

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STRATEGIC PLANNING & ACADEMIC & SYSTEM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY
GRAND BALLROOM, STUDENT UNION
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
JANUARY 29, 2009

Mr. Martin convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Academic and System Oversight Committee of the Board of Governors at 9:00 a.m., in the Grand Ballroom, Student Union, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida, January 29, 2009, with the following members present: Ann Duncan; Charlie Edwards; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Sheila McDevitt; Arthur "AJ" Meyer; Ava Parker; Tico Perez; Carolyn K. Roberts; Commissioner Eric Smith; Gus Stavros; Norman Tripp; and Dr. Zach Zachariah.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held November 20, 2008

Mr. Tripp moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held November 20, 2008, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Workforce, Research, and Economic Development Project Team

Ms. Duncan said that, on January 20, 2009, the Florida Technology, Research, and Scholarship Board met jointly with members of this Committee's Workforce, Research, and Economic Development Subcommittee to consider the 21st Century Technology, Research, and Scholarship Enhancement Act Annual Report. She said the minutes of that meeting had been distributed to members of the Board and they reflected the actions taken by the Subcommittee. Ms. Duncan moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting held January 20, 2009, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Ms. Duncan said the FTRS Board and the Subcommittee had reviewed the Annual Report of the projects created by the 21st Century legislation, the Centers of Excellence, the Research Commercialization Assistant Grant Program, and the World Class Scholars Program. She thanked Dr. LeMon for this excellent report. She reported that the Subcommittee had been pleased to note the accomplishments of the centers and the scholars, and the economic benefits brought to the state. She said the state had invested its money wisely in these centers and scholars. She moved that the Strategic Planning Committee approve the Florida 21st Century Technology, Research, and Scholarship Enhancement Act Programs Annual Report, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred. Ms. Duncan further moved that the Committee waive the two-meeting process and that the Annual Report

be considered by the full Board for approval later in the day. She said this would allow the Report to be submitted to the Legislature in a timely manner. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

3. Academic Programs Project Team

Mr. Martin recognized Dr. Marshall, Chair of the Academic Programs Project Team. Dr. Marshall reported that the Team met by conference call on January 21, 2009, to review the revised proposal and business plan for a Doctor of Pharmacy program at USF. He said the Team had also reviewed a request for limited access status for the B.F.A. in Graphic Design at USF. He said the notes from that meeting had been provided to all members of the Board. He noted that Mr. Temple and Mr. Martin had been unable to participate on the call, but that Mr. Perez, Mr. Stavros, and Ms. Duncan had been on the call and had participated fully in the discussion with the representatives of USF.

A. Proposal for New Degree Program: Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.), USF

Dr. Marshall said the University of South Florida sought approval of a Doctor of Pharmacy program to be implemented in 2011. He said the full proposal had been discussed by the Team in October, but the item had been pulled from the November agenda at the request of President Genshaft. Working with Board staff, he said the University had revised its eight-year budget projections to clarify the funding sources. Further, he said the University had also revised the implementation schedule so that it was now in complete alignment with the timeline suggested by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education. He said USF had also updated the need and demand portion of the proposal and reported that there was still an unmet projected need for pharmacists in Florida. He said the University had also provided numerous letters of support for the program from the local business community and government officials.

Dr. Marshall said the materials distributed to Board members included a copy of the revised program budget, a revised implementation timeline, a document from USF which clarified their case for the pharmacy program, and observations from Board staff who had reviewed the revised information. He noted that all these materials had been posted to the Board's Web site.

Dr. Marshall said that, during the conference call, President Genshaft and Provost Wilcox presented their revised business plan for implementing the pharmacy program. He explained that the plan called for USF to fund the three years for planning out of existing institutional resources and fundraising. The University would then seek through the Board's LBR process the non-recurring and recurring state appropriations beginning in 2011 when the first students enrolled. After a discussion that focused primarily on these two aspects of the revised proposal, Mr. Perez had suggested that the Project Team bring the proposed pharmacy program forward for consideration by

this Committee with a positive recommendation. He said that all on the call had agreed.

President Genshaft thanked the members of the Team for their thorough review of the proposal. She said the pharmacy program was important to the medical complex at USF, and the Tampa Bay area.

Mr. Edwards said he had toured the medical facilities at USF the previous week. He said the addition of the pharmacy program made sense with the children's hospital, the Moffitt Cancer Center, and the Byrd Center already located at USF.

Mr. Tripp said he had raised questions about the need for the program. He said that he did not feel he had adequate documentation regarding the potential for job growth for pharmacists. He said he was also concerned about the need for additional recurring dollars. Dr. Wilcox explained that the job figures came from the Workforce Innovation regional study. He said it demonstrated a Florida shortfall of licensed pharmacists. He added that, as a percentage of its resident population age 65 and older, Florida was first in the nation. He said an aging population was more reliant on medications. He said the University had received needs statements for pharmacists from retail partners and clinical partners. He said they had reported on struggling to find licensed pharmacists. He asserted there was an unmet need for more pharmacists.

Mr. Perez said he felt the University had brought this proposal forward through a careful process, and was committed to allocating existing resources for the first three years. He said he also felt the University had presented a responsible budgetary approach. He said President Genshaft had written the Chair with a careful approach regarding continued funding of the program through the planning and implementation stages.

Mrs. Roberts commended USF for the work done on this pharmacy program proposal. She said she supported the program; the difficulty in this decision was the funding piece. She said she was pleased that USF had worked to find the funds needed for the program. She said she remained an optimist about Florida's future, and recognized the shortage of pharmacists. She thanked President Genshaft, Provost Wilcox, and USF Board Chair Law for the revisions to the proposal and the commitments regarding funding.

Ms. Parker thanked the staff from USF who had taken the time to visit with her about the program, which she said made sense for its Tampa campus. She said her concerns were about timing and funding. She said it was not clear whether this was an eight-year program, four-year undergraduate and four years to the Pharm.D., or a six-year program. She inquired about the plans if the state funding were unavailable when it was anticipated.

Dr. Kevin Sneed said the Pharm.D. was a professional four-year program. He said nationally, the pharmacy program did not require an A.A. for admission, although

some students entered the program with a bachelor's degree. He said a student entering the program from high school could complete the degree in six years. He said that admission to the professional degree is separate from admission to the undergraduate program. He said the traditional pharmacy path was the B.S. and four years in the Pharm.D. He said a student could enter the program with an A.A., for a two-plus-four program, but having the A.A. would be a minimum requirement for admission.

Ms. Parker inquired whether the four-plus-four was the model program. Dr. Sneed said the proposed program followed the four-plus-four model, but that they would accept a two-year degree from applicants. He said most students seeking admission would have the four-year degree, similar to students seeking admission to medical school. He said they were discussing partnership programs with the community colleges and would likely recommend minimum requirements for students in a two-year program.

Dr. Wilcox said he anticipated this would be a competitive program and would attract students with demonstrated successful academic track records. He said the majority of students would have the baccalaureate degree. He commented that some medical students have three years of prerequisites before entering medical school.

Dr. Wilcox addressed the concern about funding if the economy did not improve by 2011. He said USF was committed to cover the planning costs. He said USF would come to the Board for enrollment funding prior to the 2011 Legislative Session to support the first class of students entering in Fall 2011. He said, if this Board was not comfortable with the Budget Request, this would allow the USF Board of Trustees to decide the immediate future of the program. This might mean a delay in the admission of students, finding alternate funds, or finding funds within the University. He noted that this was best decided by the Board of Trustees.

Ms. Parker commented that what tended to happen with these programs was that there was some compulsion to continue them. She said she was looking for the commitment from USF for alternate sources of funds. She said it should be clear that a commitment for funding would not come just from the System.

Ms. McDevitt thanked the staff of USF. She said she shared the concerns voiced by other Board members. She said the program would involve significant expenses going forward. She said she appreciated that USF had readjusted the business plan for the program and had presented its commitments regarding funding in a letter from President Genshaft. She requested that the letter be included in the Minutes of this meeting. She said staff needed to remind the Board of these commitments when the request for state funding was made in 2011, at which time the Board might want to reevaluate the program. She said there were seven pharmacists in her family and they complained constantly about the lack of pharmacists. She said she hoped the program

would succeed. The plan included time for the planning and accreditation process, and the Board could take another look at the appropriate time.

Chancellor Rosenberg inquired whether there was a threshold minimum number of students to begin the program. He said the proposal identified 50 students. Could the program begin with 25 or 30 students? Dr. Wilcox said they had determined 50 students as the base number of students in the program. He said with changing economic realities, this number could be scaled upward. He explained that to accommodate a funding shortfall, USF would increase the number of students in the class. He said they would not go below 50 students for the first class, 75 students for the second class, and 100 for the third class. He said they were planning for a total of 400 Pharm. D. students by the sixth year.

Dr. Rosenberg said if there were not enough funds to support 50 students, this would be a bright line for Board of Governors funding in the Legislative Budget Request. Dr. Wilcox responded that this was not necessarily the case. He said they would ask the USF Board of Trustees to consider some alternatives, e.g., increasing tuition and recognizing other sources of funding. He suggested that this Board's approval of the proposal would help with fund-raising.

Mr. Stavros commended President Genshaft and Provost Wilcox for this proposal. He said there was a significant need for pharmacists. He commented that, from his experience in raising money for university foundations, having medical and pharmacy schools assisted fund-raising efforts.

Dr. Marshall said the Academic Programs Team had been influenced by the answers given to the questions raised by Ms. Parker. He agreed that the University needed a "what if" plan, and approval of the Legislative Budget Request for funding by this Board before proceeding to the Legislature. He said the Team was comfortable with the proposal.

Dr. Zachariah said he had mixed feelings. He said the pharmacy program was a great fit for USF. He said that, for the past 20 years, he had been told by the Dean of the Pharmacy School at Nova Southeastern that its graduates had jobs before they finished school. He said in the current economy, job offers were declining. He noted that this decision had long-term consequences.

Mr. Meyer said the students supported the Pharm. D. program, but he urged the USF administration not to divert student academic support dollars to this program. Ms. Duncan said support for this program had also been voiced by the business community. She said she was pleased that USF had also addressed several funding contingencies.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Committee approve the proposed Doctor of Pharmacy at the University of South Florida, CIP Code 51.2001, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Martin said that the Board was currently following a two-step process for these program proposals, bringing the items from Committee to the full Board at the next following meeting of the Board. He said there was a sense of urgency with this program as USF needed to request legislative approval required for programs leading to licensure and stay on track for accreditation.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Board waive this two-step process and consider the program proposal, as approved by the Committee, at the full Board meeting later in the day. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

B. Request for Limited Access Status, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Graphic Design, USF

Dr. Marshall reported that the Academic Programs Team had also reviewed and discussed the USF request for limited access status for the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Graphic Design. He said that limited access status was appropriate to this program, which required a portfolio demonstrating student ability and which had faculty and resource limitations.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Committee recommend to the Board approval of limited access status for the BFA in Graphic Design, as presented. Ms. Duncan seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Dr. Marshall noted that students were already seeking admission into the Graphic Design program. He moved that the Board waive the two-step process and consider the program proposal, as approved by the Committee, at the full Board meeting later today. Ms. Duncan seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

C. Doctoral Proposals

Dr. Marshall said the Project Team had also discussed whether it would be prudent to suspend the established timetable for the submission and approval of doctoral proposals because of the existing and projected budget reductions. He said the Team agreed that staff should issue the scheduled call for proposals to be considered at the June Board meeting. Each proposal would be evaluated with regard to university and Board priorities, and within the context of the budget situation at that time.

4. Baccalaureate Degrees/System Structure Project Team

A. Final Reports, Florida College System Task Force and State College System Pilot Project

Ms. Parker said she had asked the Commissioner to present two issues on which he had taken the lead. She noted that, at the September Committee meeting, Commissioner Smith had presented an update on the two reports being done on the newly created college system, one by a task force he was chairing, and the other by a group of presidents from the Pilot Project created by the Legislature. She said both reports had been completed and submitted to the State Board of Education, the Legislature, and the Governor. She suggested that Board members should consider how the two delivery systems, the SUS and the State College System, could best work together to increase the production of baccalaureate degrees.

Commissioner Smith said Dr. Will Holcombe, Chancellor, Community Colleges, was present to assist in the discussions of the two reports. He said the reports were to outline a structure and approval process by which community colleges would migrate to the state college system. He said the reports differed in their recommendations regarding the baccalaureate approval process and in the recommendations regarding funding and tuition.

Dr. Holcombe said the Task Force included representatives from all the sectors, including the proprietary schools. President Genshaft served as a member of the Task Force and had chaired one of the subcommittees. He said the Pilot Project group consisted of the nine college presidents named in the statute and had started their work in June. He said the Task Force had begun meeting in August and had presented its report to the State Board the previous week. He said there were similarities in the reports, e.g., preserve articulation for admission and transfer, maintain historical community college mission, retain governance by the local boards of trustees, retain oversight by the State Board and Commissioner, and definition of state college. He said the reports differed about the authority for program approval. He said the Task Force had recommended that all baccalaureate proposals should be approved by the State Board of Education; the Pilot Project recommended that the local boards be authorized to approve programs, once the first baccalaureate for the college had been approved by the State Board. He said this issue would likely garner the most discussion.

He said both reports had discussed the primacy of the "2 plus 2" system in Florida now and in the future. He said the community colleges remained the main avenue for students to gain access to the baccalaureate degree. He said the baccalaureate degrees now awarded by the former community colleges were directly related to employment, in the fields of education, nursing, and applied technology. He said a high priority for the State Board in approving these baccalaureate programs was justification in the job market. He said the Task Force recommended strengthened coordination with the universities in the proposal process with consultation by the Chancellors prior to consideration by the State Board. He said the Pilot Project continued the requirement for cooperation and consultation with the institutions, but made no provision for consultation at the state level. The Task Force recommended that colleges seeking initial baccalaureate authorization provide a "strategic vision" of where they are headed with these programs: What is the area of emphasis, and is that

area needed in the job market? He said the Task Force recommended that funding be calculated based upon an enrollment plan. He noted that community colleges were not currently funded in this manner because of their open access enrollment policy.

Commissioner Smith said the reports differed in their recommendations regarding funding. He said the Pilot Project recommended funding the community college upper division at 85 percent of the SUS funding, whereas the Task Force recommended decoupling the community college baccalaureate funding from the SUS, suggesting a cost-plus funding approach for upper division, using a ratio of Florida College System funding for lower level plus 35 percent.

Commissioner Smith said that baccalaureates at the community colleges had been approved by the State Board since 2002, and that there were already 13 of the 28 colleges awarding baccalaureates. Dr. Holcombe said that 5300 students were enrolled in upper-level courses in 2007-2008, and over 7000 students were estimated for 2008-09. He said the age group of these students was the same as for students traditionally enrolling, those who were 35 to 45 years old. Dr. Holcombe said the data since 2004 showed students older than 25, and greater numbers of students older than 35, enrolling in community colleges, rather than students 18 to 25.

Ms. McDevitt inquired whether the Legislature needed to implement any of these recommendations. Commissioner Smith responded that both reports were required by the Legislature. Dr. Holcombe said the Legislature would decide how to implement the recommendations. He added that part of the problem was the terminology, as the legislation renamed the community college system, the Florida College System, and introduced the term, "state college." He said 13 colleges offered the baccalaureate and four of them had added "state college" to their names. He said the recommendation going forward was that the naming of an institution would be a local decision.

Mr. Edwards inquired about program approval. Dr. Holcombe said the Task Force had recommended that program approval remain with the State Board; the Pilot Project had recommended that after initial State Board approval, that program approval rest with the local boards of trustees. Mr. Edwards said he was concerned that local control would create possible duplication. He inquired if the Commissioner had a position. Commissioner Smith responded that the State Board had adopted the Task Force report and supported the position that the State Board approve all baccalaureate degrees at the colleges.

Ms. Duncan expressed a concern about library costs. She said she hoped that library services would be shared. Dr. Holcombe said the CCLA was working with the FCLA. He said that both reports said that all colleges should remain in the same system, and not separate to a third system. He said this had been an early concern.

Commissioner Smith said that the "2 plus 2" system was vital to the state and to the students. He said the State Board and this Board needed to be careful to maintain

Florida's premier community college system in this new broadened mission and focus on baccalaureate production.

Mr. Stavros said that the Pappas Report had addressed the need for more baccalaureate degrees in Florida. He said he was familiar with the education and nursing degrees available at St. Petersburg College.

Mr. Tripp inquired whether any schools were anticipating making changes to the current "open door" admission policy. Dr. Holcombe said no, that he would be sure it did not happen. He said the schools would have to keep the budgets separate and not co-mingle the funds for community college students and the funds for the upper-level students.

Chancellor Rosenberg also stressed the importance of the "2 plus 2" policy. He said this Board's enrollment management strategy has been premised on the notion that the universities would find space for A.A. and eligible A.S. transfer students. He said he had also discussed this with the provosts, especially with the current budget restrictions. He said the Board was committed to community college graduates finding a seat at a university, even if not at the university of their first choice.

Mrs. Roberts concurred in her support of the "2 plus 2" system. She inquired whether the Board should expect the demand for seats in the SUS to continue as more baccalaureate degrees were offered or whether there would be less demand in the SUS from students transferring from community colleges.

Commissioner Smith said they would track the enrollment patterns. He said there might still be demand for programs not offered by the colleges awarding four-year degrees. He noted that four-year degrees were in limited fields. He said the goal was to achieve more baccalaureate degrees. Dr. Holcombe said he expected overall demand to increase for students entering universities from the Florida College System. He said that, while he had been at Broward Community College, he had worked with FAU to create partnership campuses where baccalaureate and masters level courses were offered by the University. The opportunity for more partnerships is wide-open.

President Bense said the numbers of A.A. transfers were down at UWF. She said the four-year degrees were keeping students at the colleges. She said cost was a factor, and students were staying home. It was not fostering enrollment in the State University System.

Mr. Tripp said there were some colleges that had natural partnerships with local universities. Dr. Holcombe said he believed it would be different as the colleges respond to their local environments. He said Chipola Community College was not likely to grow its enrollment, but Indian River State College was likely to grow because the population in the area was growing. He said there might be good discussions about program mix and opportunities for more joint planning. Mr. Edwards said FGCU and

Edison State College were sharing Edison facilities in Charlotte County to offer programs needed in that area. He encouraged all the colleges and universities to cooperate more and to utilize existing resources.

President Genshaft said she found it valuable to have served as a member of the Task Force. She thanked Dr. Dottie Minear and Dr. Nancy McKee for their assistance. She said these new colleges would change enrollment patterns. She noted that, as four-year colleges, the colleges needed SACs accreditation. She said the recommendation from the Task Force on State Board authority for program approval was a major difference in the two reports. She said as community colleges were changing, the "2 plus 2" landscape was changing and will make a difference in universities' enrollment. She noted that the Task Force had recommended a lower tuition rate for these colleges.

President Brogan said there were now multiple degree providers. He said partnerships were reliant on the relationships of the presidents, and these were developing "on the fly." He said the Board needed to think about what it was trying to accomplish, how to measure progress, and what governance structure is needed for the future. He noted that the Pappas Report had focused on access to the baccalaureate degree. He said he believed that the new colleges would definitely have an impact on the number of students at an institution. He said the Board should consider the accountability sets upon which it would rely.

Mr. Martin inquired about the differences in the costs in the two systems. Dr. Rosenberg said that the lower level had about a \$30 per credit hour difference. Dr. Holcombe said the Legislature had set community college upper division at 85 percent of the SUS cost. Mr. Martin inquired whether either report addressed housing. Dr. Holcombe said housing was not addressed. He added that most of the community colleges did not have residence halls.

Mrs. Roberts said the state's dollars needed to be spent wisely. She said the state and the Board needed to be clear about the direction for these new colleges. Ms. McDevitt said that it was important to manage this "morphing" of colleges and not lose sight of the quality of the degrees being awarded. She said she was working toward having a couple of joint meetings each year with the State Board of Education. She added that the proposed tuition legislation would help the SUS eliminate duplication if that was the right thing to do.

Ms. Duncan inquired about enrollment and whether the universities would lose enrollment. She asked whether students who were not admitted to the SUS would enroll at the community/state colleges. President Genshaft said it depended on the region. President Brogan noted that it was difficult to extend all the needed services for students at satellite campuses. He said that FAU would need to plan together with the new Indian River State College, the former Indian River Community College, regarding undergraduate education. He said FAU might decide to pull back on undergraduate

degrees in education, to avoid duplication. Some decreases in undergraduate programs might be voluntary in order for the universities to focus more on graduate programs.

Mr. Perez inquired whether the data the Commissioner was tracking showed that these programs were, in fact, producing more baccalaureate degrees. The Commissioner agreed that these were important questions. He said he would present that data later.

Dr. Rosenberg said this Board had set strategic goals for the state regarding the educational attainment of its citizens. In analyzing levels of attainment, if Florida wanted to move to a top 10 state by 2020, Florida needed to increase the number of its residents with baccalaureate degrees by 1.5 million. He said the Board would have to determine the targets for 2020 and 2025, and work backwards to determine each system's contribution. He suggested that the Board use this data in a joint meeting with the State Board.

President Brogan suggested that three members of this Board, three members of the State Board, and three members of the community college board develop the long-term view for higher education in Florida. He said they should also develop metrics and report how these were being achieved. He said this should be done as a team, rather than being left to the goodwill and good intent of the individuals.

Dr. Holcombe said the Task Force had recommended program approval at the state level where there was an opportunity for greater cooperation. That would provide the opportunity to plan better at the state level. He said the issues were about access and productivity. He said the "2 plus 2" system was undergoing change as universities dealt with financial stress, but the policy needed to remain viable.

Dr. Abele said these discussions should begin with the facts. The Board needed to know how many students were graduating from high school and the number of students who were entering universities and community colleges as first-time-in-college students. He said his data showed that the number of standard diplomas to high school graduates was dropping. He said it was difficult to know the real demand for additional access without looking at the data.

Dr. Bense said the new state colleges had affected UWF. She reported that the college presidents in Northwest Florida were meeting together to do program planning: What do students need, what are the jobs and who should offer what programs? She said the silver lining was increased cooperation.

Ms. Parker said there were certainly a number of issues to be discussed in planning for the new state colleges and their relationship with the community colleges and the universities and that the chair had mentioned having joint meetings with the State Board of Education to start working on these issues. Ms. McDevitt said there was nothing to prevent the Board from creating a coordinating group with the State Board of Education and include people from the Florida College System.

Ms. Parker thanked the Commissioner and Dr. Holcombe for their presentations.

B. Update: College and Career Readiness, Access and Success Initiatives

Ms. Parker said that one of the projects the Board adopted as part of the Forward by Design initiatives was to work with the State Board of Education to ensure students were adequately prepared to enter, and succeed, in the State University System.

Commissioner Smith said that College and Career Readiness was one of the focus areas of the Department's Next Generation Strategic Plan and was fully aligned with the Department's strategic goals promoting highest student achievement, seamless articulation and maximum access, and workforce development. He noted that 1996 data showed that fourth graders' performance in math was seven points below the national average in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data; by 2007, Florida's students had moved to five points above the national average. He said there were similar improvements shown by eighth graders. He noted that these students were better prepared to move on to college. He said the groundwork for these initiatives had begun with Commissioner John Winn and his Go Higher, Florida! Task Force.

Commissioner Smith said Florida was also involved in the American Diploma Project, which was a national initiative focused on aligning high school exit requirements with postsecondary admission standards. He noted that 34 states were participating in the Project. He said they were engaged in serious discussions about standards for students, including revisions to the curriculum, particularly new math sequencing. He commented that the revised high school accountability program would have the most profound affect for the SUS. He said there were now ninth and tenth grade assessments. Beginning next year, FCAT performance would constitute one-half of a school's grade; the other half would include graduation rate, participation and placement in AP courses and testing, dual enrollment, and SAT and ACT test performance. He said this accountability program has had a significant impact on student achievement. He commented that gearing high school course offerings to college readiness would accelerate reform in the high schools. He said the high schools were also exploring the use of end-of-course tests. He said he anticipated a continuing increase in the numbers of students who were moving forward and ready to be successful in college.

Dr. Rosenberg inquired whether the end-of-course exams would relate to the college admission process. Commissioner Smith said they did not at this point, but they could. He said the tests were student specific and did not relate to the high school's grade. He said they were looking at developing tests for courses which would be required for graduation.

Mr. Perez said he would be interested in the data. Commissioner Smith commented that over the past decade, Florida, as a majority minority state in K-12, had made significant improvements in the NAEP assessments.

President Brogan concurred that this was great news for K-12 in Florida. He said these reforms were put in place over the past 10 years and were derided at the outset. He said that the changes needed to continue. He said he was convinced that all children could learn and the system should continue to evolve. He said the greatest lament of business leaders in 1994 had been the quality of K-12 education. He said the Commissioner was now able to brag about these students.

Commissioner Smith said that students' financial support affected both access and success in college. He said staff had produced two Information Briefs that helped identify an opportunity to get more federal financial aid for the lowest-income undergraduates and a sizable group of lower-middle-income students who did not get aid from the big federal and state grant and scholarship programs but had substantial financial need. Dr. Dan Cohen-Vogel noted that the brief, "An Opportunity to Get More Federal Aid to Students," estimated that nearly a quarter of SUS students who were likely eligible for federal Pell grants and other need-based aid programs were not applying for financial aid and were leaving at least \$24 million in federal dollars untapped. He said there were likely community college and private university students who were also not applying for this financial assistance. He said both briefs suggest that there are opportunities for the Board and the broader education community to expand the amount of support for students in order to reach as many students as possible.

Mr. Martin suggested that it might be appropriate for the Student Affairs Committee to examine these financial aid issues and ways to get more financial assistance to students in the SUS. Ms. Duncan, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, agreed and said these were excellent issues for her Committee to explore.

Dr. Cohen-Vogel introduced Dr. Paul Dosal, Executive Director, ENLACE. He said Dr. Dosal had worked with him on these studies. Dr. Dosal said it was unacceptable to leave \$24 million on the table. He said he was working to help students apply for all the financial aid for which they qualified. ENLACE's Assistant Director, Mr. Braulio Colon, advised the Board of College Bowl Sunday, to be held on Sunday, February 22. He said workshops would be held throughout the state; these workshops were designed to help students and families complete financial aid forms.

Commissioner Smith also asked Dr. Dan Cohen-Vogel to describe the initiative of the National Association of System Heads, "Access to Success." The initiative focused on where the SUS was relative to gaps in enrollment, degrees, and graduation rates between majority and minority students and between upper- and lower-income students. Dr. Cohen-Vogel said the goal was to cut in half these gaps in success between these groups of students. He said 20 states were participating.

Mr. Martin said that the Committee recognized there were gaps in the rates at which different groups of students earned college degrees. He said the Board reiterated its commitment to reducing these gaps in adopting the Forward by Design initiatives. He said he recognized the universities were facing great challenges in having to make severe budget cuts, but hoped to minimize the impact of these cuts on the access and success of SUS students. He said the Committee should continue to hear periodic status reports on these efforts and the changes in data from the impact of these efforts.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m., January 29, 2009.

Frank T. Martin, Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary