

MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY  
FT. MYERS, FLORIDA  
JUNE 9, 2005

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 10:15 a.m., in the Ballroom, Student Union, Florida Gulf Coast University, Ft. Myers, Florida, June 9, 2005, with the following members present: Dr. Akshay Desai; Ann Duncan; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Bill McCollum; Sheila McDevitt; Gerri Moll; Lynn Pappas; Ava Parker; Carolyn K. Roberts; Peter Rummell; Chris Schoonover; John Temple; Commissioner John Winn; Dr. Dreamal Worthen; and Dr. Zach Zachariah.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held April 21, 2005

Mr. McCollum moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held April 21, 2005, as presented. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Follow-up Issues: University Mission Statements; Update of University Information; Update of Goal for Targeted Programs

Mr. Dasburg said that several matters were unfinished at the last meeting. The Committee needed to adopt the universities' revised Mission Statements, discuss the added data points in the university descriptions, and update the goals for the targeted degree programs.

Dr. Nate Johnson said the staff had added a statement of Shared Mission for the SUS. He said staff had also revised some the universities' mission statements by removing goal statements. He added that the Appendix included the universities' complete mission/goals/vision statements. Mr. Dasburg said the Committee was not dismissing the goals statements; these would be considered by the Committee at a future meeting.

Dr. Johnson said after the last Committee meeting, FAU had provided a substantive change in its mission statement to reflect its research mission. He said there were no other substantive changes to university mission statements, although UWF and FSU had submitted revisions. He said information about research expenditures, the number of doctoral degree programs, and the number of doctoral degrees awarded had been added to the university summaries. He said there was some concern about the descriptions for the range of doctoral programs. Mr. Dasburg said that concern was easily resolved by removing the terms "extensive" or "comprehensive," and leaving only the numbers of degree programs and degrees awarded. This would remove any concept of a "tier" system.

Dr. Johnson said there had also been further discussion of the goals for the targeted degree programs, rather than stating a goal of 50% of degrees in the targeted areas. The Strategic Plan now includes the numbers of degrees in the targeted programs, reflecting the numbers submitted by the universities. He said the information had been submitted by the universities in June 2004, and institutional goals might change. Mr. Dasburg said the Board was establishing goals for the State University System. He said that everything was now congruent; the Board might discover shortfalls in the coming year at which time the Board of Governors will start the process with the State University Presidents Association. There will also be new information as the Economic Development Committee reviews the list of targeted programs.

Mr. Dasburg inquired whether the University Presidents had any comments. Dr. Hitt said that UCF was dissatisfied with the revisions to its mission statement provided by Board staff. He said UCF had submitted a statement different from the statement included. Dr. Johnson said staff had tried to put all the mission statements in a consistent format. Dr. Hitt said the staff rewrite too narrowly restricted the scope of UCF's programs and seemed to limit the University to regional concerns rather than allowing a developing international focus.

Dr. Marshall inquired why staff were rewriting the university goal statements. Dr. Johnson said they were so varied; staff put them in a consistent format. Mr. Dasburg noted that UCF did not believe staff had accurately reflected UCF's mission. President Brogan said he did not believe the Board meant to lock any of the universities into a position from which they could not move forward. He also inquired why staff were rewriting these mission statements.

Mr. Dasburg said the Board was trying to develop a meaningful process, and it was important to achieve an accurate extraction of the university statements. He said there was no intent of this Committee to tier the universities in any way. He said since the universities had raised concerns about the use of certain terms, those terms would not be used. He noted that the Constitution did prescribe that this Board would define the "distinctive mission" of each university. He said each university has a mission; it is easy to satisfy UCF's concern; there is no intent to "tier" the universities.

Commissioner Winn said there was a natural and intentional tension between the Board of Governors and the universities. The Board needs to assure that the universities all meet statewide goals and needs. This may not always be in concert with the goals of the university presidents. He asked about the criteria used in the process of deciding what mission statement would be approved. He further asked about the significance of the mission statement in relation to the overall goal that the universities meet statewide needs.

Mr. Dasburg said the mission of the individual universities is the subject of the Strategic Plan. The Board is now approving the Strategic Plan. There are other issues to be addressed such as university finance and bonding, but the first focus should be on the statewide needs identified on the Y-axis. Prospectively, he said the Board would need to keep refining the Strategic Plan to make sure the universities were meeting the state's needs. He said the goals described on the Y-axis were not a point of tension

with the universities, but should be seen as a cooperative document so the universities achieve the state's needs.

Commissioner Winn inquired about "unfulfilled need" which would create a situation for the Board to find a way to meet that need. He added that he was only speaking hypothetically about a "tension." He said he knew of none at this time.

Chancellor Austin said she would ask staff to review the abbreviated mission statements to be sure these summary statements reflected the university missions.

Mr. Dasburg said the staff had not changed the universities' mission statements, and the universities could pursue their various ambitions. The operative clause for the Board is "distinctive mission." He said the Board's real task is to avoid unnecessary duplication, noting that there would be duplication in a state this large. He recalled the intense dialogue with UCF about its proposal for a Ph.D. in Economics. He said that in future, he would recommend that staff make no recommendation on these proposals, but provide the analysis for an informed debate by the Board. He said the Board would have discussions of the universities' goals during the next year. The principle debate for the Board will be around the word, "unnecessary."

Commissioner Winn said the Constitutional language did not deal with "mission statements." He suggested the Board's Strategic Plan include the universities' mission statements, as submitted by them. President Bryant added that these should be viewed as a "statement in time" with opportunities for the universities to redirect their missions. Mr. Dasburg concurred. Dr. Bryant added that the universities were in the best position to state and to summarize their mission statements. Mr. Dasburg suggested that rather than extract from the universities' mission statements, that they be included in full, as submitted by the universities with a two-page limit.

Mrs. Roberts noted that this was a difficult discussion; universities always are nervous when the Board discusses mission. She said, however, that the state had limited resources and the Board had an obligation to meet needs. At some time, the Board will need to make some of these decisions and they will be hard ones. She agreed that the Strategic Plan was a snapshot of the present, and a working, living document. Again, Mr. Dasburg said the focus and "tension" would be about "unnecessary" duplication. Mr. Temple moved that the Strategic Plan include the universities' mission statements, as submitted. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Dasburg moved approval of the Strategic Plan, as presented and amended. Mr. Temple seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

### 3. Cost per Degree

Dr. Johnson said there were a number of issues to be considered regarding the cost per degree analysis, including potential uses of the data, whether for accountability, planning or funding purposes. He said the primary question was whether such a model could be developed. The methodology for Bachelor's degrees looked at FTIC data for

the average instructional cost per degree. The data showed a range of costs for different programs, as well as differences for the costs for the AA transfer students. Mr. Rummell suggested that the costs of attrition should be added, and Dr. Johnson said they were included. He inquired about the costs for AA transfer students. Dr. Johnson said these were only the costs while these students were in the SUS. Ms. Duncan inquired whether staff knew the community college costs for the transfer students. Mr. Dasburg said he had spoken to the Chair of the State Board of Education, Mr. Phil Handy, about that data.

Dr. Abele said there was excellent information on the attrition of students. He said that 62 percent of community college students leave without any degree; 25 percent of SUS students leave without any degree. Dr. Bryant suggested the Board might want some discussion about this with the Chancellor of Community Colleges. She said that some students entering the community colleges were not enrolling to seek a degree, but were enrolling for job preparation, so the data should be distinguished.

Ms. Moll inquired whether the base included the costs of endowed faculty chairs. Dr. Johnson said these costs were not included. He said these funds would have an impact on specific disciplines at each university. Dr. Johnson said the expenditure analysis had been used in developing the cost figures, and this included state funds. Foundation dollars would not be in the accounting system for state funds.

He reviewed the top 10 disciplines from which the most bachelor's degrees had been awarded. He noted that students do not always start in one program and stay there for four years. The cost of any particular major would include the costs for students who had tried the program and those who had earned the degree in that major. Mr. Dasburg inquired whether this figure was distorted or whether it was a good proxy. Dr. Johnson suggested that it might be used to figure the costs for degrees. Mr. Dasburg said there was a growing demand for degrees. These cost figures could be used to defend university budget requests to address this increased demand. Dr. Johnson noted that in general, the greater the aggregation of these figures, such as at the System level, the more reliable they were. By discipline, the numbers were more difficult. This also hinged, in part, on the institutional definition of when a student actually "starts" in a program.

Mr. Dasburg suggested that these costs could also be used to demonstrate that if the universities did not achieve a certain level of funding, the universities could not produce the sought-for number of graduates. He said that the budget request for the next year should include the costs for incremental growth.

Commissioner Winn said this was a good model for the current costs, and provides a base to understand the relationship between costs and tuition. He wondered if it would also be possible to analyze the influence of core costs against attrition, changing majors, and other similar variables. Dr. Johnson said that was the effort, to reach some correlation with graduation rates. He recommended that the data be broken into core costs, with a cost per credit to an attrition ratio. Mr. Dasburg suggested that such an analysis would be useful for the Finance Committee and for the Accountability Committee, as well.

Mr. McCollum inquired if these numbers reflected equipment costs, fixed costs, buildings, plant operations and maintenance. Dr. Johnson said they reflected the expenditure analysis, the direct costs, including salaries. Indirect costs were calculated by formula. Capital costs were not reflected.

President Brogan said engineering at FAU was more expensive than at any other university. He said the Board should consider some of the expensive factors, including the very expensive program in Ocean Engineering. He said in the aggregate, this was a good approach, but that there were extremes that would have an impact. He said this data could be used to look at funding per degree.

Ms. Moll said logic would tell you that class size has an impact. In developing this data, it is important not to lose sight of quality in reaching for greater efficiencies. Mr. Dasburg said that at this stage, the Board was just crawling, as it began looking at what it costs to do things at the universities. Commissioner Winn commented that there is a tendency to jump to conclusions when data is aggregated. Mr. Dasburg said the Board was exploring a process and looking to engender a sense of trust with the universities. Mrs. Roberts said it was important to remember the quality factor. Dr. Johnson said that several factors were included in the engineering costs, including instructional costs and "attrition rates." These costs are also effected by when universities allow their students to be called engineering students.

Mr. Dasburg said this exercise had begun with a consultant and was now being handled by Board staff. Ms. Pappas suggested that the data might be more meaningful using a mean, rather than an average cost. Mr. Dasburg said the work would continue using the same data, but the Committee did not yet have the whole framework for the discussion. The Committee would continue to study and refine the information. He said there was no intent here to defend any particular university or program. The discussions would continue at the next meeting.

#### 4. Supply and Demand, Engineering, USF

President Genshaft introduced the Dean of Engineering at USF, Dean Louis Martin-Vega. She noted that previous presentations to the Committee had described supply, university capacity and workforce demand in teaching and nursing. She said engineering could not be explained in a supply and demand model. She explained that engineering graduates increased the economic competitiveness of the state and contributed to its economic potential. She said that average salaries for engineers were high-wage salaries in the workforce.

Dean Martin-Vega described the aging of the engineering workforce, fewer American students choosing engineering, and fewer international students enrolled in U.S. engineering programs. He also showed the higher production of engineering degrees in China, Europe and Japan. He said Florida ranked eighth in the U.S. in the number of engineering degrees awarded. He showed Florida's ranking against regional and national competitors in the number of doctoral scientists and engineers per 1000 workers and graduate science and engineering students per 1000 inhabitants. He demonstrated that Florida lags as well in patents and in research and development

investments. He described the benefits from past state investments in engineering education. He also described some of USF's research activities. He emphasized the importance of reaching students at the elementary school level. He described programs at USF where doctoral students were working with K-5 grade students in summer camps. He said engineering programs also needed to reach out to minorities and women if Florida was to be a technologically advanced state. He said engineering was not just about teaching and research, but was also critical to the economic development of the State of Florida.

Mr. Rummell inquired whether there was a paucity of demand for engineering education, similar to teaching. Dr. Martin-Vega agreed. He added that engineering graduates created jobs in the economy.

Mr. McCollum said he worried about the diminishing numbers of engineers, and the declining numbers of international students. He said he would be interested in additional breakdown data for the numbers of engineers in specific discipline areas. Dr. Martin-Vega noted that over half of the engineering students at MIT are international students. He added that the state made significant investments in engineering in the 1980's which reaped excellent results. President Hitt said the issue was attracting younger students in the K-8 years. It is too late to attract students to engineering when they enter the university.

Ms. McDevitt said her company hired engineers and had hired many USF graduates. She agreed with Dean Martin-Vega about the aging engineering workforce. Dr. Desai suggested that Florida should invest funds to complement the NSF funded K-8 programs. President Genshaft added that she hoped that at some point it would not be so difficult for international students to obtain visas for study in the U.S.

Dr. Desai inquired if USF was getting qualified applicants. Dr. Martin-Vega said they were getting qualified applicants at the undergraduate level, but that the graduate programs were not getting as many qualified applicants because of the difficulties faced by international students in getting visas. President Hitt said UCF could accommodate more students in its engineering programs. President Machen said all the programs had more capacity than it could fill. President Cavanaugh said UWF was working with the high schools to develop the pipeline. President Brogan said there were not enough American students to fill the slots previously filled by international students. Provost Rosenberg said FIU needed more Graduate Assistants for its programs.

Commissioner Winn said this presentation emphasized that the issues were beyond the ability of just one sector to satisfy. He said it was important to address the broader issues.

Mr. Dasburg thanked President Genshaft and Dean Martin-Vega. He said this demonstrated that when the demand was at the universities and the issue was specific as one this Board could address, the universities would act to satisfy the demand. He said that the presentations on teachers and engineers demonstrated that the shortage of the demand transcended this Board and required a broader state approach. Commissioner Winn said the State Board had created a Task Force to look at the

teacher shortfall. He said the presentation also demonstrated the importance of a solid education in K-12 so students would be prepared to study engineering.

5. New Business

Mr. Temple said he wanted to raise an issue for new business. He said that the Subcommittee on Medical Education, which he co-chaired with Dr. Zachariah, needed to address the requests from UCF and FIU for new medical schools. He said he wanted to be prepared to make recommendations to this Committee at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Dasburg said he would put on the agenda for the July 21, 2005, meeting to receive the Subcommittee report.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m., June 9, 2005.

---

John Dasburg, Chairman

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary