## NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE FULL COUNCIL AT ITS NEXT MEETING. SHOULD REVISIONS BE MADE, THEY WILL BE INCLUDED AS AN ITEM IN THE MINUTES OF THAT MEETING.

# Minutes of the Meeting of the COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION POLICY, RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

Wednesday, January 8, 2003 Florida State University College of Medicine Tallahassee, Florida

Members Present:	Akshay Desai	Philip Morgaman
	Diane Leone	Bob Taylor
	Bob McIntyre	Pat Telson

Chairman Philip Morgaman opened the meeting and welcomed the Council members.

#### <u>Welcome</u>

Dr. Fred Leysieffer, Associate Provost, Florida State University, welcomed everyone to Florida State University. Dr. Leysieffer commended the Council on their willingness to review difficult issues in education.

## **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the December 11, 2002, meeting were approved as circulated.

## Chairman's Report

Chairman Morgaman said that the Council has the responsibility today of reviewing the Committee reports. Chairman Morgaman deferred to the Executive Director's report.

## **Executive Director's Report**

Dr. William Proctor introduced Mr. Jay Pfeiffer, from the Florida Board of Education, who went over the recommendations of the Florida Board's higher education Funding Advisory Council. Mr. Pfeiffer said that as the Board of Education considered its role last year, it formed a variety of councils and advisory processes. The councils were comprised of people across all units in the Board of Education. They broadly represented education sectors around the State, both public and private, K-12, community colleges workforce, and universities. He said the councils dealt with a number of issues. Among them were strategic imperatives, accountability, and higher education funding. The higher education funding group included about 20 people from around the State. Basically, the council looked broadly at the status of higher education in Florida. He said as the council worked through the review, they came up with a representation of the whole process that has come to be identified as the "Pipeline Presentation." Which tracks the movement of students through K-12, from high school into postsecondary education and beyond. He noted that of 100,000 high school graduates in Florida each year, about 60% of those students with a standard diploma immediately move into postsecondary education.

The council found that Florida ranks very high among the States in terms of providing access to the first year of postsecondary education. When the council looked at the attainment of those students after the first year, the picture changed a little. While community colleges do produce a large number of associate degrees relative to other states, Florida ranks very low nationally in terms of the overall output of baccalaureate degrees. Mr. Pfeiffer presented the recommendations proposed by the advisory council accepted by the Florida Board of Education. Mr. Pfeiffer said that the goal of the State Board of Education, in the next ten years, is to move up to the national average with respect to baccalaureate production.

Mr. Pfeiffer said the council also looked at research and development and supports areas where the State can appropriate modest amounts of money that can be matched by other efforts in the private and public sector. He said that a substantial amount of council time was spent in reviewing revenue estimates and discussing ways to increase revenues available to the higher education system. The basic recommendation is to provide fee and tuition flexibility to the local Boards of Trustees and their presidents. This could move tuition and fees up to the national average for public institutions. He also said that each Board of Trustees would have to provide a tuition plan to the Florida Board of Education for its approval.

Mr. Pfeiffer said that among the states, Florida has the most successful Pre-Paid Tuition Plan. This plan has worked in Florida because it has been based on a predictable level of fee increases and a common fee structure throughout the postsecondary system in Florida. He said we should recognize that we have an obligation to all existing contracts and look at what other states are doing who have the kind of tuition flexibility that we are proposing. They also want to increase need-based financial aid that the State supports. Mr. Pfeiffer said they want to look at the Bright Futures Program with respect to what the impact of increased tuition and fees would be on this financial aid program.

Mr. Pfeiffer said that there was also a council that dealt with K-20 Accountability. He said they identified ways to measure 9 performance themes that are common across all K-20 sectors, which will also serve as a basis for performance funding. He said they are proposing, based on their experience with workforce funding, to build a 10% portion of each budget around a performance improvement process.

Chairman Morgaman asked, as we look forward into the future how education in Florida is funded, if it makes sense to do a broader devolution of power than the State Board is now anticipating. He noted that perhaps the Boards of Trustees should have much broader authority over setting tuitions, fees, and financial aid policies. Chairman Morgaman asked if this subject matter has come up. Mr. Pfeiffer said that the subject has come up in the discussions on accountability. Mr. Pfeiffer said that one of the conversations he participated in was to look at a process that would more or less be contractual. Chairman Morgaman said that, as part of the Council for Education Policy, Research and Improvement's master planning responsibility, the Council will step back and take a longer term view of where should the system flow.

Mr. Bob Taylor commended Mr. Pfeiffer on the format of his presentation. He also noted that he was glad to see that the advisory council dealt with issues on the Pre-Paid Program and Bright Futures. Mr. Taylor asked if the advisory council was going to take all the recommendations to the Legislature at one time. Mr. Pfeiffer responded affirmatively.

## <u>Master Plan</u>

**Teaching Profession Recommendations** - Chairman Morgaman directed Dr. Jon Rogers to guide the Council in a review of the recommendations in the draft report: *Florida Teachers and the Teaching Profession*, which represents the work of the Committee on the Status of the Teaching Profession. The Council discussed the format of the report and Mr. Bob Taylor stressed that the "mission critical" policy recommendations must be identified for the report to be meaningful and have value to policymakers.

In each of the primary sections of the report, teacher recruitment, teacher retention and teacher preparation, key policy recommendations were identified by the Council and companion recommendations in the report were designated as "implementation strategies." The Council agreed that teacher compensation is a primary focus of this report and spent considerable time in a review of issues of teacher compensation. Chairman Morgaman said that a comprehensive redesign of the system of teacher compensation is needed in order to reward teachers for performance and student achievement. The Council supports the establishment of a minimum teacher salary in the state.

In a discussion of teacher preparation issues, Mr. Taylor discussed the critical need for postsecondary programs to be strong and productive in order to meet the state need for high quality teachers. He said that, in order for this to occur, the production of teachers should become a top priority of the institutions, governing boards and Legislature. The Council directed staff to include this recommendation in the report and identified critical issues relating to the elimination of barriers to teacher preparation and certification and the need for preparatory programs to include the demonstration of effective teaching of current subject matter standards and state initiatives.

The Council deferred final action on the report until its February meeting in Ft. Myers.

**Career Education and Development** – Ms. Tara Goodman briefed the Council members on the recent activities of the Master Plan Committee on Career Education and Development. Chairman Morgaman requested a full report on the committee draft at the next Council meeting, with plans for final action in March.

Dr. Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), thanked the Council for the invitation to speak at the Council meeting. He said that when you raise standards in high schools you must also begin to improve middle grade schools. There are about 115 middle grade schools that SREB is working with in the region.

Dr. Bottoms said that in this country our students do pretty well through grade 4. He said that math is a stumbling block. He said that 50% of students coming out of grade 8 are below state standards in mathematics. He said that 85% of the jobs are going to require some education beyond high school by 2020. Less than 40% of the teachers believe their mission is to get students ready to do challenging high school studies. Dr. Bottoms said that there is an issue of what does one need to know and be able to do, to be ready for algebra. He said that there is not a lot of communication between high school and middle grades. He said that they have surveyed about 15,000 eighth grade students and more than 80% say they plan on going on to public study after high school. When you look at the experiences they are having in grade 8, less than 40% are having intensive literacy experiences, meaning that the students read 8-10

books that year. He said that less than 25% are having the same experiences in mathematics. Dr. Bottoms said that the European countries teach algebra and geometry to their vocational youth in grades 7, 8, and 9. He said that the U.S. is still debating in some states whether to require geometry for high school graduation. Florida is one of those states. Dr. Bottoms said that we should look at transition programs between middle grades and high schools. He said that we cannot wait until the students get to community colleges to do developmental work.

Dr. Bottoms said that most of the teachers in this country, in the middle grades, have an elementary certification, which means they have one math course in college. He said across the country, about 61% of the teachers in middle grades (6, 7, and 8) do not have at least a minor in the subject matter they are teaching. This is very different from what the rest of the world does.

Dr. Bottoms said that SREB followed up on 8,000 high school graduates in 2000 across the country, who were vocational completers. He said fifteen months after high school, 75% of those students were enrolled in postsecondary study. He said that most of our accountability formulas do not place enough emphasis on retaining students. He said that there are twelve states that now give end of program exams to measure what students are learning through their current technical studies.

Dr. Bottoms concluded by saying that community colleges placement tests should be given to high school youths by the middle of their junior year to permit enrollment in remedial courses prior to graduation.

**Structure Committee Report** – Mr. Taylor updated the Council on the Committee report. Mr. Taylor said that existing structures are being put together in a new overall structure. However, it's not unusual to think that they may not fit. Mr. Taylor said that the Council's role and responsibility is to think about what has to be done to make this system work. How do we achieve the advantages that are embedded in the concept? He said we need to focus broadly and creatively on the right issues and do it without regard to whether it is an existing structure, somebody else's recommendation, or that it may irritate somebody, or without regard to any political sensitivity. Mr. Taylor also said that the Council should dig deep and not stop at a superficial level. We need to find creative solutions and communicate effectively to the various constituencies that we serve.

Mr. Taylor said that he wants the Council to review the six specifics in the Committee report. He hopes the Council would come to a decision about the specifics. He said the Council should review each one, and in subsequent meetings spend time on each topic and produce a document that could be used by the policy makers of the State. Mr. Taylor said the Council should be bold and creative in trying to solve the issues in favor of the students. Mr. Taylor said that this is an attempt to bring all these issues together on one piece of paper that provides a context and talks about opportunities for improvement and governance. The Council discussed the Committee report. Chairman Morgaman suggested the Committee prepare draft recommendations and make this an agenda item for the next meeting.

# Centers and Institutes

Dr. Glenda Rabby provided a brief overview of the final version of the Public Postsecondary Centers and Institutes Study and highlighted the report's key qualitative and quantitative findings. She noted that the executive summary and appendices were the only new additions to the study. Mr. Bob McIntyre asked if any of the recommendations had changed since the December 2002, meeting and Dr. Rabby said that they had not. Mr. Taylor suggested that Dr. Rabby move some of the key findings from the last page of the executive summary to the first part of that document to highlight the positive findings of the study. Mr. Taylor said he felt that the economic value of the centers and institutes were among the most important findings of the study. Dr. Rabby said she would incorporate Mr. Taylor's suggestions into the final report. The council unanimously approved the study.

# Equity of University Funding

Dr. Nancy McKee and Mr. Bob Cox presented changes that had been made to the draft Equity of University Funding report since the Council's December meeting: the report had been divided into Part I (Recommendations for Immediate Consideration) and Part II (Recommendations for Further Study); the definition of Equity had been modified to allow each university to accomplish its defined mission *within the K-20 system*; the two issues Florida International University (FIU) had raised in December had been reviewed (supplanting of General Revenue with out-of-state student fees and the inequity of university funding compared to the Florida Resident Access Grant); peer comparisons had been fine-tuned; and the impact of differential tuition had been reviewed.

The Council adopted the report, subject to editorial review by the members. Dr. McKee and Mr. Cox were directed to make the following changes to the report: (1) After Table 20, which deals with the funding of enrollment growth, eliminate the language that draws a conclusion regarding out-of-state student fees and, instead, indicate that the question, "Is the formula inequitable because of these issues?" is a policy question and the answer depends on the perspective. Both sides of the perspective should be argued; (2) Create a Part II-A and a Part II-B, with an introductory statement that should reflect that the discussion of the issues for further study are broken into two parts. Part II-A reflects the route the Council believes is the appropriate policy step for the state of Florida, and Part II-B reflects a list of suggestions that will improve the status quo, if the status quo is maintained. Part II-A should indicate that an intensive study needs to be done of the method of funding of higher education, re-examining the concepts underlying it, including the potential abrogation of continuation funding and FTEbased funding and the ramifications of the replacement of those items with a more contractually based system in which universities are provided funding based on state policy objectives, and authority is devolved to the local boards of trustees over budget, tuition, financial aid, and other policies.

# **Constitutional Amendments**

Dr. Proctor said that it appears that, at this time, the Board of Governors has decided not to have a staff, but will use the State Board of Education staff. Dr. Proctor said he did not think anything would happen with the amendments until the Legislative Session.

Dr. Proctor said that Ms. Pat Telson attended a meeting on Constitutional Amendments and Implementation. Dr. Proctor noted that there is no definition of extra-curricular classes in the Class Size Amendment. He said the Council may want to suggest to the Legislature that they define what an extra-curricular class is.

Regarding Class Size implementation, Dr. Proctor said that he was not sure if there was a specific implementation schedule or guidelines on the expected rate of improvement per year.

He asked the Council if they would want to suggest that the initial focus be K-3. Dr. Proctor asked if you have students enrolled in dual enrollment courses that are not on campus, should they count in or out as class size and should we encourage dual enrollment courses? Dr. Proctor asked if the Council wants to suggest a proposal of modification to the Class Size Amendment proposing an alternative, which would focus on specific grades and courses where it would have the most impact.

## **Other Items of Interest**

Upcoming meetings are as follows:

February 12, 2003	Ft. Myers
March 12, 2003	Tampa
April 9, 2003	St. Augustine
May 14, 2003	Orlando
June 11, 2003	Ft. Lauderdale

## Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 12, 2003, at Florida Gulf Coast University in Ft. Myers.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m. on Wednesday, January 8, 2003.

William B. Proctor Executive Director