address the needs of graduate students, including health insurance and graduate stipends.

Dr. Hickey reviewed key elements to meeting the goals of the Strategic Plan, including fully funding the Board's Legislative Budget Request, authorizing a technology fee, supplementing PECO funds, and enhancing organizational nimbleness through tuition flexibility and other mechanisms.

Ms. Pappas remarked that describing the receipt of a declining percentage of revenue did not communicate the System's needs to a Legislature listening to a litany of needs. She said the University System needed to link needs with the increases in costs, beyond those covered by enrollment growth funding. She said everybody talked about declining revenues as statewide needs grew. Dr. Hickey said it might be helpful to describe the universities' needs in terms of purchasing power. Chancellor Rosenberg added that the System should also provide comparative data from other states showing the percentage of General Revenue allocated to the universities.

Ms. Pappas said that showing that you received less funding than in the previous year did not define the need. It was more convincing to demonstrate the actual costs; therefore, the need existed. Ms. McDevitt said it would be helpful to have a graph showing the key costs rising and revenue sources declining. She said she would also be interested in comparative data on tuition and fees. Dr. Hickey inquired whether a graph showing a growing expense line and a revenue line growing at a slower rate would be helpful. Ms. McDevitt said that would be useful, particularly including all revenue sources. Dr. Peláez said that this information demonstrated once again that faculty salaries in Florida were low. She said, at the core, excellent universities depended on faculty recruitment and retention.

Commissioner Winn commented that the High School Task Force had just recommended requiring more credit hours for high school graduation, particularly a math credit higher than Algebra 1. He said the Task Force had made this recommendation despite the fact that there was already a critical shortage of math teachers.

Chancellor Rosenberg inquired whether the Provosts had done an assessment of faculty loss as a result of retirement and departures. Dr. Hickey said individual institutions had done such an assessment; Dr. Austin had reported that the Board staff had done a systemwide report. Dr. Rosenberg said the universities expected to lose approximately 400 to 600 faculty a year, out of a total of 10,000 faculty. He said with the salary compression of existing faculty, replacement costs for new faculty were higher. Dr. Hickey concurred, noting that replacement costs "boggle the mind." He

explained that this was not merely because of salary, but the added costs for facilities and other support required to attract “star” faculty, particularly since the pool of really high-quality faculty was small.

Dr. Rosenberg asked Dr. Hickey to review start-up costs for new faculty. Dr. Hickey said that to recruit top science/technology/engineering faculty required about \$200,000 to \$250,000 to purchase the equipment and the technical support to launch a faculty member’s research program. He said that it might require as much as \$500,000 to support a very productive research faculty member.

President Hitt said the issue was the cost to be a good university and the cost of meeting the needs of the state. He said universities were strong economic drivers; communities needed good research universities to enhance their quality of life. Ms. Duncan said the state derived real economic value from having a set of ranked universities; economic development people could talk about that economic impact. Dr. Hitt added that UCF’s Research Park now had 10,000 jobs with average salaries of \$60,000 to \$70,000. He said he had been told the impact of the Park was approximately \$3 to \$4 billion. Ms. Duncan said she would be interested to know similar information about the universities ranked among the top 20 nationally. President Hitt commented that the graduates of these institutions might not necessarily be meeting the needs of any particular state. Dr. Hickey said ranking made it easier to attract faculty. He said not having a reputation actually cost the institution more in recruiting faculty. He said young assistant science faculty were not interested in sunshine. For them, getting their research programs underway was more important, and their mobility was enhanced once they had won their second NSF and NIH grants.

### 3. Targeted Program: Nursing

Dr. Desai said he had been asked to review nursing programs in the System, as nursing was identified in the Strategic Plan as a targeted degree program. He noted that Florida, and many other states, was suffering from a shortage of nurses. He said the universities were currently turning away thousands of students seeking a career in nursing. Shortages in the number of faculty members and in clinical training sites also inhibited expansion. He said some of the universities had been awarded SUCCEED grants to address the shortage, but these were not recurring funds and would end in June 2006. He noted that the Board’s Budget Request included \$13 million for the year 2006-2007, and \$19 million in the succeeding years to increase the number of nursing graduates. He commented that several of the universities would bring proposals for new Doctor of Nursing Practice programs to address the shortage; he encouraged the Board to pay special attention to these proposals.

Mr. Richard Stevens presented an overview of Nursing Education, describing the nursing shortage, the bottleneck for admissions to nursing programs, funding requirements, and demand vs. degree production data. He said that both the universities and the community colleges were unable to admit thousands of applicants in 2005-06, and that this was a problem nationwide. He reviewed occupational projections for Registered Nurses from the Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation, as well as information from the Florida Hospital Association predicting severe nursing

shortages. Mr. Stevens said there were currently 10 Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs, eight ASN to BSN programs, nine Master of Science in Nursing programs, and five Doctoral programs in the University System, and he described their enrollment and degrees granted information, noting that in 2004, the SUS produced approximately 27 percent of the new registered nurse graduates in Florida. He reviewed the major barriers to nursing program expansion, including higher salaries for nurses in private practice.

Commissioner Winn inquired about the enrollment growth projections. Mr. Stevens said the universities had provided the projections to respond to the degree projections included in the Strategic Plan. The Legislative Budget Request, in the NET Gain Nursing issue, would provide funds to increase graduates above those already projected as a part of the Strategic Plan numbers. He added that it was not possible to meet the demand without the programs at the community colleges.

Mr. Stevens explained the Doctor of Nursing Practice, the DNP, and the need for doctoral level education to prepare advanced practice clinicians and clinical faculty. He said the focus of the DNP was to prepare individuals for careers in advanced practice nursing, including clinical teaching, whereas the focus of the Ph.D. was to prepare individuals for careers in research and as faculty. He said the DNP would be the only nursing practice doctorate eligible for accreditation by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education.

Dr. Desai noted that the Board had previously voiced some concern about the movement of the Master of Physical Therapy programs to the Doctor of Physical Therapy. There was concern in the medical establishment about these practitioners being called "doctors." Dr. Peláez noted that there was a long tradition in academia of individuals with Ph.D.s being called "doctors." Dr. Desai said that as "doctors," these individuals could bill insurance companies for their independent practice. He said this could also be confusing to patients, with physical therapists and nurses being called "doctors."

Mr. Temple said he recognized the need for additional nurses. He inquired whether the issue was one of needing faculty for nursing programs, noting that other states were experiencing the same problem.

Dr. Desai said this was about defining the scope of practice for nurses, as well as creating independent billing for this practice. He said programs with the Ph.D. urged the Board to let them move forward with the new DNP programs.

Mr. Temple inquired whether the universities were recruiting faculty outside Florida. Mr. Stevens responded that faculty shortage was a national problem, exacerbated by the requirement for a low faculty to student ratio. Mr. Temple wondered whether the state should put special initiatives in place, such as "sign-on bonuses" to alleviate the problem. Mrs. Roberts noted that hospitals were doing that, but the problem for faculty was salaries.

President Genshaft said the DNP was a new degree. She said for the past 25 to 30 years, there had been no doctorate for nursing, so individuals who might seek the doctorate would pursue a doctorate in psychology or some other field with a research doctorate. The DNP was to teach the practice of nursing, rather than the research of nursing. She said the purpose for the degree was to get more teachers in the nursing field. She said USF had the Ph.D. in nursing and Board staff had allowed USF to begin the DNP program without further Board of Governors approval.

Mr. Stevens clarified that to meet the conditions of the SUCCEED grant, USF had submitted the proposal to add the DNP as a track under the Ph.D. program. He said it was his understanding that USF was not moving its MSN program to the DNP. He said the staff had allowed USF to move forward for purposes of the grant, with the caveat that the DNP would require Board approval as a continuing program.

President Machen suggested that the Board should authorize universities with the nursing doctorate to implement the DNP with the approval of their Trustees, subject to satisfactory review by the Board staff. He said this was the way to begin to address the teacher shortage. Dr. Desai said he anticipated that discussion at the next Board meeting.

#### 4. Targeted Program: Engineering

Mr. McCollum said he had been asked to take the lead on the review of Engineering as one of the Board's critical targeted programs. He said he had met with the Provosts and one of their great concerns was the reduced number of foreign students entering the universities. He said the Provosts had learned that the more involved students were with math and science in the early years, the more likely they would succeed in rigorous programs at the university level. He said one university was already actively involved in programs to assist in K-12 education and programs to mentor beginning university students.

He described some internal, short-term solutions including efforts to help first year students through individual tutoring, as well as recruitment initiatives. He suggested that if students were aware of the demand in the business sector, this might elevate interest in the programs. He also suggested that the universities might explore "contracts" in the targeted areas, and partnerships with the community colleges, in developing the proper tracks for potential engineering students to be prepared for their university coursework.

He said progress was being made because of the commitment from the universities to address the need, with a plan of action to be reported to the Board later in the spring. He said it was clear that provosts and faculty should be more involved with K-12 teachers and students in strengthening math and science programs. He noted that while he was leaving the Board, he was confident that this discussion would continue because of the need for engineers.

5. Targeted Program: Teaching

Dr. Marshall said he had been asked to be the Board member to lead the discussions on the need for more teachers. He said he had begun his discussions with Dr. Jon Rogers on the Board's degree goals, the impediments to creating more teachers, and the need for more teachers in the public schools. He would report on these discussions at a future Board meeting.

6. Identification of Programs to Use in Developing and Testing an Appropriate Methodology for Cost per Degree

This agenda item was postponed for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m., January 26, 2006.

---

John Dasburg, Chairman

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary