

MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA  
JULY 22, 2004

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 10:40 a.m., in the University Center, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, July 22, 2004, with the following members present: Pam Bilbrey; Dr. Castell Bryant; Jarrett Eady; General Rolland Heiser; Commissioner Jim Horne; Sheila McDevitt; Gerri Moll; Lynn Pappas; Ava Parker; Carolyn K. Roberts; Dr. Howard Rock; Peter Rummell; John Temple; Steve Uhlfelder; and Dr. Zach Zachariah.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held May 27, 2004

Dr. Zachariah moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting held May 27, 2004, as presented. Dr. Rock seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Update, Medical Education Subcommittee

Dr. Zachariah informed the Board that Florida International University had submitted a proposal for a new medical school. He said this Subcommittee had held several workshops earlier in the year on the subject of medical education. He said that any application for a new medical school must address three important questions. 1) How would a new medical school affect total state appropriations to the universities? 2) Where would medical residents be placed? 3) How will the University ensure that these medical students and residents practice in Florida?

He reminded the Committee that it had asked CEPRI to develop a model for the Board defining the parameters of the issue and how the Board should review these proposals. The Committee had been advised that it would receive this model within the next 60 days.

3. Update on Strategic Planning Process

Mr. Dasburg said the Presidents had met and had offered their recommendations on replacing the objective on the Y-axis of achieving membership in the American Association of Universities, within the goal, which was rewritten, "Building world-class academic programs and research capacity." He said the Board had agreed to replace the AAU objective as it was a measure not within the control of the universities. He asked Dr. Mark Rosenberg, Provost, FIU, to explain the alternative measures.

Dr. Rosenberg said the Presidents had recommended that the measures should include: total research expenditures; Federal research expenditures; doctorates awarded; and U.S. patents issued; and that in each case, these totals should be divided by the total number of full-time faculty. He said these measures would reflect

systemwide activities. He noted that these measures would advance the recognition of the universities, and help them achieve world-class status.

Mrs. Roberts inquired whether these measures were consistent with achieving AAU status. Dr. Rosenberg responded that these would help the universities to move in that direction, although they might not be sufficient. Dr. Bryant said these measures clearly addressed the part of the goal that spoke to "building research capacity." She inquired about the measures to address "building world-class academic programs." Dr. Rosenberg said these were reflected in national rankings. Mr. Dasburg said he would ask Dr. McKee to be clear on that point.

Mr. Rummell asked if there were a general understanding of the criteria used to measure these four issues. Dr. Rosenberg said that they are common measures but noted that the first measure of research expenditures came from the institutions reporting their own data.

Mr. Dasburg said the Committee had now completed the Y-axis setting out the strategic goals and objectives for the State University System. The Board has now completed the first step. He asked the Chancellor to send the Goals and Objectives document, as amended, to members of the University Boards of Trustees for their information. He noted that the Presidents had become familiar with this document, and that he did not expect a negative reaction from the Trustees. He said that by October 15, 2004, he expected to receive some outline from the Trustees of their University Strategic Plans, which should conform to the Board's Strategic Plan.

Mrs. Roberts clarified that the plans would not be acceptable unless in the format of the Board's plan. She moved that the University Strategic Plans submitted by the University Boards of Trustees follow the model of this Board's Strategic Plan, as adopted. Dr. Bryant seconded the motion, and members concurred without objection.

Mr. Dasburg reported that copies of the RFP had now been distributed. A response was expected by October 15, 2004. The RFP sought assistance to the Board in providing a structure by which the universities could be compared. He asked Board members to send any comments regarding the RFP to Dr. McKee.

Mr. Dasburg said that at a previous meeting, Committee members had discussed whether university programs were supply driven or demand-driven. He said that the Presidents would be asked to present on two programs on their campuses at the November Strategic Planning Committee meeting.

Dr. Rock inquired about the recognition of non-targeted degree programs in the Strategic Plan. Mr. Dasburg said this was included under the Goals and Objectives for the universities, as D. "Meeting community needs and fulfilling unique institutional responsibilities."

4. Presentation, University Enrollment and Degree Plans

Dr. Nate Johnson said the Chancellor had requested enrollment plans from the universities. The universities had been asked to provide the following information: full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment plans by level and branch campus; headcount enrollment plans by program area and level; planned degree awards by program area and level; lists of new programs planned with initial enrollments; and other enrollment/strategic planning data, as needed. He said the responses to these questions would help the Board learn how many degrees the universities were planning to award and how the university plans compare with statewide goals; what program areas were growing the fastest; and how much growth the universities were planning in total FTE instruction provided.

Dr. Bryant inquired how the universities would accomplish these plans with their large numbers of part-time students. Dr. Johnson said this will give the Board a view of both types of data, with the FTE information.

Mr. Temple said this data was very helpful. He inquired if it were possible to look at data from 10 years ago. Mr. Dasburg asked Dr. Johnson to amend the chart showing the bachelor's and master's degrees awarded since 2002-03 with the data since the year 1992-93, and distribute it to Board members.

Ms. Pappas inquired about the use of these enrollment plans. Dr. Johnson compared them with sailing. Universities have the direction they want to go, but much depends on external conditions. He said this Board determines part of the "weather" for the universities "sailing" with these plans. The Legislature also had its role to play in these plans.

Mr. Dasburg noted that the Committee had earlier noted an aberration in the number of doctorates awarded. He said this information was helpful as it was normalized for this unique aberration in Florida. Dr. Johnson said over the projected ten-year period, the plans showed some slight differences with the estimated national averages for bachelor's, master's and first professional degrees. He noted the significant increase in the number of doctorates from the national average was the plan from UF to increase the award of doctorates in targeted areas important to the Y-axis.

Dr. Johnson reviewed the planned growth in bachelor's degrees in some of the targeted program areas. He also identified the programs with the most planned growth in doctoral degrees by 2012-13, noting how these fit in with the Board's Strategic Plan. According to their plans, UCF, USF and FIU were the universities proposing the largest increases in headcount enrollment by 2012-13.

Mr. Eady inquired about the rationale behind these projections. Dr. Johnson explained that the universities had made assumptions based on mission; student demand, including demographic growth, achievement and interest; economic, educational, and cultural trends driving field-specific growth or decline; and funding.

Dr. Bryant noted that these were university plans and wondered about their relationship to the Board's Strategic Plan. Dr. Johnson said these were enrollment projections; the Board's Y-axis addressed specific degrees and programs.

Mr. Dasburg agreed that the metrics were crude. The Board had now defined a set of strategic goals. The universities were providing information on how they would perform against those goals. They are inferring that in order to achieve these degrees, they will need this enrollment, which requires infrastructure and budget. All the steps to achieve the end-result are not shown.

Dr. Bryant said there should be a relationship between enrollment and graduation. She said the Board was not interested in seeing students enroll; these students needed to graduate. Mr. Dasburg commented that the metrics were not yet linked. The consultant to be hired would help them create the model to link these factors, from the universities to the Board's Strategic Plan. Dr. Austin agreed that the consultant would provide a System perspective, but each university had an idea about the yield data.

Dr. Bryant said the universities could address yield. If there were changes, the Board needed to know the bottom line. Mr. Dasburg said the Board had not agreed on the structure to be used to make this analysis. The Board has made a broad statement as to where it wants to stand as a State. The universities have provided information as to how to get there, advising the Board that it would take this many FTE to achieve those goals. The Board does not yet know how to analyze this information.

Mr. Uhfelder inquired how to separate from the data the part-time students who will never graduate. Mr. Dasburg said it was only possible to infer the production of degrees from this planned enrollment. They did not yet know yield, or the university most efficient at doing this, or even how many universities were needed to achieve these Board objectives.

Dr. Bryant inquired whether the assumptions should include facilities. Mr. Dasburg said this was a subset within the broader area of funding. He said as the Board looks back 24 months, it can begin to see trendlines, and answers as to facilities and funding, and will begin to glean the answers as to the System's capacity to produce what the Board has said the State needs, e.g., nurses, engineers, teachers.

Mr. Dasburg said the presentation on Degree "Import/Export" Information would be made at the Committee's September meeting.

#### 5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m., July 22, 2004.

---

John Dasburg, Chairman

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary