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

Wednesday, September 18, 2002 Seminole County School Board Office Sanford, Florida

Members Present:	Diane Leone	J
	Bob McIntyre	F
	Philip Morgaman	F

Jacob Stuart Robert Taylor Pat Telson

Members Absent: Akshay Desai Ed Moore

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

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

#### Chairman's Report

Chairman Philip Morgaman discussed the status of the proposed constitutional amendments related to education with particular attention to the class size amendment. He noted the recent Supreme Court decision not to include the cost impact of the proposed amendments on the ballot, and observed that the figures developed by the Estimating Conference and the Council would probably prove to be conservative. He estimated that the predicted annual cost of the class size amendment would probably approach \$3 billion rather than \$2.5 billion. He said that recent estimates found in some newspaper of \$8.5 billion, only reflect the first year cost and subsequent incremental increases, rather than the true overall cost. In addition, he said that this law estimate assumed all additional teachers hired would have bachelor's degrees and no experience; there would be no inflation, and no additional land or facilities costs beyond the first year. He requested that Council staff make available to the members a comparison of the various estimates including the assumptions and data on which they are based.

The Chairman reported that a coalition, *Foundation for Florida's Future*, had been established to oppose the amendment and discussed the various entities that have taken a position regarding the amendment. After discussion among the members, it was agreed that the Council would not take a formal position on any of the amendments, but would continue to serve as a source of objective information on the potential impacts. The Chairman asked staff to compile information on potential sources of revenue for the estimated costs of the various amendments and also to summarize current research on the expected benefits from the proposed changes. He invited the Council members to participate in public forums where the amendments are discussed.

#### Executive Director's Report

Dr. William Proctor referred members to the written report on recent staff activities provided with the agenda, and discussed future Council meeting dates. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held at the Academic Village in Pembroke Pines on October 9, 2002, with time for committee work after the full Council adjourns. Subsequent meetings and proposed locations are:

November 6, 2002	Sarasota	
December 11, 2002	Jacksonville	
January 8, 2003	Tallahassee	

## FIRN Analysis

Dr. Proctor noted that staff member, Mr. Glenn Mayne, was asked by the Florida Board to assist them in reviewing the FIRN network and making recommendations relative to funding; what would need to be funded; and what are the capabilities of FIRN. Dr. Proctor noted that Mr. Mayne prepared a report for Council members to review and asked them to approve this item. A motion was made and seconded by the Council to approve the report.

#### Centers and Institutes

Dr. Glenda Rabby provided an overview of the results of the Centers and Institutes (C&I) survey conducted as part of the Council's study on public postsecondary centers and institutes. She noted that the survey was sent to all 512 C&Is and that 53% of C&Is responded. The results were based on the number/percentage of responders. Dr. Rabby reported that 44% of the personnel associated with C&Is were faculty positions. A substantial number (911) were tenure earning or teaching faculty. Slightly more than one-half of the C&Is reported affiliation with a specific primary discipline, underscoring the multidisciplinary approach that many C&Is use to conduct activities, particularly applied research projects. While C&Is are primarily referred to as research units, the survey revealed that across all types of C&Is approximately 50 % of C&I activities were devoted to research, 30% to teaching/training and 20 percent to public service and other professional services. Staff affiliated with C&Is taught over 3,000 courses in 2000-01. Further data indicate a substantial productive effort in terms of C&I staff including publications, conferences, presentations, patents and other notable accomplishments. A relatively large number of students both graduate and undergraduate were involved in professional C&I activities. Dr. Rabby noted that the survey revealed what staff has noted in site visits to universities across the state: C&Is are addressing many of Florida's most fundamental and high priority issues and problems through activities supported in large measure by external funding sources.

Dr. Ian Phillips, Associate Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Programs at the University of Florida (UF), provided the Council with an overview of the importance and advantages of C&I activities at the university. Dr. Phillips noted that C&Is serve as a bridge between intellectual interests on campus and interested groups worldwide. Dr. Phillips noted that of UF's 172 C&Is, the largest number (106) are type 3 centers that receive no direct state appropriation but receive and expend millions of dollars in external grants. Dr. Phillips informed Council members that the University of Florida has recently adopted new procedures and policies for evaluating and sun-setting C&Is. Each C&I that report to the provost will complete an annual program review. The majority of C&Is will submit an annual center report to the VP for Research and to a Center Review Committee. Each center will receive one of three grades: Achieving Mission

and Goals; Needs Improvement/ on Probation; or, Sunset. Criteria for the three levels have been established. Dr. Phillips provided staff with the materials and forms related to center review at UF. Dr. Rabby noted that several state universities have begun to adopt internal review procedures for evaluating the effectiveness and quality of C&I activities. At the October Council meeting, Dr. Rabby will provide the members with the statewide C&I economic/ return on investment analysis. The final report is due in January 2003.

## University Funding Equity

Dr. Nancy McKee presented the study outline for the University Equity Funding Study. She reviewed both the proviso in the General Appropriations Act that directed CEPRI to conduct the study and the proviso that directed the State Board of Education to conduct a similar study. Dr. McKee gave an overview of the equity funding studies that have been conducted since 1984 and the different methodologies that have been used to calculate funding adjustments since then. She presented major policy questions that the study needs to answer and the methodology that will be used to conduct the study.

One of the major study activities will be to survey the university presidents to obtain their input regarding equity. Chairman Morgaman directed Dr. McKee to inform the Council very quickly of any lack of cooperation among the university presidents in this task. He stated that on an earlier issue the chairman of the Florida Board of Education had intruded upon CEPRI's statutory authority by sending a letter telling people they did not have to comply with CEPRI's request. Chairman Morgaman stated that they have had a discussion since then and he does not expect that to occur again. However, because of that occurrence, if Dr. McKee encounters any failure to cooperate on anyone's part that gets in the way of CEPRI fulfilling its legislative mandate, she should let Dr. Proctor know right away. Chairman Morgaman stated that the Council is not going down that road a second time.

## Character Education

Dr. John Wiegman introduced the guest speakers for Character Education and thanked them for attending the Council meeting.

Mr. Donald Griesheimer, Chief, Bureau of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment for the Florida Department of Education, noted that Florida statutes now require that character education be taught in grades K-12. The *Florida's Partnerships in Character Education (FPCE)* is a U.S. Department of Education grant awarded to the Florida Department of Education and to the University of Central Florida (UCF) to assist schools in meeting this unfunded mandate.

Dr. Jeffrey Cornett, Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Research, Technology and Leadership, College of Education, University of Central Florida, stated that the UCF Consortium coordinates the *Florida's Partnership's in Character Education* grant for Social Responsibility and Character in Education. The partnership includes four strands: character education, law related education, conflict resolution and service learning.

Dr. Mike Robinson, Professor, Department of Child, Family and Community Sciences, University of Central Florida, pointed out that the mission of the *Florida's Partnerships in Character Education* grant was to build state and local capacity to support character education instruction by serving as a statewide clearinghouse, and by creating a database to track project results.

Ms. Judy Wiant, Character Education Liaison for the Seminole County Public Schools (SCPS), noted that character education has been part of the district's strategic plan since 1992, and that the *Keys to Your Character* program was in all elementary, middle and high schools. For each of the last four years, the SCPS has assisted in hosting a statewide character education conference.

Dr. Robert Williams, Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning Principles, College of Education, University of Central Florida, emphasized the importance of community involvement in character education efforts, and highlighted Florida school survey data indicating a need for character education.

Dr. Cornett concluded the presentation by emphasizing not only was a commitment to character education evident in Florida, but also in the new *No Child Left Behind* federal legislation.

#### Lunch Program

Ms. Pat Telson introduced Ms. Gloria Staats, Principal of English Estates Elementary School and Ms. Marjorie Murray, Special Projects and Title I Coordinator for the district. Ms. Staats began with a video overview of her school. She noted that the school of over 700 has a diverse population; approximately 51% White, 25% Hispanic, and 19% Black, with 58% of the students from families below the poverty level. She said that when she arrived, the school had a *D* grade, which subsequently improved to *A*. She noted, however, that the higher grade was based in part effort and improvement and was not an absolute indicator of achievement. The challenges faced by the school include high turnover (last year 428 out of 739 entered or withdrew), language, lack of interaction with adults at home, and a high number of disciplinary referrals. She noted that when the statewide Pre-K reading readiness assessment was stopped, a disservice was done to the students. She said that failure and retention are not the answer.

Ms. Murray discussed the transfer of readiness programs to the agency for Workforce Innovation and Partnership for School Readiness, and said that the impact has mixed the delivery of services with the restrictions and paperwork associated with welfare reform. Dr. Proctor noted that Secretary Jim Horne is supporting the return of Pre-K programs to education. In response to a question by Mr. Taylor, both Ms. Staats and Ms. Murray said that it is difficult to track individual student progress because of high turnover and also because the standards and procedures change every year. Ms. Murray said that English Estates Elementary is a high poverty high performing school, and information on how other comparable schools are handling the challenge would be helpful. Dr. Proctor noted that the Annenberg Foundation is supporting a Florida database that will permit this analysis for individual schools. He said that a similar effort in Texas, *Just for the Kids*, uncovered some interesting findings. For example, low-income students at high performing schools.

In response to a question by Mr. Taylor, Ms. Staats noted that a key need for teachers is increased time for planning. They receive four days now, but that should be increased to at least two weeks. Both she and Ms. Murray commented on the success of a three-week/half day summer session teacher in-service. Mr. Bob McIntyre asked about the preparation of teachers to deal with the reading needs of their students. Ms. Staats replied that new teachers may or may not be prepared to respond to the wide range of the needs and ability levels found among incoming kindergarten and first graders. Dr. Proctor asked about paperwork and the principal

observed that increasing litigation, district requirements and changes in State policies all contribute to the growth in documentation.

Mr. Taylor and the members thanked both presenters for their efforts and for sharing their perspective with the Council.

# <u>Master Plan</u>

Dr. Proctor provided a PowerPoint presentation on the overall design of the Master Plan and its major components. He stressed the importance of accountability and evaluation throughout the process. Chairman Morgaman suggested several additions to the overview, and was assured that the timeline for development still called for preliminary presentations by the existing committees in October with refinement of a draft for circulation continuing until the end of the year. In addition, it was noted that a committee of the whole on funding would begin work in October with an overview of how funding currently is addressed in each of the major education components. The Chairman noted that a committee to address Character Education would begin work in January or February.

Mr. Robert Taylor asked if the Master Plan would address implementation of the K-20 system. Both the Chairman and Dr. Proctor noted that full implementation would begin in January 2003. In response to this and a follow-up question by Ms. Diane Leone, Dr. Proctor observed that the Master Plan should contain recommendations, which will give traction to the K-20 system at the local level. Mr. Taylor observed that the discussion of funding would present a key opportunity to support the K-20 system. Dr. Proctor observed that there is no local K-20 structure at this time, and discussed previous attempts to address this through regional coordinating councils. He said that specific steps and timelines will be addressed in the Plan and that a year from January the Council will be submitting a report card on the overall system.

## Committee Reports

The committee reports were deferred until the October meeting.

## Other Items of Interest

There were no other items of interest at this time.

## <u>Next Meeting</u>

The next meeting will be held at the Broward Community College, Academic Village in Pembroke Pines, Wednesday, October 9, 2002.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. on Wednesday, September 18, 2002.

William B. Proctor Executive Director