

MINUTES
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
MARCH 18, 2004

Mr. Dasburg, Chair, convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning/Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Governors at 8:00 a.m., in the Cape Florida Ballroom, Student Center, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida, March 18, 2004, with the following members present: Pam Bilbrey; Dr. Castell Bryant; Miguel DeGrandy; General Rolland Heiser; Commissioner Jim Horne; Sheila McDevitt; Lynn Pappas; Carolyn K. Roberts; Dr. Howard Rock; Peter Rummell; Clayton Solomon; Steve Uhfelder; and Dr. Zachariah P. Zachariah.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held January 22, 2004

Ms. Bilbrey moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting held January 22, 2004, as presented. Dr. Bryant seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Medical Education Workshop

Mr. Dasburg said that the Subcommittee on Medical Education held a lengthy workshop the previous afternoon. Members were further educated as to medical residency requirements and opportunities, import/export of doctors to Florida, demand for new doctors, and building new medical schools. He thanked Dr. Zachariah and Mr. Temple for chairing this Subcommittee. As a result of the discussions, it became clear that there were enough variables for a model to be developed. He moved, as follows: "That CEPRI be directed to define the parameters of a model to be used to quantify the adequacy of the State's physician workforce; project the extent to which a physician shortage exists and to develop cost/benefit estimates of various alternatives to produce the required number of additional physicians including but not limited to: expanding the capacity of existing medical schools, creating new medical schools, expanding or creating new residency programs and other incentive programs to attract physicians to Florida. CEPRI shall define the parameters of the model in collaboration with an advisory committee including representatives of the Council of Florida Medical School Deans, the Graduate Medical Education Committee, and representatives from other interested public universities. Upon completion of the definition of the model's parameters, the model shall be developed in collaboration with the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Florida, under contract with the Department of Education." Dr. Bryant seconded the motion.

Mr. Dasburg asked Dr. Zachariah and Mr. Temple to oversee the work on the model. He suggested that the Board should proceed quickly, as this model would be useful to the Legislature and to the universities, as well. There were no further comments, and members of the Committee concurred.

As to funding, Mr. Dasburg said he had asked the Chair, Chancellor Austin, Commissioner Horne, and staff to develop a quick estimate of the cost for the project, within the next two weeks. He said he hoped the Commissioner could fund this from the Department's budget. Failing that, perhaps they will need a non-recurring appropriation. He said he expected the project to be completed no later than this summer. Mr. Rummell said he did not understand the cost issue if the project were to be done internally. Mr. Dasburg said the UF Bureau of Economic and Business Research charged for its work.

3. Discussion, Amending the Board's Powers and Duties Statement

Dr. Rock offered a motion to amend the Board's Powers and Duties with a statement of the Board's support for academic freedom at the universities. He explained the provisions of the 1949 Statement on Academic Freedom from the American Association of University Professors. He said the importance of protecting academic freedom had been discussed during the campaign for the Constitutional Amendment establishing this Board. Without academic freedom, there is no university. He explained that academic freedom did not mean propagandizing in the classroom, but it did mean the right to teach freely the results of one's research, and to speak and write freely as citizens. He noted that this had been a problem during times of great controversy. He said he wanted to assure that this Board was clear in its support of this ideal. Ms. Bilbrey seconded the motion for purposes of discussion.

Ms. Pappas inquired where this statement was to be added. Mr. Dasburg said the Board had adopted its Statement of Powers and Duties in October 2003. Dr. Rock proposed to add this statement on academic freedom. Mrs. Roberts said that all the Board members certainly supported academic freedom, but with devolution, this was more appropriately a matter for the local University Boards of Trustees.

Dr. Bryant said the Statement of Powers and Duties was a statement of the issues for which this Board is responsible, not a statement of issues it supports. She said her concern in adding this statement was how this Board would support academic freedom. This Board has no direct responsibility for academic freedom. She read the text of the Amendment, which described that this Board was "...responsible for the management of..." Dr. Rock said this Board had put on its agenda for consideration serious university audits. He said he was concerned about the cases that went beyond any one institution. Mr. Uhlfelder noted that there were many other issues that could similarly be added, such as seeking to ensure that students demonstrate competent knowledge and ensuring post-tenure review of faculty members.

Commissioner Horne said he was not clear what problem this would solve. He said the ultimate consequences for ensuring academic freedom were at the universities, not with the Board of Governors. He said this was a step in the wrong direction.

The motion failed.

4. Discussion of Issues Raised During Prior Meeting

Dr. Johnson said three main questions had been raised during the previous meeting: why don't high school graduates continue their education?; what can be done about the "seam" between high school and universities?; and, do universities have the capacity to accommodate students in the pipeline? He said that in looking at the "persistence" rate, there were the students who wanted to continue in higher education and are able; are the institutions available to accommodate these students. Efforts were underway in the State to be sure students were successful in continuing their education; now capacity in the universities was the key issue. He described the growth in the number of high school graduates. The aim of the Strategic Plan was not earth-shattering, to award Bachelors degrees to one-third of the generation in the K-12 pipeline, i.e, that 34% of 21 year olds have obtained a Bachelors degree. He explained that college persistence rates had increased dramatically over the past ten years, and that the college-bound population is growing faster than its age group. More graduates are taking the SAT; institutions are becoming more selective. The issue was not merely if there were space, but if there were space where the student was applying for admission. Further, the number of applications from community college transfer students was also increasing. While the universities did have to admit students with the A.A. degree, there might not be the space available at the sought-after university in the sought-after program. He said the problem would only continue, as the performance of the State's fourth graders continued to improve.

Mr. Dasburg said the target of the Strategic Plan was that Florida achieve the national average in the number of Bachelors, Masters, and doctoral degrees for its population. There were no further questions.

5. Update on Strategic Planning Process

Mr. Dasburg said that now that this Committee had developed the systemwide goals on the Y-axis, it was now time to begin working with the University Boards of Trustees, the Presidents and the University Provosts, to add the data on how the universities would contribute to achieve these strategic goals. He said this project had been developed "top down." Now that this Board has determined its goals, they need to be tested at the university level. He said that he had discussed these goals with several of the Presidents, and Provosts, as well as with members of the University Boards who were chairing the Universities' strategic planning committees. He would share their comments with the Committee in April. The universities would bring to the Committee their unique missions, as well as the ways they planned to address community service goals. He said he had also met with President Hitt, in his role as Chair of the State University Presidents Association, and Dr. Hitt had indicated that he was comfortable with the proposed structure and with the direction of the goals. He said Dr. Hitt would invite him to a future SUPA meeting for further discussions and to get a general sense from them that these are goals and a structure with which the universities can work. The Plan would be sent to all the Presidents, Provosts, Trustee Strategic Planning Chairs, the State Board of Education and the Governor's Office.

Ms. Pappas inquired whether the universities were serving large numbers of out-of-state students. Dr. Johnson responded that they were not.

Dr. Bryant said the Board needed to be cognizant of the statewide needs to be sure the number of doctoral degrees produced meets the need. She said it made no sense to create three or four programs if there were a need for only five or six graduates. Dr. Rock added, however, that the Board should be attentive to the quality of the institutions, as provided by doctoral programs. Mr. Uhlfelder said he was concerned about the effective utilization of resources. He said in the next decades, the technology used in teaching will change. He said he was also concerned about proposed legislation to convert the community colleges into four-year colleges. Mr. Dasburg noted that these were all valid points, although he said he was not sure how to deal with them. He observed that discussions of the Strategic Plan just raised more questions. He said the enrollment pressures on the universities were immense and would force the universities into new ways of thinking. Mrs. Roberts said the Board would also need to discuss growth since the universities were already very large, and some consideration of new branch campuses might be needed.

Ms. Pappas remarked that the Board would also need some cost-benefit analysis of the additional facilities needed to accommodate all these new students. She said this also raised questions about what should be built that would be the most sensible in leveraging resources.

Mr. Dasburg said that if we assume the goals are correct, then the question is how to accomplish implementation, and what implementation means in terms of class seats, dormitories, and the like. He said the Board had discussed a modeling approach to evaluate the need for new medical schools. A similar approach was needed here. Dr. Bryant said they should identify the relevant factors; the discussion was now too broad.

Mr. Dasburg asked the Chancellor to identify what was needed to draw up a model of what the Strategic Plan means for the State University System, and its needs for classrooms, dormitories, etc. He said what he envisioned was defining the 25 top issues. He suggested that the Chancellor might want to explore assistance external to the Department of Education. Commissioner Horne suggested that this might entail a credibility issue; an outside firm or The Council of 100 might provide that credibility. He said they were really discussing more than just historical trends for the universities, but were rather discussing a transformation, now that so many more students were prepared at the K-12 level.

Mr. Rummell said we had spoken at length about demand; the other side is supply. We were now trying to understand the mismatch between supply and demand. He suggested that we start at the university level and discuss the universities' supply capabilities. Mr. Dasburg said he would challenge that approach for the practical reason that if the Board asked the universities about their capabilities, they would hear back about 11 medical schools. He said this process required a great deal of top-down leadership. Commissioner Horne added that in education, supply is determined by government appropriations. Universities are 75 percent subsidized by the State.

Mr. Dasburg asked Commissioner Horne to explore funding for continuing the SUS strategy work through a combination of the Division of Colleges and Universities on the one hand, and a consultant on the other. Commissioner Horne indicated he would get with the Chancellor on this matter.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m., March 18, 2004.

John Dasburg,
Chairman

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary

