

MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
STRATEGIC PLANNING/EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA  
JANUARY 22, 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 Ballroom, Reitz Union, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, January 22, 2004, with the following members present: Pam Bilbrey, Dr. Castell Bryant, Miguel DeGrandy, Commissioner Jim Horne, Lynn Pappas, Ava Parker, Carolyn K. Roberts, Dr. Howard Rock, Peter Rummell, Clayton Solomon, John W. Temple, Steve Uhfelder, and Dr. Zachariah P. Zachariah.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held December 3, 2003

Dr. Bryant moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the meeting held December 3, 2003, as presented. Mr. Temple seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Discussion: Strategic Planning for the State University System

Mr. Dasburg said that at its meeting in December, the Committee had discussed the development of the Y-axis Goals and Objectives, defining State University System goals and Constituent University goals. The universities would mirror the System requirements as described by the Y-axis. The Committee had engaged in a robust debate and the document included in the agenda had been modified to reflect those discussions. He had met with President Hitt as the President of the State University Presidents Association to review this approach to strategic planning. The document would be shared broadly for review and discussion with the Governor, Commissioner Horne, members of the State Board of Education, University Boards of Trustees and University Presidents, as this Board set the strategic direction for the whole University System.

Dr. Nate Johnson provided information in response to questions from the Committee about retention and graduation rates for students in the University System, the effect of high school graduation rates on baccalaureate degree production, and data on state critical needs and targeted degree areas. He presented comparative data on "same institution" graduation rates for public colleges in the 12 largest states, noting the 57% six-year graduation rate in Florida. He said a seven percent increase in that figure would put Florida equal to the best state, Virginia, and would result in 8500 additional FTE. He commented that the data showed an "eventual" graduation rate for all freshmen in Florida of 70%. He also described the effects of improving high school graduation rates and the additional baccalaureate degrees this would produce.

Mr. Dasburg said this was important information and should be shared with the Department of Education, as the universities needed improvements in the pipeline to produce more baccalaureates. Commissioner Horne said there were also issues of enrollment and funding for the universities and questions about those students who

want to come to a university, but do not attend. Mr. Dasburg suggested that at the next meeting, the Committee discuss actions the Board of Governors should take with regards to the seam between high school graduation and postsecondary enrollment. Mrs. Roberts noted that the universities are already involved in numerous outreach activities with the school districts. Dr. Bryant suggested that the Board needs the facts to understand the barriers and why students choose not to proceed with their education before making any recommendations. This Board needs to concentrate on degree-seeking students and their intent to graduate. She said the Board should concentrate on the barriers at the universities that discourage students from attendance.

The Commissioner said there were many opinions about student "persistence" rates. It was clear that more students needed to enter the universities and earn their degrees. Mr. Dasburg inquired what this Board should do about achieving more baccalaureates in Florida. Commissioner Horne said that much was already being done, but that this also involved funding and demand issues. Mr. Dasburg said he would welcome additional information from the Commissioner about pipeline issues and how this Board should address them. Chancellor Austin noted that the universities were already engaged in many outreach opportunities. Mr. Dasburg said it was more important that the universities produce additional baccalaureates, which can be achieved by increasing the number of high school graduates attending the SUS. The Board could make statements that this goal was admirable or it could work for additional funding for the universities and measure the additional baccalaureates produced by the increased funds allowing the universities to accommodate additional students. Dr. Bryant emphasized the importance of the college persistence rate.

Mr. DeGrandy said this issue encompassed two questions. One question: what can be done to increase the percentage of high school graduates who go on to college. Second question: do the universities have the capacity to accommodate these students. He said the Board needed a better sense of the issues underlying the raw numbers, e.g., did students leave for lack of tutoring; were there financial aid concerns. He asked that staff provide further information and detail on the additional baccalaureates that could be generated from increased high school-to-college continuation rates at the next meeting. Ms. Pappas inquired about the effectiveness of outreach programs and how much was spent on them. Mr. Dasburg said the Board needed to know what it could do about this "seam" and also needed further information about the "persistence" numbers.

Dr. McKee explained the textual revisions to the factors on the Y-axis made at the last meeting, in I.A, in I.A.5, and I.B. In addition, staff had provided detail for I.B.1-5, Critical Needs, Economic Development, and Educated citizenry/workforce. Staff had used data collected for a 2001 Workforce Estimating Conference report, updated and expanded to include graduate and professional programs which met critical statewide needs, were identified as important to continued high-tech industry development, or which had a record of placing graduates in high-wage jobs. An Advisory Group on Emerging Technologies, including both industry and university representatives, analyzed targeted industry sectors with areas of research important to economic development. These programs were listed in broad descriptive areas under I.B.3 on the Y-axis.

Mr. Dasburg noted that a key aspect of strategic planning was to address and to anticipate need. If there were a stated interest in having more engineers, then the Board's decisions on funding and tuition policies should be consistent with that strategy. Mr. Rummell inquired about looking at costs. Mr. Dasburg said if it were determined that the State needed more engineers, more teachers, and more nurses, then the Board needed to know the costs of producing them. He also noted that the Board might establish the goal to produce more engineers, but it could not micromanage the universities to achieve this end-result. This Board needed to identify the big strategic objectives for the State and then build the consensus to achieve them.

Mr. Dasburg said that Part II of the document captured the goals and objectives for the constituent universities, in which the universities address their part of the strategy and address community needs and institutional mission.

He said he had posed three questions for the Board as to its proper role. Clearly the Board had a role to play in the scenario where there is a forecasted need and a substantial demand. There is a less clear role for the Board where there is a forecasted need, but inadequate demand. There is no role for this Board, but rather for the University Boards, in the scenario where there is no forecasted need, but considerable student demand.

He said the next step was to distribute this document to the Trustees of the universities and to the University Presidents for their comments on the proposed factors on the Y-axis. Then, the document should be shared with many others, including the members of the State Board of Education, for their comments.

Ms. Pappas inquired about determinations as to the quality of the programs. Mr. Dasburg said there were many questions about appropriate measures. These were the subject of the discussions of the Accountability and Performance Committee.

Dr. Bryant noted another issue. While the State might need engineers at present, and the universities receive the additional funding to address the costs of producing these additional engineers, the following question was how to address the "redirection" of funds when engineers are no longer in such demand. The Board should engage in that discussion as well. Mr. Dasburg commented that the Board's Strategic Plan would not be shelved; it would be a living document, reviewed constantly as the Board looked at needs.

Ms. Bilbrey inquired about Centers of Excellence. She said a university might identify a future Center of Excellence in its Strategic Plan. Mr. Dasburg said this was a factor for university determination, but the Board of Governors would not be micro-managing the universities. Part II gave the universities the opportunity to express their mission.

Mr. Dasburg said the Board's goals were articulated in Part I; the universities are in Part II to articulate their role in achieving state goals. He asked members of the Committee to work with the universities in fleshing out Part II of the Goals and

Objectives document. He said he hoped to have the university section completed fairly quickly.

3. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 a.m., January 22, 2004.

---

John Dasburg,  
Chairman

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,  
Corporate Secretary