

MINUTES
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
APRIL 22, 2004

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 11:00 a.m., in the H. Manning Efferson Ballroom, Student Union, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida, April 22, 2004, with the following members present: Dr. Castell Bryant; General Rolland Heiser; Commissioner Jim Horne; Sheila McDevitt; Lynn Pappas; Ava Parker; Carolyn K. Roberts; Dr. Howard Rock; Clayton Solomon; John Temple; and Steve Uhlfelder.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held March 18, 2004

Mr. Temple moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting held March 18, 2004, as presented. Dr. Bryant seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Update on Strategic Planning Process

Mr. Dasburg said that copies of the Y-axis had been sent to the University Presidents and to the Provosts for their review and comment. He said he had been scheduled to discuss the Board's strategic planning process with the Presidents at their meeting on April 12, 2004, but bad weather had kept him in Miami; this meeting had been rescheduled for May 18, 2004. He said the dialogue on the Y-axis was now the "bottoms up" part of the process. He reported that he had already met individually with Presidents Hitt and Machen. The general sentiment was that the A and B categories would work, but there was concern about the C category, dealing with the external recognition of Florida's universities. He said he would report on these discussions to the Committee in May.

Mr. Dasburg reported that a proposal had been submitted to the Commissioner, to the Department's CFO, and to Chancellor Austin, regarding the hiring of a consultant to do modeling about the universities for the Board. The purpose of the modeling would enable the Board to understand the ability of each university to meet the goals set out in the A and B categories, and the costs of achieving those goals. If the Board's goal is to increase the number of baccalaureates, then the Board needs to know the cost to each university to achieve that goal.

3. Medical Education Subcommittee Update

Mr. Temple said at the last meeting, the Board had adopted a motion asking CEPRI to define the parameters of a model to assess the needs and costs of medical education in the State. He said Dr. Austin had received a response from Dr. Desai accepting the challenge. No timeframe was provided. He said he would encourage them to move quickly.

4. Update on Draft Framework for Strategic Planning Process: Florida's Doctoral/Research Programs in National Contexts

Mr. Dasburg said the Committee had asked for additional information about doctoral programs in Florida and the production of doctorates. He said Florida was producing far fewer doctorates in comparison with the numbers of baccalaureate and masters degrees produced.

Dr. Nate Johnson explained that doctoral students were creating new ideas, rather than learning existing ideas. He described the areas where there was the most federal spending in academic research and development and the areas that account for the most growth in federal research spending. He also described the areas which accounted for most of Florida's doctorates as compared with the nation, and some comparisons of the production of doctorates in the life sciences and the physical sciences, by private and public institutions, in the 20 largest states.

Ms. Pappas inquired about the extent to which the volume of doctoral participation affects the quality of the program at the undergraduate level. Dr. Johnson responded that the Top 10 rankings of public institutions for their doctoral programs vary. Mr. Dasburg said he would be interested to know how much in these figures for doctorates is "demand pull" as opposed to "supply push." Dr. Johnson noted that the programs expanded and improved in response to student demand. He added that degree programs tend to cater to the local population, which would account for a greater number of degree programs outside the life sciences.

Mr. Dasburg thanked Dr. Johnson for his presentation. He asked what this Board should do to alter the mix of doctorates, in the face of a State demand for more engineers, for example. Dr. Rock said the key component was building an outstanding faculty. Mr. Dasburg said the Y-axis identified the critical program areas. The universities would be asked to come back to the Board and identify where funds should be directed, and, in some cases, re-directed. Mrs. Roberts said the universities would not just build doctoral programs. These were built upon strong masters-level programs. Mr. Dasburg commented that it would be helpful to ask the Presidents to have on SUPA's next agenda a discussion on how their universities would address this issue, about the current mix of programs, the need for a different mix in the future. It would be helpful to hear different views on how the System will get to where all agree the University System needs to go.

Commissioner Horne said it would be necessary to redirect resources. In place is an artificial supply system, not a free market system. This Board will need to set the strategies to re-prioritize the universities' goals. This Board will need to guide the allocation of resources to critical needs. He said it was his view that production of doctorates was supply driven. He noted that this Board, and the University Boards of Trustees, would have to make the decisions on re-focusing resources; everything cannot stay the same. The programs now in place may not always be available.

Dr. Bryant observed that doctoral programs had an impact on the funding of facilities. There were a number of factors available to help decision-making on

doctorates. She said this Committee and this Board needed to identify the criteria they would be using to approve university requests for doctoral degrees.

Mr. Dasburg commented that the Strategic Plan was State University System driven. This Committee had recognized early in the process that the universities had unique missions. While the universities will be directing resources to SUS objectives, they will also be responding locally. The Strategic Plan tries to direct the System focus on a particular set of needed degree programs. Dr. Bryant expressed concern about programs for which demand diminishes over time. The universities should also have the flexibility to address their needs. Mr. Dasburg said the Board would provide some guidance, while also being receptive to the universities' requests for new doctoral programs because they are able to make a compelling argument of need. Dr. Bryant said the criteria needed to be known at the outset.

Ms. Pappas said she needed a better understanding of whether doctoral programs were top-down or bottoms-up. Dr. Rock said any program must start with a strong faculty base, which then attracts strong students. Dr. Johnson commented that program rankings show that there are currently strong faculty in the areas targeted in the Strategic Plan; the base is in place already.

Mr. Dasburg suggested that the Presidents should have the discussion of programs as "demand pull" versus "supply push," recognizing differences between the focus of the System from the focus of the universities. He said it was important to consider carefully the development of criteria for new doctoral programs with an outside focus. He suggested that the Chancellor work with the universities and come back with suggestions, perhaps a "need methodology," first, how to develop the criteria, and second, the criteria for new doctorates.

5. Discussion of Institutional Program Planning Process

Mr. Dasburg said Dr. Austin had requested planned enrollment and degree information for the next ten years at the degree program level. He said this information was necessary in the development of the Board's Strategic Plan. He noted that universities had Colleges of Engineering, but the Colleges were further defined by the programs within the Colleges, i.e., mechanical engineering, chemical engineering, aerospace engineering. The staff had asked several universities to comment on their planning at the program level.

Dr. Julia Pet-Armacost, UCF, said that university enrollment planning was not done by program. She described some of the models used for enrollment planning at UCF. As a university, UCF had selected certain strategic initiatives with the overall goal of becoming a strong metropolitan research university. Overall enrollment planning was done through 10-year enrollment projections, which were updated annually. Separate enrollment planning was in place for UCF's 21 regional campuses and three branch campuses. Enrollment management was done at the institutional level, not at the program level. She estimated that of the 85 programs at UCF, enrollment planning was done in only about seven programs. Students are admitted to the university, not to a program.

Mr. Dasburg noted that after two years, students had to declare a major. Dr. Pet-Armacost responded that students self-select their majors; the university could not control the number of "seats" in a major, but could control the numbers of students entering limited access programs. He also inquired whether the university did any type of modeling to plan for students choosing particular majors. Dr. Pet-Armacost said that the College of Engineering did some planning.

Dr. Austin noted that institutions do have data to give them some sense for projecting enrollment by program. They also have historical demand information, and have defined their own strategic objectives.

Mr. Dasburg inquired whether UCF would be able to respond to the Chancellor's request for program enrollment information. Dr. Pet-Armacost said UCF would be able to respond.

Dr. Colburn, UF, said UF faced challenges in enrollment management and budget development. He said it was important to have faculty in critical areas, and to provide needed graduate student stipends. He said each spring, each college engaged in program budget planning. These efforts were directed to the University's Strategic Plan goal to achieve excellence. He said they could provide the Chancellor with enrollment information at the program level. Some enrollment is generated by student demand; other data is generated in discipline areas the University is developing, such as Biomedical Engineering. He said that the University was working to change the enrollment pattern at UF. The University was supporting enrollment growth at the graduate level to reflect the University's membership in the American Association of Universities, and seeking slower enrollment growth at the undergraduate level, with a target goal of 6750 entering freshmen by 2007. He noted the problem in attracting top graduate students was that stipends in the range of \$15,000 to \$22,000 were not enough.

Dr. Mike Armstrong, FAU, explained enrollment planning at Florida Atlantic University. Five years earlier, the University had planned for significant growth in its engineering programs. The University could not anticipate that major engineering firms would leave Boca Raton, nor the dot.com crash of the late 1990's. He added that FAU, like other universities nationwide, was experiencing the loss of many international students as a result of new visa restrictions since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. He said the information was available at the universities to respond to the Chancellor's request for enrollment information at the program level. They could address capacity and major trend information. He said, however, the University would prefer to deal with two-digit CIP code information, rather than six-digit CIP code information.

Dr. Johnson said some data was needed at the six-digit CIP code level. The two-digit CIP code information was too broad, and did not distinguish programs at the detail level necessary. He noted that some goals on the Y-axis cross two-digit codes. He indicated there could be a middle ground between two-digit and six-digit codes.

Mr. Dasburg said it appeared that the universities could respond to the Chancellor's request for information without too much difficulty.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m., April 22, 2004.

John Dasburg,
Chairman

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary

