

MINUTES
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
STRATEGIC PLANNING & ACADEMIC & SYSTEM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TALLAHASSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
MARCH 25, 2009

Mr. Frank Martin convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Academic and System Oversight Committee of the Board of Governors at 4:20 p.m. on March 25, 2009, in the Banquet Hall, Economic & Workforce Development Building, Tallahassee Community College, Tallahassee, Florida, with the following members present: Ann Duncan; Charlie Edwards; Dr. Stanley Marshall; Sheila McDevitt; Arthur "AJ" Meyer; Ava Parker; Tico Perez; Carolyn K. Roberts; Dr. Judith Solano; Gus Stavros; and Norman Tripp.

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held January 29, 2009

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Committee approve the Minutes of the Meeting held January 29, 2009, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

2. Medical Education Subcommittee

Mrs. Roberts said the Board had approved two new medical schools with the understanding that these approvals would be considered in the context of a multifaceted plan for medical education in Florida, a plan that would consider residencies and a resource base for the existing medical schools. She noted that the economies of the nation and the state were quite different from what they had been when the Board approved the Medical Education Resolution. She said, for that reason, it was more important than ever to monitor the health of the new and existing medical programs, that the Board understand their funding, and that, if appropriate, the Board consider changes which would improve their chances for optimal funding. She commented that three separate initiatives brought medical education funding to the fore, i.e., potential legislation, an OPPAGA report, and an SUS Presidents Task Force report.

President Machen said he had been asked by Chancellor Rosenberg to chair a workgroup consisting of SUS presidents with medical education programs. He said the group had been charged to explore options for a staff position in the Board office associated with medical education and whether it was possible to establish a more transparent, systemic, and rational approach to medical education funding than the one currently employed. He thanked Mr. Russ Armistead, Associate Vice President, Finance and Planning, UF Health Science Center, and Dr. LeMon for their assistance.

He said the group thought that a staff position dealing with medical education was a good idea, but not now given the current budget situation. He said that long-term, with five medical schools in the state, it made sense to have one person regularly dealing with this issue.

Dr. Machen said this Board had voted to approve two new medical schools, but had also voted in favor of equitable funding for all medical schools in Florida. He said there were a number of issues in sorting out the funding of medical education. He said this did not include the start-up costs. He commented that it was in the state's best interest to have a standard of state support for medical students throughout the SUS, a standard approach to funding the basic costs of these students. He said the work group had made seven recommendations on funding medical education, found in the report, in the Committee Agenda, pages 19 - 28.

Dr. LeMon said the issues could be summarized in the following manner: 1) Do we have a system of medical education funding that is equitable across all SUS schools of medicine; 2) do we have a system of funding that is transparent; and 3) in the long term, is the funding sustainable for the new and existing schools? He reported that a study done by the American Association of Medical Colleges in 1995 had prorated an average rate for medical instruction. The study estimated that the national average cost to educate one medical student was \$62,724. Should Florida use the national average or some percentage of that average, e.g., 80 percent? Dr. LeMon said the Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability (OPPAGA) had also done a study of medical education program funding models, released a few weeks earlier. OPPAGA had also had a difficult time understanding the funding, but had observed that dollars from the Faculty Practice Plans were replacing state funding. He said the medical schools needed more sustainable and rational funding.

President Hitt agreed that there should be a standard funding methodology, but that he did not know the "right number." He said a figure related to the national average sounded about right. Dr. Machen said that, however the number was determined, it should give each school a base level of funding. President Hitt noted that each medical school had a different mission and a different mix of programs. Mrs. Roberts said the issue was to agree on a specific number.

Dr. Pat Haynie, USF, said she had worked with Mr. Armistead and Dr. LeMon and that she concurred with the proposal. She clarified that the presumption for a base standard was for an established college of medicine. She said there were clearly additional expenses in starting a new school. Dr. Machen added that a medical school was not fully accredited until the first class graduated. Dean German, UCF, said UCF's medical school would be at full enrollment and the first class of 120 students would graduate in 2017.

Dr. Solano said she could understand the additional funding needed to ramp up new programs. She commented that established programs might also need additional funds for equipment or to replace faculty members.

Dr. Machen said funding for the UF medical school had slipped so low that the University had been called to task by the accreditors. He said it was important that all agree on the standard. Dr. Friedland, FAU, said that all were in agreement as to the concept. He noted that the accrediting agencies had voiced this funding concern throughout the nation, not just in Florida. Mr. Tripp inquired how finding agreement on a funding formula for medical education would affect funding for other programs in the SUS, such as biotechnology programs. Dr. Machen said that was a good idea. The universities might be able to make the case that other programs should have a standard state-based funding. Ms. McDevitt inquired whether there were standards for medical education funding in place elsewhere. Dr. Machen said not many states had five distinct medical schools. Dr. LeMon added that OPPAGA could not identify any state with a handle on state funding and accountability for medical education. President Delaney said it was not only difficult to compare medical programs, but to compare any degrees. He said he was quite certain that the English degree at UNF was not the same as the English degree at UF.

Mrs. Roberts said the Board should decide on a time certain by which to come up with the number, or a funding formula. Dr. Machen said that the Board needed to indicate that it would concur with a proposed funding formula.

Mr. Tripp said it was a mistake not to fund a staff position focused on medical education. He suggested that the medical schools should commit the funds to support this position. Mr. Edwards said he had talked about the need for such a position on several occasions, although he did not know the cost to fund the position. He said he recognized that this was a difficult time to seek additional funding, but that it was valid if this Board and the universities were going to be leaders in medical education. He suggested that the Board continue to pursue the funding of this position.

Dr. Solano inquired about the House bill dealing with medical school funding. Mr. Delaney said it had passed out of committee in the House.

Mrs. Roberts said she would ask Mr. Delaney to develop a timeline for addressing the recommendations raised by the workgroup and report back on that timeline.

Dr. Machen inquired whether the Committee would consider accepting the seven recommendations in the report. Mr. Edwards moved that the Committee accept the report of the workgroup and the seven recommendations, as presented. Mr. Perez seconded the motion. He suggested, however, that the recommendation as to the new staff position, "should be delayed until the economy improves," be amended to state that the position should be filled whether or not the economy improves and

implemented as soon as possible. Mr. Edwards agreed with the suggested amendment, and members of the Committee concurred.

Mrs. Roberts said there should be a specific timeline in place for discussion of a new funding formula. Dr. Solano expressed concern about a legislative timeline. President Delaney suggested that the staff could work it out. Dr. Abele said he looked forward to working with staff on this funding formula.

3. Baccalaureate Degrees/System Structure Project Team

Ms. Parker said that one of the Forward by Design projects the Board had adopted was to increase the number of distance education degrees, with a special emphasis on high state needs and in cooperation with community colleges and not-for-profit independent colleges and universities. She noted that the Legislature last year had also focused on distance learning and had created the Distance Learning Task Force to review and make recommendations on several issues. She said the Task Force had submitted its report to the Legislature, to this Board, and to other interested parties. She said the Executive Summary was included in the agenda materials. She recognized President Hitt, who co-chaired the Task Force.

President Hitt said the Task Force had recommended continuing and enhancing distance learning. He commented that the number of students enrolled in distance learning courses in Florida was ahead of the rest of the country. He said Florida had a cooperative approach to developing distance learning among its institutions of higher education. He explained that the Task Force had divided its work among six workgroups. He said the Task Force had used some basic principles in its work: increasing access; achieving cost efficiencies; review existing strengths; keeping a coordinated system; and maintaining local institutional control of distance learning.

President Hitt said the enrollment data showed that distance learning was no longer an ancillary activity. He commented that a large number of courses had some distance learning component. Students are enrolling in combinations of on-campus classes and distance learning classes, and the numbers of students taking distance learning classes was increasing. In addition, the inventory of programs offered through distance learning was increasing with growth particularly at the undergraduate level. Dr. Hitt said there were now 60 undergraduate degrees that could be completed using only distance learning; three years ago, there were only 22 such programs. He said the Task Force had made 26 recommendations, which were included in the agenda materials.

Mr. John Opper, Executive Director, Florida Distance Learning Consortium, and a member of the Task Force, said the Task Force had addressed about 12 major topics. He said the Task Force had made a recommendation on the definition of distance learning, noting that there were a number of different definitions around the country. He said the Task Force had recommended the adoption of a definition of distance

learning where at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course was delivered utilizing some form of technology and where the student and instructor were separated by time, space, or both. He said the Legislature had established a fee for “distance learning” last year; the Task Force clarified that the fee would apply to courses meeting that 80 percent threshold. He said the Task Force had also recommended the adoption of a definition of hybrid/blended courses where at least 50 percent and not more than 79 percent of the direct instruction of a course was delivered utilizing some form of technology when the student and faculty member were separated by time, space, or both.

Mr. Opper said the Distance Learning Consortium had been in place since 1996. The Consortium included the SUS, community colleges, and the ICUF institutions. He said that, the previous year, the on-line catalogue was established in statute to be maintained and operated by the Consortium. He said that, when students found a course, they could not simply click and register for the course; the Consortium had been asked to look into this issue. He explained that there were initiatives underway to allow for an on-line registration process.

Mr. Opper explained the Digital Content Repository, the Orange Grove, and its efforts to reduce duplication in its holdings. He noted that there were costs associated with adapting to on-line courses. He noted that researchers could search the resources in the Repository to build their on-line courses. He said that, with the high cost of textbooks, faculty could place open-access textbooks in the Repository. He said there were now 45 textbooks in the Orange Grove and there was no restriction on the use of materials in the Orange Grove. He said they were exploring working with the University Press of Florida in producing digital textbooks. He estimated this would save at least 40 percent of the cost of current textbooks.

Mr. Stevens noted that distance learning could help address the strategic goals of the state. He said this Board continued to be interested in certain accountability issues including time to degree and degree completion. He explained that three of the recommendations addressed the completion of associate and baccalaureate degrees. There were opportunities for collaborative programming and degree completion opportunities, accelerated and customized for adult learners. He commented that, if the Board sought to increase the production of baccalaureate degrees, this could be done in the workforce through adult learning campaigns.

Mr. Stevens said that, in 2007, they had looked at data about SUS non-completers in the marketplace. From a 1996 cohort, approximately 10,000 students dropped out without a degree. He estimated that there could be as many as 100,000 non-completers in the workforce within 30 to 60 credits of completing their degree.

Mr. Stevens noted that several of the recommendations from the Task Force had budget implications. He said the on-line catalogue would need funding, and that \$100,000 was in the budget request. He said the Orange Grove Digital Content

Repository was a model for the nation. There was a request for \$680,000 to buy the software they had been loaned. The budget also included incentive funding to pay for the time of faculty and staff for cooperative program development.

Ms. McDevitt inquired if these funding requests were included in the budget last year. Mr. Stevens said they had been in USF's base budget for a number of years. He noted that this Board had requested funding for the Orange Grove Repository for a number of years.

President Hitt said the Task Force had included both community college and SUS representatives. He thanked staff for their work.

Ms. McDevitt inquired if there was anything that would encourage those already in the workforce to complete their basic degree. President Hitt said that, with the data of employees just a few credits short of the baccalaureate degree, it was certainly worth exploring ways to help them finish. He said there were continuing education opportunities on the campuses. He said the campus community included "blended" students, students who were enrolled in both distance learning courses, and classes offered in the traditional way on campus. He said distance learning should be an integral part of all degrees, offering students convenience and flexibility. He commented that distance learning courses were not cheap when they were done properly.

Ms. McDevitt said that, as the universities were reducing course offerings, it might be cost-effective to have distance learning programs that could be used by all the universities. She noted that some of the universities had already been discussing the elimination of certain programs; these might be the ones where distance learning offerings could be used.

Ms. Parker inquired whether there was consensus on the definitions. Mr. Stevens said the group was mostly in agreement on the 80 percent figure, particularly from the user perspective. He said there had been discussion that the funding structure might need to be adjusted. Ms. Parker asked that staff monitor legislative action regarding these definitions and fee expectations and update the committee in June.

Ms. Parker inquired about the recommendation to review revisions to state-level data collection and reporting requirements for learning. Mr. Stevens said the SUS and the community colleges had included data elements for distance learning, but had adopted different definitions. He said they have since gone back to re-define the definitions, which will be adopted by the state colleges and the SUS. Ms. Parker asked that staff bring to the committee in June an analysis of the reporting scheme specified in Recommendation 13, with a determination of the feasibility and impact on the university system if changes were made to the data collection and reporting requirements as specified.

Ms. Parker noted that recommendations 7, 16, 17, and 18 dealt with collaborative contracts and shared services. She suggested that Ms. Duncan's Shared Services Team review these recommendations to determine action that might be needed by the System. Ms. Duncan said she would be happy to take that assignment.

Ms. Parker suggested that recommendations 25 and 26, dealing with incentive funding for collaborative and cooperative degree programs, should be considered by the Baccalaureate Degrees/System Structure Project Team. She said it might seem an odd time to think about incentive funding, but that these types of programs might increase degree productivity which might reduce costs over the long run. Ms. McDevitt commented that it might be done without incentive funding. President Hitt remarked that it was difficult to know how to sculpt cooperative agreements with the emergence of the new state college system.

Ms. Parker commented that the recommendation to place instructional resources and/or open textbooks created with state funds in a digital repository would likely save quite a lot of money. She wondered about the guidance for the staff in addressing these recommendations. President Hitt observed that there were no funds provided. President Delaney said that this would be good for students and was worth pursuing. Ms. Duncan concurred, and said it should reduce costs if done correctly.

Dr. Solano said she had participated in the work of the Task Force on behalf of the interests of the faculty. She said distance learning was embraced by the universities on different levels. She said she had no idea of the resources available in the Orange Grove Repository. She said she thought it was only K-12 materials. She said the faculty selected the textbooks and the other resources students needed for class. She said faculty needed to be comfortable in using the resources available from the Orange Grove, but that she thought faculty would embrace it. She added that faculty would need training to do distance learning courses correctly. She said it might be helpful to invite staff from the Orange Grove to the universities to demonstrate the resources. President Delaney said there was big potential with the general education courses, which might have more in common across the System.

Mr. Tripp said there was some opinion that the community colleges were cheaper. He said he did not think this was true, but that it might be cheaper with more collaboration. He suggested that the universities might consider exploiting the star power of some of their faculty for these distance learning courses.

President Delaney said he had come to appreciate distance learning courses. He noted that these courses were more than just videotapes and were actually more labor-intensive as there was a great deal of interactivity with students. President Hitt suggested a demonstration at a future Board meeting. He added that the benefit in these courses was the flexibility for the learner. He said anybody getting into this course development needed to invest in technology specialists; it was very expensive.

President Bense said UWF was working with the military in distance learning. With many technical advances, there were huge advantages for course completion by servicemen and women. She said the universities were charging in-state fees and out-of-state fees for students in these courses. She said that some states were charging an e-rate, which was somewhere between in-state and out-of-state fees. She said the fees charged needed to cover the costs.

Mr. Martin thanked Ms. Parker.

4. Academic Programs Project Team: Termination, Ph.D., Engineering Mechanics, UF

Dr. Marshall said the University of Florida had requested termination of the Ph.D., Engineering Mechanics, to eliminate duplication between it and the Ph.D., Mechanical Engineering, which had identical coursework and examination policies. He noted that, when the decision was made to eliminate the program, students were shifted into the Mechanical Engineering and Aerospace Engineering graduate programs with no loss of credit towards their degrees.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Committee approve UF's request to terminate the Ph.D., Engineering Mechanics, CIP Code 14.1101, as presented. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

Dr. Marshall also moved that the Committee waive the policy of waiting until the next scheduled Board meeting for final approval of this item and hear it at the regular Board meeting the next day. He said this would close the issue for the university administration. Mr. Edwards seconded the motion, and members of the Committee concurred.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m., March 25, 2009.

Frank T. Martin, Chair

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje,
Corporate Secretary