

January 15, 2007

Mr. John Dasburg
Chair, Academic Programs/Strategic Planning Committee
Florida Board of Governors
State University System of Florida
325 W. Gaines Street, Suite 1614
Tallahassee, FL. 32399-0400

Dear Mr. Dasburg:

The Pappas Consulting Group Inc. is pleased to forward you its report, *Proposing a Blueprint for Higher Education in Florida: Outlining the Way to a Long-term Master Plan for Higher Education in Florida*.

During the course of our contract negotiations, we refined the “bottom line of the study” to provide a blueprint for Florida’s higher education future with the target date of 2030 at the 90,000-foot level. We also agreed that this endeavor would represent the beginning of a meaningful dialogue among people of good will regarding the future structure of the State University System of Florida rather than a prescriptive solution.

We were instructed to be bold and candid throughout our four-month endeavor. We have respected the directive of the ITN and the Foundation Board’s responses to interested consulting firms that the final report should reflect the view of the Pappas Consulting Group Inc. without the influences of individual stakeholders or political pressure.

Indeed, as will become readily apparent upon reading our report, we have designed a blueprint that first and foremost takes into account the need for statewide higher education policy that includes the State University System of Florida, the Florida Community College System and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. It is within this context that we focus on the future structure of the State University System of Florida.

Report Structure

This report contains six sections. The first provides an introduction to our work and the second enumerates the approach we undertook to complete this study. We next provide a series of observations and related recommendations, which lead to the description of a proposed blueprint for action. The fifth section of the report responds to questions in the original ITN, and the last section provides our conclusions.

Mr. John Dasburg
Chair, Academic Programs/Strategic Planning Committee
Florida Board of Governors
Page 2

In addition, there are a series of appendices that provide the reader a greater understanding of the depth of the analysis we undertook during the short timeframe of this study.

Throughout, we were careful to confirm the accuracy of the data we were provided. As you are aware, the timeframe of this report did not allow for review for complete factual accuracy; however, we are confident that the general observations and recommendations are sound.

An Auspicious Time for Thoughtful Debate and Planning for the Future of Florida Higher Education

The Pappas Consulting Group Inc. believes strongly that Florida has an immediate imperative and a unique opportunity to forge a covenant among the Board of Governors, the new Governor, the Legislature, Education Leaders, Business Leaders and communities to plan and execute a more intentional future for higher education. We are most aware that the observations contained in Section III of this report may read as criticisms and may be offensive to many; however, we believe that we are at the juncture where many of the players may be willing to give something up for the betterment of higher education in the state of Florida.

We are not naïve. We understand fully that each of the players will have to make difficult choices concerning the: relinquishing of power; financial choices including increasing resources and expanding fiscal flexibility; and demanding more fiscal discipline. If that willingness is not present, future conversations on the blueprint and the emerging master plan will be an interesting academic exercise but little else.

As Governor Crist said in his inaugural address a few short weeks ago: “Our challenge: To recognize our common future, our common destiny. To understand that we are stronger in cooperation than in competition. That the work we need to do, we can only do together.”

It is in this spirit that we present you our report. We look forward to reviewing the contents of this report with you and the Board of Governors on January 24, 2007.

Sincerely yours,

OpusOne™ and a
P.C.G. development
are needed to use this product.

Alceste T. Pappas, Ph.D.
President and CEO
Pappas Consulting Group Inc.

**PROPOSING A BLUEPRINT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA:
OUTLINING THE WAY TO A LONG-TERM MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION IN FLORIDA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Our Approach to the Study	2
III. Observations	3
IV. A Florida Blueprint	13
V. Response to Related Questions	33
VI. Conclusion	36

Appendix A: Required Documentation

Appendix B: Map of State University Instructional, Research, and Service Locations

Appendix C: List of Interviews and Focus Groups

Appendix D: Inventory of Documentation

**PROPOSING A BLUEPRINT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA:
OUTLINING THE WAY TO A LONG-TERM MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION IN FLORIDA**

The Florida Board of Governors Foundation, Inc. engaged the Pappas Consulting Group Inc. to make recommendations to the Board related to the future structure of the State University System (SUS).

The ITN that was issued was the proverbial camel designed by a committee and did not clearly delineate the bottom line of the study. After a series of discussions with Mr. John Dasburg, the Chair of the Academic Programs/Strategic Planning Committee of the Florida Board of Governors, and the sponsor of this work, we mutually agreed that the Pappas Group would provide a blueprint for Florida's higher education future with the target date of 2030 at the 90,000-foot level. We also agreed that this endeavor would represent the *beginning of a meaningful dialogue among people of good will regarding the future structure of the University System rather than a prescriptive solution*. Indeed this has been our mantra throughout this daunting endeavor, although there appear to be unreasonable expectations of what this study will resolve in the immediate future.

Given the very short timeframe of the study and the limited resources available to conduct the study, we agreed to focus on tangible options and mileposts for the expansion and stratification of the current state university system. We further agreed to give examples of what we have learned from other states through our collective seventy-five years of higher education experience as institutional leaders and higher education consultants. We agreed to give general thoughts and directions about accountability, costs and return on investments but not a detailed analysis at this initial juncture. Throughout, we agreed to utilize the data extant within the state and through national sources with the understanding these data would help inform our recommendations. Our recommendations are also based on the Pappas Group's experience and knowledge of other state university systems, while recognizing Florida's unique context.

We agreed to be direct, candid, and bold, to remain undaunted by political pressure, keeping in mind the objective of providing an initial blueprint subject to on-going scrutiny and modification for the benefit of the citizens and the State of Florida, rather than a report that simply benefited our client. We have attempted at every level to produce a focused study rather than one that examines every issue of political or academic interest. We are confident that this report and its high level, informed set of observations and recommendations at the macro-level, will enable the beginnings of healthy and spirited dialogue concerning the State University System of Florida and its interface with the community colleges, the independent colleges/universities, and K-12.

We cast a broad net in terms of data collection and analysis, calling for previously developed reports and documentation from state data bases, the strategic plans for the State University System and the eleven state universities, as well as requested support documentation. We collected data from other states, regional and national organizations and researched our own database. Some of this documentation is enumerated as Appendix A of this report.

In addition to this extensive research, we intentionally designed an interview and focus group process that elicited dialogue and thought-provoking discussions rather than robotic and technocratic question and answer sessions. We met with the Chancellor of the Board of Governors (BOG) and his staff in small groups to ascertain the role of the Board of Governors staff and their relationship to the Board of Governors, and their relationship to the eleven institutions that comprise the system, as well as members of the Board of Education, the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) senior staff and several ICUF institutions. We also interviewed each member of the Board of Governors in person or on the phone at least once.

We held eleven, three-four hour focus groups with the Presidents of each of the SUS institutions and their Vice Presidents. These sessions provided valuable insight into the ambitions of the individual institutions as well as their perception of the role and responsibilities of the Board of Governors and its staff. We interviewed each Board of Trustees Chair to ascertain his/her perceptions of the role and responsibilities of the local board of trustees vis-à-vis the Board of Governors.

We also reached out to the Chancellor of the Community College system and his chief academic officer and with selected community college presidents whose institutions offered the baccalaureate. The Chair of the State Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education made themselves available and provided their perceptions. We also spoke with several leaders of the business community. Legislative leaders and others were interviewed in order to gain a broad perspective of their vision of the State University System and the challenges confronting it. Appendix C contains the interviewees who were part of our information gathering process.

Upon conclusion of this extensive and broad data and information gathering effort, we reached conclusions based on our own experiences in public higher education and their systems and began to develop a series of observations and recommendations. Those observations and the resultant recommendations follow. We are confident that there will be objections to both our observations and recommendations with probably no individual or group agreeing with everything in the report. This will lead some to defend the status quo. Others will suggest tinkering rather than creating. Yet others may have more radical suggestions. Again, we welcome spirited debate, but one that results in actions that position Florida for a bright future.

1. The Demand For Additional Access To Higher Education In Florida Has Not Yet Been Fully Documented.

Even though Florida has widely admired data systems, it does not seem to have developed a widely accepted set of projections for future demand for higher education. This will be necessary prior to developing and approving any final master plan in the years to come. For example, SREB data raise a number of complex and interlocking issues. Florida will continue to have population growth far in excess of the national average between 2004 and 2014 (19.5% vs. 8.9%), but that growth will be slower than in the last decade (24.6%). More importantly, the age distribution and the ethnic composition will change dramatically, with potentially severe impacts on the rate of higher education enrollment growth.

In 2004, the 18-24 population group was 8.9% of the state's population. By 2015 that is projected to decline to 7.9% and to further decline to 7.6% by 2025. On the other hand, the 65 plus age group will go from 16.8% in 2004 to 19.5% by 2015 and to 24.7% by 2025. So whereas Florida's K-12 enrollments grew 28% between 1992 and 2002 (more than double the national average), they are only projected to grow 8% between 2002 and 2012. This, of course, remains substantial growth in the college-age population.

However, the demographic shifts in the future raise serious questions about both higher education participation rates and sector selection by students. In 2006 white students are the majority in the K-12 schools (56%), but in 2018 white students will be the minority (40%). Black enrollment is projected to decline slightly from 20% to 18%, while Hispanic enrollment is projected to leap from 21% to 36%. With an already low high school graduation rate (56% according to "Measuring Up 2006"), Florida runs the risk of further declines unless it becomes aggressively intentional about closing the achievement gap. Indeed, when measured by SAT scores, the achievement gap is actually widening. White students in Florida had an average SAT of 1043 in 2005, Hispanics 961, and Blacks 856. In Fall 2005, SUS only admitted 537 freshman students (1.8% of total enrollment) with SAT scores between 800-899 (with half of those attending FAMU) and 1,637 (5.6% of enrollment) between 900-999.

These gaps can be seen in the 8th grade NAEP scores for Math with 78% of whites performing at or above Basic level, 56% of Hispanic children, and 39% of Black children. This pattern plays out at the bachelors level with 23.8% of the white population having a bachelor's degree, 17.5% Hispanics, and 12.4% of Blacks (all three are below the national average, which is particularly disturbing when one considers how many retirees to Florida from out-of-state are included in these numbers). The data consistently show that minority students graduate from high school at lower rates than do white students, participate in higher education at lower rates, and graduate from higher

education at lower rates. Compounding these challenges is the increase in low-income Floridians (up from 37% in 1990 to 50% in 2004).

Therefore straight-line projections and especially increased participation projections (59% of Florida high school graduates participate immediately in higher education; this is slightly above the national average, but one has to remember that Florida is also significantly above the national average in the number of students who never make it to high school graduation) seem to fly in the face of reality; this is especially true since few of the enrollment projection related reports even acknowledge the achievement gap.

The demographic shifts could also signal that even higher proportions of students will choose the community college as their entry point to higher education. Minority and poor students (often for financial and/or academic support reasons) are disproportionately represented in community colleges. As Florida already has a larger than national average percentage of its students in two-year colleges (53% vs. 45%), this shift has additional public policy implications.

The only certainty about projections is that they will be wrong. With so many variables in play (for example, two-year college enrollments usually expand significantly during recessions and often even decline during strong economic times) and human behavior being at the center of choices, it is not reasonable to expect precision in projections. However, good planning demands that the most sophisticated attempts be made and that honest conversations about issues such as the achievement gap take place. It is not clear that Florida has yet done so.

Recommendation

The BOG should establish a working group of experts (both from within and outside of SUS) to develop and maintain a sophisticated, 10-year enrollment projection model for individual institutions and statewide higher education.

The group may wish to examine North Carolina's (UNC) projection model, which is county-based and able to anticipate demographic shifts.

- 2. The State University System of Florida has significantly increased degree production and has emphasized high demand degrees; however, graduate and professional programs have grown at a faster rate than undergraduate degrees and there are significant K-12 pipeline issues.**

A number of reports in the late 1990's, including several from the Business/Higher Education Partnership with their blockbuster titles ("The Emerging Catastrophe," "Catastrophe Forestalled," and "Bursting at the Seams") called for an increase in access, with emphasis on bachelors degrees. The Board of Governor's recent Strategic Plan also emphasizes increasing degree production in high demand areas such as teaching, nursing, allied health, and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields.

Higher education in Florida responded with increases in degree production that outpaced the overall population increase and enrollment increase, although these increases still leave Florida below the national averages. The 2006 report from the Florida Council of 100, "Preparing for the Future," indicates that Florida ranks 43rd for bachelors degrees per 1,000 residents (age 18-44), 33rd for graduate degrees, and 47th for graduates in science and technologies. Yet the rate of increase in degree production has been higher at the graduate level than at the undergraduate level. According to SREB data, between 1993 and 2003 Florida increased its bachelors degree production by 42.4%, its masters by 58.5%, its doctorates 56.1%, and its first professional degrees by 39.3%. While these increases are commendable, it would seem that even more emphasis should be placed on increasing bachelors degrees. Doctorates are very expensive to produce and many doctoral graduates in research areas enter a national marketplace. Non-research based doctorate graduates may be more likely to be employed within the state. Yet, they are also relatively expensive and require supervision from tenured faculty members, therefore reducing the availability of those faculty for undergraduate instruction.

The emphasis on STEM fields and other areas of high state need is also commendable but raises issues of the available pipeline. Math and Science scores in the K-12 system do not indicate a robust pipeline. Furthermore, when those scores are disaggregated by race, the achievement (and interest) gap is stark. With the projected increase in the proportion of minority students entering higher education, the pipeline will shrink further without substantial intervention. This challenge is compounded by gender issues as well. Female students are significantly underrepresented in all STEM fields at the very time they are an increasing percentage of the higher education enrollment (57% in the State University System of Florida).

Interestingly, a recent study in North Carolina (Pappas HB 1264 Staying a Step Ahead: Higher Education Transforming North Carolina's Economy) revealed that employers were less concerned about the number of graduates than with the education of those graduates. They sought students with highly developed "soft skills" such as critical thinking, problem-solving, ability to work in teams, communication skills, ability to see "the big picture," and workplace ethics (integrity, punctuality, work ethic). These expectations will require higher education to rethink both curriculum (especially in the general education program and the place of interdisciplinary learning) and pedagogy. An interesting example can be seen at North Carolina A&T, which has completely

reconstructed its general education program and its expectations of majors, plus a capstone experience for all students.

Recommendation

The BOG should establish a working group, consisting of a majority of SUS faculty/academic administration but also including representation from the business community and the community colleges, to examine the general education programs in SUS to insure their currency for preparing students for a global society.

3. The conditions for success do not yet exist for the implementation of a long-term master plan for Higher Education in Florida.

The “conditions for success” in implementing a long-term master plan for higher education are currently almost non-existent in Florida. There has only been one truly coherent master plan in the history of state higher education planning. The visionary California plan that segmented higher education into three carefully delineated sectors is now nearly fifty years old. It has stood the test of time well. Yet it was developed in simpler times when the slate was relatively clean and when that state was willing to invest in the success of the plan. The conditions in Florida, both current and historic, do not suggest that the state could replicate such planning as California’s (and, to a lesser extent, New York’s, North Carolina’s, and Wisconsin’s). These conditions include:

- A Very Unclean Slate.

While at first glance Florida seems to have very few universities for the size of the state, eleven (population 2003, 17M) versus sixteen in North Carolina (population 8.4M), nineteen in Georgia (population 8.6M), forty-three in Texas (population 22.1M), thirty-two in California (population 35.5M), it has a myriad of higher education sites (see map, appendix B). These sites are not coherent as some universities favor branch campuses, others regional campuses, and others joint-use facilities. In their present form, these sites are undersized and overly expensive.

- Mission Leap not Creep.

While many states have experienced mission creep, no state in recent years has come close to Florida’s mission leap. The establishment of three new medical schools since 2001 alone symbolizes this mission explosion (in addition to two previous ones and substantial state support for the University of Miami’s Medical School). Whether this was the most efficient way of increasing the production of physicians or not, these decisions will either prove that Florida was more visionary than any other state or more undisciplined. Certainly since that time, several additional states have started to plan new medical schools and many medical schools have increased the size of their classes. None, however, have planned to open three medical schools (California, for

example, will expand existing medical schools and open one additional school; the cost of that school is estimated to be \$1.4B. over 15 years.) To put this mission decision in context, though, the ultimate cost of starting these three most recent medical schools would probably have supported the start-up of three to five new universities.

If the medical schools decisions were the only mission elements in play then the situation might be manageable. However, that is not the case. At a time when federal research funding growth is slowing dramatically (especially when contrasted to the “boom years” of the late 1990’s), a majority of Florida’s current universities have major research university ambitions, including several who declared a goal of being invited to join the most prestigious research university organization (AAU), and even those without such ambitions still either describe themselves as research universities (including the newest and most nontraditional in design, Florida Gulf Coast University) or have ambitions to add large numbers of doctoral programs (such as University of North Florida).

Even when the state’s limited resources were more targeted at fewer research universities a number of years ago, only one (University of Florida) could claim to be a major national player (and not a leading national player at that). Texas, for example, has just two major research universities (or minisystems): the University of Texas and Texas A & M, both AAU members. Wisconsin has one major research university (University of Wisconsin – Madison plus an urban research university in Milwaukee), New York four (SUNY Albany, Buffalo, Binghamton, and Stony Brook). California has nine (with a couple more under development) but is a much larger state and has had the time to develop research universities. The reality is that established research universities tend to grow stronger and stronger and virtually no university can break into “the big leagues” (the University of California San Diego being the one notable exception in the last quarter century.)

Another stark reality is that the “cost” of research actually is greater than the “income” if true costs are fully considered, although one can make a case for many indirect or related economic benefits.

Finally, mission leap is not limited to the universities. A number of community colleges have begun to offer limited baccalaureate programs. While Florida is not unique in this regard (approximately 10 states have something similar, although Florida has by far the largest number) and a case can be made for providing such access in carefully defined programs, it nevertheless has to pay attention to the possible dilution of emphasis on the traditional community college mission. As a state with a larger than national average undereducated adult population (Florida has 17.1% of its age 25-44 population without a high school diploma or GED versus the national average of 12.3%) and as a state with increasing populations of minority students and first-generation college students, Florida will need its community

colleges to be highly focused on two-year programs that transfer effectively (an area where Florida has been a national leader) and that prepare students for basic employment.

- Major Resource Constraints.

While Florida's universities have major (and expensive) ambitions, the reality is that Florida is a very low tuition state. Depending on the data definitions used, Florida is either 50th (College Board data) or just above the lowest (SREB). This presents many dilemmas for funding. Some other states that have traditionally tightly controlled tuition, such as Texas, have recently "deregulated" tuition control to the universities with a statutory requirement that a specified, significant proportion of the revenue go to needs-based aid. Without increased flexibility with tuition for the SUS institutions (which can be designed to protect or enhance access even more so than Florida's rather modest present needs-based program) or major new state investments, no blueprint or long-term master plan can possibly begin to even take shape.

In addition, the current funding system (an enrollment formula) rewards quantity over quality, as it focuses solely on inputs not outcomes. It is little wonder that Florida has three of the largest universities in the top ten in the nation, rather than three of the highest-ranked. It is little wonder that universities resist the breaking away of branch campuses into stand-alone campuses, since their enrollments (not to mention their political clout) are enhanced by having branch campuses. It is little wonder that universities with research ambitions have to grow their undergraduate programs to such a size that they can help "underwrite" the research and graduate programs. Universities understand how to play the funding hand that is in play. The current funding mechanism, however, does not incentivize the development of a coherent blueprint or long-term master plan for higher education; it encourages the status quo.

A convergence of economic decisions will negatively impact the future funding of public higher education.

Although both the Bright Futures and the Stanley G. Tate Florida Prepaid College Program (formerly known as the Prepaid College Trust Fund) should be recognized as innovative, they bring with them some particular long-term challenges.

In the case of Bright Futures, over 140,000 Florida students have been granted funding in recognition of their high school academic achievements to pursue postsecondary education in Florida. The total dollar value of the grants awarded in 2005-2006 was \$306M. Since 1997, a total of \$1.6B has been granted. Many of the recipients are non-need based students.

In the case of the Tate Florida Prepaid College Program, that started in 1987, a parent or student can lock in the cost of tuition, local fees and student housing at today's fixed price. The plan guarantees the coverage of a Florida public institution when the child goes to school. As its website touts: "Together, the tuition plan, local fee plan and dormitory plan cover about half the total cost of sending a child to a public college in Florida." Another feature of the plan enables the participant "to transfer the value of the plan—the same amount the Florida Prepaid College Plan pays a public college in Florida—to most private colleges in Florida, select technical schools and most out-of-state colleges."

As of June 30, 2006, the Prepaid College Trust Fund's total assets amounted to \$6.7 billion, with an actuarial reserve of \$586 million, representing 9.6% of the fund's liabilities. Contract sales continue to increase, totaling 1,140,579 through the 2006 enrollment period, and scholarships awarded by the Foundation Board have grown to 23,401, of which 17,217 were awarded to Stanley Tate Project STARS students.

These programs, coupled with the State's seeming pride in maintaining the lowest tuition rates for universities in the nation, will soon pose a significant threat to the state as burgeoning numbers of these eligible students attend Florida's community colleges and state universities. Indeed, all of these economic decisions, while fueled in many ways with good intentions, will bankrupt the state's higher education system if these fundamental policy issues are not revisited in a timely manner.

- Seamless in Name Only.

While the much-discussed development and revision of a "seamless" K-20 system has utilized considerable political capital and has been the focus of educational leaders, Florida currently has a system that not only is not seamless, but also has tears in its seams. The title of the May 2006 National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education report is revealing: "The Governance Divide: the Case Study for Florida." The report points out that many of the components of K-20 collaboration – such as 2 + 2 policies, statewide articulation, common course numbering, common prerequisites, acceleration mechanisms, data systems, common applications, and Bright Futures scholarships – have been put in place over the last forty years. Indeed, Florida has led the nation many times in putting in place student-friendly policies.

However, the unresolved governance issues and lack of attention to aligning curriculum and performance standards between K-12 and higher education raise serious questions about the preparedness of the state to adopt a long-term higher education master plan that will depend on further deepening of collaborations. The most recent and stark example of the Florida governance swamp is the dispute between the Board of Governors and the Board of Education over authority to grant approval for baccalaureate programs. It also increases the tension between

universities and community colleges at a time when both should be working together fervently to increase access. Fortunately, in the last few days, the Board of Governors and the Department of Education have reached an agreement that identifies nursing, teaching, and the BAS as the appropriate degrees for community colleges and that seeks to modify section 1007.38 to reflect this agreement. The legislature should do so because this agreement could end an unnecessarily divisive chapter in the relationship between universities and community colleges.

Furthermore, even within the state university system, many unresolved governance issues remain and create major tensions between the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees at each university. Some tension is inevitable but until there's a greater sense of partnership, as has evolved, for example, in North Carolina, it is unlikely that any blueprint or long-term master plan can have shared ownership between the Board of Governors and the local board of trustees. Without shared ownership, the plan has little chance to succeed.

- Planning without Implementing.

While Florida has an extensive and often impressive planning framework and environment, there's little evidence that many of these plans ever get off the shelf. For example, several key components of this study have already been previously addressed but never implemented. In 1991, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) issued an extensive report (over 100 pages) with assistance from MGT of America. The report responded to a 1990 legislature proviso calling for "criteria for the establishment of new institutions within the state university and community college systems. Such criteria shall include projected enrollment, the capacity of existing public and independent institutions, alternatives to addressing any identified demand, and impact on other institutions both adjacent and statewide." In many ways, the report still rings true today. When it was written, there were 9 state university system institutions; today there are 11. However, one of those is New College which became a stand-alone university. While a very impressive institution, New College is not intended to provide solutions to increased access. Florida Gulf Coast University, then, is the sole access addition to the state university system since the 1991 PEPC report exploring the approach for adding additional universities (and community colleges) was written.

Another example of a report that provided some relevant options for today was the 1998 PEPC report, "Feasibility Plan for Implementation of State College System" (also with assistance from MGT of America). The report examined, again at the request of the legislature, the development of a group of institutions that would emphasize baccalaureate education (and this was before so many Florida universities started to emphasize their graduate and research ambitions). Ultimately, the report recommended that such a "middle tier" system was "premature" in 1998.

What is striking in Florida is how rarely, if ever, analytical reports with substantial comparative state-by-state data and with solid goals, objectives, and metrics ever find their way into implemented state policy.

- Implementing without Planning.

While Florida plans certain policies and initiatives with considerable formality, it does not appear to have a strategic plan for economic development that links to the strengths and assets of its universities. A number of states, such as California, Texas, Georgia, Arizona, North Carolina, and Ohio, have been very intentional in identifying industry clusters that they would target based on research strengths in their universities. A number of these states have then further developed those strengths by investing in recruiting additional faculty in those fields and in building the infrastructure (specialized facilities) to support those programs. The economic development recruitment then has a focus and direction, plus the infrastructure is largely in place when the new companies are recruited.

Florida's approach has seemed more opportunistic, at least until quite recently, with high profile recruits like Scripps, Torrey Pines, Burnham and SRI being recruited, then requiring the universities to react to build supporting strengths. While too simplistic, one approach is "to build it and they will come," the other is "they come and we will build it." Both approaches can succeed. A long-term economic development strategy built on university research strengths probably works better, however, because of the length of time it takes normally to build an area of research strength. It can be built more quickly (as New York has done around nanotechnology), but the immediate costs are very high and the success is less certain.

- An Inexperienced Governance and Support Enterprise

As is the case with the Board of Governors, State University System of Florida, the Florida Board of Governors Office is a new entity. Indeed, the governing entity and the Florida Board of Governors Office that supports it are the newest of this nation's public higher education systems. The irony is that this state's public university system had a long history of strong stewardship and leadership through the aegis of a Board of Regents. Then came a series of disruptions that has rendered both the Board of Governors and its staff as the least experienced higher education entity in the country. During the same period, the governance and the leadership of the Community College System has remained the same and ICUF has remained steadfast in its advocacy of the independent sector of higher education.

This disruption, along with the sorting out of the governance responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the emergence of eleven institutional Boards of Trustees with fiduciary responsibility and the authority to hire their own Presidents, has created a governance and management mire that needs additional, intentional sorting out.

At present, there are sixty-four staff members in the Board Office. The office has eight functional areas as follows: operations; academic and student affairs; communications; corporate secretary; general counsel; governmental relations; external relations; and planning and budgeting. The structure of the office basically parallels the major functions extant on each of the campuses. There is a similar approach to the committee structure of the Board.

In our view, there is significant opportunity for the Board to undertake a strategic assessment of its own effectiveness and its committee structure as well as the organizational structure and effectiveness of the Board office to focus efforts on emerging strategic initiatives (e.g. student success; economic development; e-learning; etc.) and begin to clarify thoughtfully the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Governors, its Board office, its eleven universities and their Boards of Trustees.

Recommendations

1. *The BOG should complete an inventory of existing SUS educational sites and categorize them according to existing Florida classifications. (See, also, Page 18, Branch Campus Section)*
2. *The BOG should conduct a mission review for each of its institutions and for the BOG itself. This should be conducted in partnership with the institutions and with external, independent guidance.*
3. *Florida must resolve its resource constraints.*
 - (a) *The BOG, Governor, and legislature should re-examine tuition policy and design a tuition strategy that increases institutional flexibility, yet which also actually increases access through major reinvestment in need-based aid (see Texas).*
 - (b) *The Governor and legislature should form a Blue Ribbon Commission of Florida leaders to redesign Bright Futures and the Prepaid Tuition Plan to insure their long-term solvency and that neither program has the unintended consequence of inhibiting the expansion of Florida higher education quality or quantity.*

- (c) *The BOG should forge a new covenant with the Governor and legislature that commits SUS to greater efficiency, productivity, and accountability in return for increased state allocations and expanded autonomy.*
4. *The new Governor should convene a summit of higher education leaders (SUS Chancellor, Presidents and Board Chairs; Community College Chancellor, Presidents, and Board Chairs; DOE Commissioner and Board Chair; ICUF leadership higher education and K-12 association heads; and legislative leadership) that has as its goal to bring about expanded collaboration among the groups and an elimination of existing “turf battles”.*
 5. *The BOG should examine previous reports on expanding higher education opportunities, connect with the state and business leadership responsible for those reports, and enlist allies for actually implementing this report.*
 6. *The BOG should create a position/office of Higher Education and the Economy in the Chancellor’s office to work with the state agency (agencies) responsible for economic development and state strategic planning to make SUS research (and education and public service) an integral component of the state’s long-term economic development strategy.*
 7. *The BOG should undertake a review of its effectiveness and its governance role and committee structure in conjunction with a parallel review of the role and responsibilities of the eleven Boards of Trustees to ensure that the governance of the system is greater than the sum of its individual stewards. Subsequent to this review, the Board of Governors needs to assess the structure, staffing loads, and the effectiveness of the Office of the Chancellor in order to support the ongoing implementation of the proposed blueprint and the development, over the long-term, of a master plan for higher education.*

The following Blueprint is offered to stimulate conversation about the future of Florida higher education. It sets out a long-term vision and involves many components and entities, thus making a new covenant and greater collaboration essential. While this study has been funded by members of the Board of Governor’s Foundation, the recommendations focus on the best interests of the state of Florida and good public policy rather than the interests of any educational sector. Because Florida has an “unclean slate,” the recommendations involve the State University System, the Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges - with the pipeline from K-12 being a critical factor.

Recommendations

1. Establish a new system within the SUS with sole focus on bachelor degrees and with its own governance parameters within the BOG. This system should comprise:
 - a. Any existing SUS campus that wishes to opt into the new subsystem. Significant financial incentives will need to be available.
 - b. Any existing branch campuses that has reached 2,500 FTE* and has the data to demonstrate the ability to reach 7,500 FTE within 10 years.
 - c. Any community college that wishes to produce more than 50% of its credit hours at the baccalaureate level (or 25% upper division) and that can reach (or has already reached) 2,500 FTE in total enrollment within 5 years and that can demonstrate the ability to reach 7,500 FTE in total enrollment within 10 years.
 - d. Any independent college that wishes to become a public or quasi-public college which can meet the FTE requirements in (b) above and which can demonstrate the cost-benefit to the state.
 - e. New campuses. These would only be built if responses to (a) through (d) above did not result in sufficient geographic access.

The new system institutions would become and be called state colleges. They would have local Advisory Boards; all governance would be through BOG.

2. Revise the funding approach for SUS institutions to encourage responsiveness to priority state needs:
 - a. Funding formula revised to include a retention and graduation component.
 - b. State to provide support above the base funding formula for high state need academic programs.
 - c. State further invests in targeted areas of research and graduate study based on its economic development plan.
3. Expand access to distance education degrees, with special emphasis on internet-based courses, through the establishment of BOG Distance Education Consortium. The Board of Governors should:
 - a. Create a Board of Advisors for Distance Education, primarily from institutional representatives.

** Note: All references to FTE reflect the national norm of 30 credits per FTE and not the Florida methodology.*

- b. Facilitate and incentivize collaborative distance education degrees, with special emphasis on high state need programs.
 - c. Be provided funding by the legislature to increase significantly the number of distance degrees available.
 - d. Package and market all distance education programs in the SUS and in other participating institutions.
 - e. Provide faculty development in distance education.
 - f. Establish an e-learning tuition rate.
4. Include independent colleges/universities in certain initiatives that expand access. This support should be targeted to:
- a. Including independent colleges/universities in forgivable loan programs.
 - b. Distance education programs that are part of SUS Distance Education Consortium.
 - c. Capital needs that would increase access to Florida residents within certain parameters.

Rationale

1. Baccalaureate System (State College System)

Florida will need additional access points to undergraduate education over the next two decades. These access points are likely to be most successful if they are stand-alone colleges with missions that are clear and contained, if they have strong local support yet statewide governance through the Board of Governors, and if they can reach a cost-effective size. Wherever possible, Florida should take advantage of existing facilities and infrastructure so as to use the state's resources as judiciously as possible.

- *Mission:* The mission of the state colleges should be exclusively baccalaureate and those degrees should be determined by regional economic needs.

Graduate programs can be provided in these areas by e-learning or by collaborative programs with SUS institutions. Indeed to insure that the national epidemic and Florida pandemic of mission creep does not occur in the state colleges, the legislation creating these colleges should be explicit about the focused mission. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that, at least initially, the state colleges would have comprehensive baccalaureate programs. The early focus

would be on high regional (and state) need degrees, built on a platform of an innovative general education program that would teach 21st century skills and core knowledge.

- *Governance.* The state colleges would be a sector within the Board of Governor's authority. Because of their centrality to state needs, the state colleges would be governed by the Board of Governors; however, each would have a local advisory board (as contrasted with a governing board) with fiduciary responsibility which would have substantial responsibilities (for example, recommending finalists for the Presidency).
- *Cost-Effective Size.* While there is no empirical evidence for the recommended 2,500 FTE initial size (and some states that have thresholds set them lower and some higher), this size does seem to provide sufficient critical mass to start the stand-alone process. There is empirical evidence (from a MGT study done on the relationship between indirect costs and enrollment) that 7,500 FTE is a cost-effective size for a college. While there are some further economies of scale beyond 7,500 FTE (and no empirical evidence of diseconomies at any particular higher size, although some qualitative concerns may arise with mega-sized universities), these economies moderate considerably once the 7,500 FTE level is reached.

It is recommended that the new system of state colleges be constituted from several different sources, as long as they "opt in" and meet specified criteria:

- Existing SUS institutions
 - Branch campuses
 - Community Colleges
 - Independent Colleges
 - New institutions
- Existing SUS institutions.

At least four (University of North Florida, University of West Florida, and Florida Gulf Coast University, and New College of Florida) and possibly six (Florida A&M University and the University of Central Florida) current SUS universities have a significant focus on undergraduate education:

	UG %	GR %
FAMU	87%	13%
FAU	85%	15%
FGCU	89%	11%
FIU	84%	16%
FSU	82%	18%
NCF	100%	
UCF	87%	13%
UF	72%	28%
UNF	90%	10%
USF	83%	17%
UWF	89%	11%
Total	83%	17%

These four to six, on one hand, would be natural choices to form the foundation of the new state college system. On the other hand, they (with the exception of New College) have already launched a significant number of graduate programs, particularly at the Masters level. In addition, they already enjoy considerable autonomy through their own Boards of Trustees. To expect them willingly to give up entirely either their graduate aspirations or their substantial autonomy is not realistic.

Certainly, a top-down decision could be made to require their participation in the new state college system. However, the political capital that would have to be expanded and the resistance that would have to be overcome would be major distractions at a time when Florida needs to be addressing issues of student access and achievement. Even when mergers of subsystems (such as Wisconsin and North Carolina over 30 years ago) are accomplished, it takes many years for the merged system to become fully effective.

Another approach would be for the state to provide substantial financial incentives to any of these institutions that join the new state college system and are willing to commit themselves to giving undergraduate education, especially in academic programs of high state need, the highest priority. While graduate programs would not be removed nor new ones necessarily prohibited, these institutions would have an undergraduate/graduate FTE mix established by the Board of Governors. It is recommended that this mix be 90% undergraduate, 10% graduate. On the governance front, these institutions could have certain aspects of their current level of autonomy grandfathered in, with the understanding that the Board of Governors must have some shared responsibility for Presidential selection, evaluation, and continuation plus budget allocation authority.

It is not essential for the success of the state college system for any of these institutions to join; however, it is desirable. These institutions would provide instant stature, experience, and leadership to a new system, as well as a substantial enrollment base to the new system. They are distributed geographically, also. The state and the Board of Governors would have to weigh what would be an appropriate level of financial incentive to bring the state a sufficient return on investment for an additional (not redistributed) allocation to be made to these institutions.

- Branch Campuses.

Florida makes extensive use of branch campuses and other off-campus sites. There seems to be some ambiguity about the definition and number of these sites. A recent Board presentation (September 2006) listed 20 branch campuses, while the official designation appears to have been given to 11 campuses. It is also not clear if the official definitions, listed in rule 6C-8.009, have ever been applied. So the Board of Governors should conduct a complete inventory of off-campus instruction and apply the official definitions to them. As with the uncertainty around enrollment projections, the lack of clarity here could inhibit rational planning.

Florida is not alone in its use of branch campuses. For example, some institutions in Ohio have branch (or regional) campuses and the Pennsylvania State University has a series of branch campuses. The trend, however, appears to be moving away from such structures for a number of reasons articulated in a 2003 NCHEMS report for the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. As the NCHEMS's report documents, upper division branch campuses tend to serve relatively few students (Florida's enrollment numbers appear to follow that pattern) at a relatively high cost (Florida's Funding Formula report recommends an additional \$500 per student FTE for each University's percentage of branch campus enrollment). Politics and economics often enter into the establishment of a branch campus (as Florida Gulf Coast University recently experienced). And while some education observers view them as ideal ways to extend regional service, others view them as education imperialism driven more by the desire to extend political boundaries than by the desire to expand educational opportunities.

In Florida's situation (just eleven universities), it makes sense to set some thresholds for branches to become stand-alone universities in the new state college system and to provide incentives for that to occur. Earlier reports included both enrollment and geographic criteria (distance and/or driving time). The latter, however, has become increasingly irrelevant with the advent of distance learning and with urban sprawl. In Atlanta, for example, Georgia State University and the Georgia Institute of Technology almost run into each other and several comprehensive universities (Clayton State University, Kennesaw State University, and Southern Polytechnic State University) are reasonably close by, as is the most recent four-year institution,

Georgia Gwinnett College. In other words, urban areas can have multiple universities, especially if they have mission distinctions as in Georgia.

Thus enrollment considerations become primary. Another consideration might be a challenge to the local community to raise private dollars, so that the new campus would start with a private endowment. Previous reports have recommended a rather extensive approval process. This report suggests that since the criteria are simple (2,500 FTE and a data-driven indication of ability to reach 7,500 FTE within 10 years), that the approval process be simple.

According to the data provided, three branch campuses currently meet the minimum standards: FIU-North Miami Branch campus (4,207 FTE); FAU-Davie Branch campus (3,021 FTE); USF-St. Petersburg Branch campus (2,669 FTE). Several others will likely reach the minimum threshold in the next 5-10 years. A Task Force should be created to address transition issues (for example, personnel, budgetary, and programmatic) and to recommend ways to incentivize SUS institutions to assist in growing the appropriate branch campuses so that they can stand alone. Some Presidents may not perceive that it is in their institutions best interest necessarily to grow branches and will need incentives and encouragement from the community. One incentive, of course, will be that they will retain the graduate programs and will be the graduate center for the entire region, since the state college will have a baccalaureate mission.

- Community Colleges.

Few, if any, states can match Florida for its transfer friendly policies and practices or its scope of collaborations between community colleges and colleges and universities (both public and private). From 2 + 2 articulation to common course numbering, to common prerequisites, to concurrent use/joint use (facilities and programs), Florida has often blazed a trail. With about half of its upper division students originating in the community colleges, the SUS depends heavily on these partnerships. So do students. In particular, place bound students benefit from the many degree completion programs offered at community colleges by both public and private universities. The 473 partnerships in 2005-2006 served 20,000 students with education and nursing programs being particularly popular (and of benefit to the state). The state legislature, recognizing the cost effectiveness of these partnerships, provided just over \$3M. for 2 + 2 Partnership Baccalaureate Incentive Grants.

Ironically, the state has provided considerably more than that for the start-up and ongoing delivery of the baccalaureate degrees, in limited fields, at a number of community colleges that currently serve relatively few students (over \$7M in FY 2004-05). While eleven states now have one or more community colleges offering the baccalaureate degree, Florida has been the most active state in this regard and has provided much of the national leadership. It remains a controversial issue, including

within the community college world (the two immediate past Presidents of the American Association of Community Colleges have sounded very cautionary notes, for example), with concerns about mission creep and, interestingly, costs. On the other hand, in a state like Florida that has underproduced at the baccalaureate level, has access issues, and has increasing proportions of poor and minority students, the community colleges will be able to contribute to increasing some specialized degree production. The turf battle between the DOE and BOG on the approval authority has been damaging, threatening all the goodwill generated by Florida's historic position as the leading community college/university partnership state in the nation. Students will ultimately be the losers if this is allowed to continue, and so the recent agreement should be codified by the legislature.

It also needs to be resolved because certain community colleges may well, in the long-term, wish to join the new state college system. Currently, none would come close to meeting the thresholds for the percentage of baccalaureate students (and/or upper division students), as the total headcount in baccalaureate programs at the community colleges is 3,059 out of nearly 300,000 students, with St. Petersburg having the highest percentage at 6.4%. Many community colleges, however, already exceed (or could soon do so) the other criteria of a total enrollment of 2,500 FTE and a target of at least 7,500 FTE. Again, there are compelling cost-efficiency reasons to encourage reaching a certain size and, given this is a primary motivation, it does not matter which programs the students are enrolled in.

The Florida Legislature's program evaluation agency (OPPAGA) reviewed the experience of these new programs in April 2005. Among its findings and cautions was the initial high cost per upper division credit hour of the community college (\$373 in 2004, compared to SUS of \$243), which is to be expected but which also points to the need to grow the programs quite rapidly. It will also be advisable for the state to continue to monitor costs as some of the national debate on community college baccalaureates centers around whether in fact they can keep costs low when faced with accreditation and related requirements. (The most comprehensive review of Community College Baccalaureate Degrees nationally was prepared by Karen Glennon for the University of Phoenix in 2005.) Interestingly, OPPAGA listed among the options for addressing issues, "slowly transforming some community colleges into four-year colleges that focus on teaching rather than research."

Once again the state may need to provide some incentives and the Board of Governors may need to negotiate some shared responsibilities for governance, while retaining ultimate authority.

- Independent Colleges.

Another possible source for state colleges is from within the independent college sector in Florida. That sector consists of 28 colleges ranging in size from 97 students

to 25,430 students. While most would not be interested in becoming a public (or quasi-public) college, it is not inconceivable that one or more might be willing to trade their independence for the relative financial security of becoming a state college. Such a move, while rare, is not without precedence in American higher education. Indeed, in the last legislative session, Alabama brought an independent, two-year military college into the public two-year sector. The most famous example occurred when Rutgers became New Jersey's state land-grant university. Other prominent examples include the University of Vermont, University of Cincinnati, University of Louisville, University of Nebraska-Omaha, and University of Missouri-Kansas City. And, of course, Florida has its own unique precedence with New College, which started out as a private college in 1960, then became a branch of the University of South Florida, before becoming a stand-alone in 2001.

Any independent college interested in making such a move in Florida would need to meet the FTE criteria, would need to be at least 90% undergraduate and should not have capital debt and/or operating debt at such a level that it would not be in the state's best fiscal interest to assume the financial obligations. It would not be difficult to make a reasonable estimate of the state's return on investment for taking over an independent college.

Because all of the SUS institutions are already over the 7,500 FTE target (with the exception of FGCU, which soon will be, and New College, which is not intended to be), the geographic location of the independent college(s) should not be a primary concern. However, it might be a consideration if either a branch campus and/or a community college in the same region wished to join the state college system. In that instance, if the region demographically could not support more than one state college, then priority would be given first to an existing SUS institution, then to a branch campus, then to a community college, and finally to an independent college.

As with all the options described above, the state minimizes its initial capital and, to a certain extent, its operating costs by creating a new college on the foundation of an existing higher education entity. It also accelerates the timetable for increasing access.

- New Institutions.

The final category of institutions that could belong to the state college system would be brand new institutions. This should, however, be the last option explored because of the costs and the increased likelihood that political influence would determine the location(s) rather than state and student needs.

The cost issue is a significant one. The 1998 PEPC study used somewhat different assumptions (initial FTE enrollment of 1,100 growing to 5,500 in five years; 7,500 in 10 years.) Nevertheless, it remains illustrative of the scale of cost. In that report,

MGT estimated that the 5-year capital costs (2003-2004 dollars) would be approximately \$100M; site development costs (in 1999 – 2000 dollars) would be \$10M; and annual operating costs (2003 – 2004 dollars) would be over \$36M. These estimates seem reasonable based on the actual experience of Georgia Gwinnett College, formally established as Georgia's 35th college/university within the University System of Georgia in the last couple of years. Originally, a joint use program between Georgia Perimeter College (two-year college) and the University of Georgia, it became a stand-alone when FTE reached approximately 5,000. It, however, moved to a new location in anticipation of this change as the existing program was in a leased, renovated warehouse that was landlocked. The county provided the land and basic infrastructure. Capital expenditures to date, including a request in this year's budget for a library, are approximately \$75M and counting (because the growth has outpaced the facility additions).

In addition to cost, location can be a challenge. If one were to create a map with the location of every public college in the U.S. and then layer on top of that the location of the state legislative leaders (for example, the Speaker, the Leader of the House, Senate majority leaders, and appropriation committee chairs) in the year of the founding of each college, the results might prove quite interesting. This is perfectly understandable. A new campus is a prize indeed for any community and a feather in the cap of any legislator who can deliver one. Often the most "misplaced" campuses were in rural, thinly-populated areas where legislative power resided. Such campuses have often provided economic lifelines (for example one of the smallest colleges in America, the two-year University of Wisconsin, Richland, with 350 students in a town of under 5,000, has an estimated economic impact of over \$7M a year and a total of over \$200M in its 40 year history.) Yet in a time of scarce resources (especially capital dollars in Florida), it makes little sense to allow political determinations of location. Virtually every state claims to be the most political in the nation, especially when it comes to higher education. And they are all correct. However, Florida is unarguably a state where the legislature has set much of the policy for higher education over the years (often, but not always, with impressive results). It will need to be a partner with higher education in selecting the most cost-effective and qualitative way to increase access in Florida.

Other issues can arise with brand new locations, also. Site selection can pit one community against another and can sometimes be swayed by primarily commercial rather than academic considerations. Again, this is not to criticize developers who are simply trying to put together the best possible development. It is to say that, despite the apparent generosity of gifts of land, there really are white elephants in this world. In addition, new locations often bring unanticipated environmental challenges and costs, which could be particularly acute in environmentally-sensitive Florida. The new University of California campus in Merced, for example, was delayed several years when small shrimp were discovered in vernal pools.

So while totally new state colleges should be considered, they should be considered cautiously and with green-eye-shades on. The first question that should be asked is, “If this is such an ideal location, why does it not already have some form of higher education presence?”

Florida has a unique opportunity to take advantage of its current slate of many higher education sites, yet relatively few state universities, to create a new system of state colleges in a highly cost-effective and creative way. The proposal emphasizes voluntary participation in this new system and genuine dialog in establishing the parameters of the new partnerships. Rather than mandates and statutes, sermons and sanctions, this proposal focuses on providing incentives (including the great motivation of capitalism and new dollars.) To succeed in increasing access, in providing equality of opportunity, and in building the state’s economy, Florida will need to make an investment. The return on that investment will be substantial, particularly if it is expended wisely.

2. Revise the funding approach for SUS institutions to encourage responsiveness to priority state needs.

There are a number of ways to balance the state’s needs for level and type of degrees with a University’s desire to have both comprehensive and prestigious degrees (often perceived, somewhat ironically, to be professional graduate programs.) At times that balance can be relatively easy to accomplish in fields that have currency for the state, that have high research potential for the universities, and that have interest for students across several disciplines (for example, the life sciences). At other times, the balance can be virtually impossible. Teacher education provides the classic example. The state has high need but education programs rarely bring prestige or significant research dollars (although federal support has grown). Most importantly, students’ interest in entering a demanding career that has relatively low pay continues to lag demand. Indeed, student interest and/or ability (for example, to enter a field with high math requirements, such as engineering) too rarely enter into the analysis of meeting state needs. Students have to be enticed into certain fields and universities have to be encouraged to offer certain programs.

The strength of a statewide governing board is its ability to put state needs as a priority. It can do this through its program approval process or by certain regulations, or even by sanctions. However, all of these approaches have limitations, particularly since they do not lend themselves readily to the sense of partnership with the universities and their boards of trustees. A more effective way to influence behavior is through the funding model. Changing funding models, however, can also be extremely complex and controversial. In states with funding formulas, revisions to the formula usually, for political reasons, have to have “hold harmless” “or mitigate loss” agreements for “the losers,” as happened recently in Texas. Or they have to be prospective, leaving the current base constant and focusing on distribution of new dollars, as happened in

Florida's most recent revision. In all cases, formula funding does not guarantee a certain level of funding because the state often underfunds the formula. Florida, for example, has only been providing 55-58% of the formula in recent years. Some states prefer to use new dollars to fund new programs, such as the \$95M provided to the Board of Governors for Centers of Excellence, World Class Scholars, and Research and Economic Development Funds, than to fully fund their formulas.

As part of any new covenant with the legislature, the Board of Governors has to have more funding levels to influence universities to place high priority on state needs. Currently, the legislature provides a direct appropriation to each University, not necessarily based on the Board of Governors' budget request. This, in many ways, makes the formula presently more of an academic exercise. However, if the state and the Board of Governors could jointly develop and honor a new formula, plus funded programs (such as the Centers of Excellence), much could be accomplished.

The formula would need to be fundamentally different than the current formula, developed in 2004, that essentially:

- Left the existing base budgets of universities intact.
- Funded incremental enrollment growth.
- Provided funding for program level (lower, upper, Grad I, Grad II, Grad III), adjusted by University group (A, B, C).
- Did not distinguish by program cost or program need.
- Included components for research, public support, library staffing, university support, student financial aid, student services, academic advising, tuition waivers, remedial education, library resources, offsetting inflation, technology support/resources, branch campuses, regional campuses, IFAS, health sciences.

Virtually all the components of the current model are inputs. While not unreasonable, since the inputs influence costs, this focus on inputs provides little opportunity to reward outputs. Performance-based budgeting has been tried in other states, most radically in South Carolina, but with limited results. So a new formula would need to establish a reasonable percentage that would be dedicated to outputs (for example, 5-10%) and would likely need to be phased in. This formula funding, then, would be complemented by targeted funding for state/Board of Governors initiatives that would be appropriated directly to the Board of Governors for allocation. The key output components for one or both types of funding would include:

Undergraduate Graduation Rates

While most formulas, including Florida's, fund enrollments, few (if any) provide any reward based on retention and graduation rates. Florida's universities have shown overall improvement in these rates in recent years and compare reasonably favorably to national and regional rates, at least in retention rates. Such comparisons have limitations because

of state differences, however. For example, Florida has a much higher percentage of its students in the lower division in community colleges than the national averages. Therefore, retention rates and graduation rates are likely going to be higher than national averages in universities because students most at risk for not being retained or graduating are disproportionately in the community colleges, although it is probable that the universities also have initiatives that contribute to these rates.

The Board of Governors, then, should establish its own goals for retention, four-year graduation rates, and six-year graduation rates. The current rates are as follows:

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Freshman-Sophomore Retention</u>	<u>Four-Year Graduation Rate</u>	<u>Six-Year Graduation Rate</u>
FAMU	81.0%	12.5%	41.9%
FAU	75.8%	16.0%	36.5%
FGCU	75.7%	20.6%	34.0%
FIU	86.0%	20.0%	47.7%
FSU	89.0%	46.1%	67.5%
NCF	85.3%	44.7%	N/A
UCF	83.9%	32.6%	57.1%
UF	94.8%	55.0%	78.7%
UNF	77.1%	21.2%	44.3%
USF	84.3%	21.0%	48.0%
UWF	75.6%	22.0%	40.7%

The retention rates appear to be reasonably high, with no institution below 75%, most above 80% (SREB average 84%), and one (the University of Florida) at 95% (which would compare favorably with the best institutions, public or independent, in the nation.) For some reason, the “yield” into graduates seems low with only one institution graduating at least half of its students in four years and with seven of the ten institutions (NCF does not yet have a reported six-year cohort) not even graduating half of their students in six years. Based on these data, the BOG may wish to place the highest “reward” priority on six-year graduation rates.

In establishing the goals, the Board of Governors should use a sophisticated methodology rather than a simplistic one. Mission differences, student mix differences, and multiple other factors (many beyond an institution’s influence) impact retention and graduation rates. Because of this reality, an ideal methodology looks at predicted retention and graduation rates based on the characteristics of the students. So, for example, on face value, a university with an 85% retention rate appears to be outperforming one with an 80% retention rate. However, if the former’s predicted rate is 90% and the latter’s is 75%, one has a much better sense of “value added” or “value lost.” So a funding formula could provide, for example, an extra factor per FTE to an institution for every percentage point it was over its predicted retention and graduation rates.

State High Need Programs

A number of states have provided additional funding to their universities to respond to high state need programs, such as teacher education, nursing, and allied health fields. Quite often these programs have high costs related to accreditation requirements and faculty and facility needs, so it helps when the state (and entities like hospitals, clinics, and schools) become partners in increased production of graduates. Typically, this funding targets aspects of a program or is limited to a certain number of years rather than being placed in the base budget or being part of the funding formula, since professional programs often have cycles of need (for example, nursing programs were being reduced in the early 1990's). Georgia's Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (ICAPP), for example, provides short-term revolving funding to targeted areas, most recently nursing and previously technology. This approach resulted in an additional 1,000 nursing graduates.

Providing program expansion support, however, does not guarantee enrollment and graduation increases. Student interests and choices play a crucial role. Many of these careers are rewarding, yet very challenging; many have relatively low compensation levels. At one time, nursing and teaching were among the few professional careers open to women. Today, female students can aspire to every profession and have even become the majority in some traditionally male-dominated programs like veterinary medicine. So states have discovered that they need multiple strategies to fill certain occupations, including importing graduates from other states and countries. While Florida has a modest forgivable loan program in teacher education, it could benefit from expanding both the scope and scale of the program, including to other fields. The return on investment would be considerable.

SUS should also commit to creating accelerated degree programs and "second" degree programs in these fields (including extensive use of distance learning technology). For example, some students with liberal arts degrees might be interested in earning a second degree in computing if such a degree could be earned within 12 months. The state could then provide a substantial forgivable loan (say \$10,000-15,000), sufficient for the student to live on while taking an intensive degree program. Students would be required to work a specified number of years in their field in Florida with a percentage of the loan forgiven each year.

In addition to revising the formula to incentivize the universities, the BOG could also consider disincentivizing. For example, Ohio plans to address its duplication of Ph.D.'s by determining not whether an institution can continue to offer that Ph.D., but by whether it will continue to receive formula funding to do so if it is not regarded as a state need program.

State Investment in Research

The Board of Governors should continue to receive and to seek funds to benefit the economic development of the state. It would be helpful to the Board if the state developed a coherent economic development strategy built, in part, around its universities research strengths. A number of states have had success with such targeted efforts, including innovation models: Arizona (Biodesign Institute), California (California Institutes for Science and Innovation), Georgia (Research Alliance), New York (NYSTAR and nanotechnology), and North Carolina (Millennium Campus at Kannapolis). Florida certainly has had success in attracting some high-profile, research-based activity (Scripps, Torrey Pines, SRI and Burnham), and so has the potential to attract further opportunities if there is a clear plan and strategy; if there are partnerships and collaborations between business and universities; and if there are targeted state investment. Enterprise Florida has recognized this need.

The 2006 Florida legislative session did indeed result in targeted state investment with the creation of the 21st Century Technology, Research, and Scholarship Enhancement Act that established three programs:

- 21st Century Centers of Excellence Program (\$30M)
- 21st Century World Class Scholars Program (\$20M)
- SUS Research and Economic Development Investment Program (\$45M)

These programs do appear to draw from “best practices” in other states, including: the requirement for matching dollars so as to leverage state investment; the focus on statewide economic development strategies, such as economic clusters; the emphasis on distinguished faculty in STEM fields; and an encouragement of innovation and entrepreneurship. The challenge, of course, will be sustaining the effort (especially with substantial funding over consecutive budget cycles) in the face of severe competition from other states, many of whom have been at this for longer than Florida has. It will also be critical to have an external review of both the allocation process and the results of each program. The former review should take place prior to the next round of allocations, and the latter should take place after a reasonable period of results (for example, three years).

The Board of Governors also has to resolve a complex mission question: how many comprehensive research universities does Florida need? With a declared intent to develop “World Class” universities, the Board of Governors, in partnership with the local boards of trustees, has to assess the resource capacity of the state to support world class research universities. Currently, the data suggest that Florida has one significant national class research university: the University of Florida. Admittedly these data come out of the University of Florida. However, its reports from TheCenter have wide currency in the higher education research community.

While one could debate each of TheCenter's nine measures (and they certainly have some bias towards large research universities), most higher education observers would agree with the rankings (which are done in groups rather than absolute rankings). The University of Florida sits in the second grouping with the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, the University of Texas-Austin, and the University of Washington-Seattle, all of whom are distinguished company. The basis for the rankings is the number of the nine items that the university ranks in the top 25. The University of Florida has eight items in the top 25 (the only exception being the number of faculty in the national academy, 30th). Interestingly, though, it has only one item in the top 10 (number of doctorates). Florida has no other research university in the top 50. Apart from California, where the fabled UC System has eight institutions in the top 50, most large states have two-three institutions in the top 50. That would seem to be a reasonable expectation for Florida.

This does not mean that research should not be part of the mission of all SUS institutions, with some having significant research, particularly in niche areas. Many of the top faculty today are attracted to institutions that have a significant research mission, although institutions like New College are also attractive to superb faculty. There is no indication, without a seismic change in state policy, that the resources will be available to support a substantial number of comprehensive research universities. The combination of low tuition, already relatively high state support, and leveling federal research dollars makes building "World Class" research universities in Florida a real challenge.

3. Expand Access to Distance Education Degrees

Distance Education has experienced an interesting evolution in the last decade, a period in which many anticipated a revolution (Drucker, for example, predicted the demise of the residential campus). Early efforts to create massive, stand-alone electronic campuses faltered with even high-profile efforts by the U.K.'s Open University to enter the U. S. market failing. Some institutions, most notably, Phoenix University (now the nation's largest private university with, according to some, a higher capitalization than Harvard University), have made good strategic use of distance education. Internet-based instruction (often called e-learning) has opened up new possibilities and, within the long-term timeframe of forming a state blueprint, Florida should explore further what role e-learning can play.

To date, SUS institutions have been, to varying levels, quite active in providing distance education. Data comparisons between states are notoriously suspect with distance education because of the lack of standard definitions (what exactly constitutes distance education?), the lack of standard data points (duplicated or unduplicated enrollment?), and the lack of accuracy (Florida's latest report, for example, cites several previous data errors). Several general conclusions can be reached, however:

- SUS institutions appear to offer a high number of courses by distance education.

- Relative to some other states, SUS institutions offer few undergraduate degrees 19: (Georgia has 36; North Carolina 97) by distance education.
- SUS appears to have leveled or even declined in distance education enrollment, course sections, and credit hours generated at a time when most states are experiencing significant growth. (Georgia, for example, experienced a 19% increase in course sections, 25% increase in enrollments, and a 24% increase in credit hours between FY05 and FY06.)
- SUS has seen a steady increase in students pursuing their studies exclusively through distance education (from 1,511 in 1997-98 to 9,061 in 2003-04, with over 7,000 of those being degree-seeking students).
- Approximately 92% of SUS students taking distance education courses are also taking on-campus courses.
- SUS institutions offer no collaborative distance education degree.

The Board of Governors has no distance education policy, planning, or support systems in place. Even though distance education has not revolutionized higher education and will never likely replace the on-campus experience, nor will it eliminate the need to keep adding buildings, it still must be part of Florida's Blueprint for Higher Education. Any growth state that does not include distance education in its long-term planning will be missing a crucial part of the puzzle. Indeed, even with no statewide planning and no intentional strategy, SUS has 7,000 distance education-only degree-seeking students. Put another way, this is, in some ways, already the equivalent of a new campus (except the FTE will likely be low as most of these students will be part-time and already in the workforce).

The Board of Governors ought to be intentional about distance education and take a leadership role in facilitating its growth through the establishment of the Board of Governors Distance Education Consortium. This Consortium would:

- a. Be directed, subject to final authority from the Board of Governors, by a Board of Advisors primarily consisting of institution representatives. Its responsibility would be to foster the growth of planned distance education.
- b. Facilitate and incentivize collaborative distance education degrees, with special emphasis on high state need programs. The business model for distance education is fundamentally different from the business model for traditional education. With the latter, there's virtually no course development cost but high ongoing costs because of the relatively small enrollment. With the former, there is very high initial cost (by some estimates one world class distance education course can cost \$1M, although

average costs would be considerably lower), but high returns because of the almost infinite number of students who can theoretically take that course.

With high cost for development, duplicative distance education courses and degrees are even more wasteful than duplicative traditional programs. It only makes sense to select certain key degrees, especially those in high state demand, and to develop them in a consortial arrangement. The University System of Georgia, for example, has an award-winning consortial MBA distance education degree offered collaboratively by five of its institutions. It also has a collaborative e-core (for general education), a web BSIT (for information technology), and a number of hybrid collaborative degrees, especially in the high demand health fields (including a Ph.D. offered by Georgia State University in collaboration with five other institutions and Doctor of Nursing Practice offered by the Medical College of Georgia at eight other colleges and universities in the state). **An effective system of higher education is one where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.** Collaborative degrees are a powerful tool in that model. Such distance education collaborative degrees can:

- Reduce development costs.
- Increase resource sharing across institutions.
- Provide consistency in course design and curriculum.
- Insure uniform infrastructure and services.
- Permit a consistent framework for e-tuition.
- Provide flexibility for students.

The Board of Governors, through its Distance Education Consortium, should develop a strategic plan for the degrees to be offered in a collaborative distance education format, including the general education component. To extend the fact and spirit of collaboration even further, the Distance Education Consortium might include some independent colleges and universities where they have unique contributions to make and the community college system for developing a collaborative general education program.

The end result could be the equivalent to a virtual university with select programs, yet with all the instruction coming from and the degrees being offered by the current institutions (as well as by the new state college system institutions). While the Board of Governors implements this model, it can observe the outcome of a bold experiment being launched by the University of Illinois System.

Long a leader in on-line education (through U of I Online), the University of Illinois plans to take a quantum leap with its University of Illinois Global Campus with a number of unique features. It will:

- be organized as a for-profit Limited Liability Company.

- utilize tenured faculty from its three existing institutions but will become a separately accredited institution with the UI system within four years.
- be open to new cohorts of students every four weeks, twelve months a year, with almost unlimited access to a qualified student.
- cost approximately \$20M to start-up with a break-even goal by year three and generating a profit by year five.

This model may or may not be successful but is being launched by a highly-respected major University System after significant strategic planning and will be worth watching for possible adoption or adaptation.

- c. Once the Distance Learning Consortium has established its credibility through one or more collaborative degrees and through the development of a strategic plan (which, among other things, would cite the degrees to be developed either collaboratively or through institutions), the Board of Governors should submit a budget initiative to the legislature. The focus of these degrees would be high state need programs and the budget initiative would include both course and faculty development funding. The budget request should include an analysis of potential cost-avoidance from expanding the percentage of students in Florida who earn their degrees exclusively through e-learning.
- d. The Distance Education Consortium should also be responsible for packaging and marketing distance education degrees. This marketing would, in the instance of individual institutional degrees, complement the institutional marketing. The consortium would have primary responsibility for marketing the collaborative degrees in partnership with the participating institutions. The reason for consolidating the marketing effort is to give students a single point of information. The Consortium should also explore whether it should provide a single point of entry to programs through a portal (for application, admission, payment, advising, and so on).
- e. The Distance Education Consortium could provide economies of scale for faculty development and training, perhaps on a regional basis. An annual distance education conference and periodic regional workshops would be of considerable benefit and would also provide a consistency of service.
- f. The Distance Education Consortium should work with the institutions, with state legislative leadership, and with national/regional organizations to develop an e-learning tuition rate. Organizations like the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) have advocated an e-learning tuition rate for all students. Distance learning crosses state, national, and international boundaries. Old concepts like in-state and out-of-state tuition become questionable in this competitive environment. There are also cost considerations that need to be factored in because of the business model differences cited earlier.

So while the Distance Learning Revolution has not yet emerged, Florida has a considerable upside to investing more, not just dollars, but also planning and collaboration in this area. It may not be the answer to increasing access, but it is certainly one of the answers. It deserves considerable and intentional attention.

4. Include Independent Colleges and Universities in certain initiatives that expand access.

The Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida can play an increased role in providing access to undergraduate education for Florida students. While not particularly large in number or size compared to many states, these colleges and universities serve approximately 65,000 Florida students (with over 40% of those being minority students) and award over 15,000 total bachelors degrees a year. This, of course, is the equivalent of one or two large public universities. As the Business/Higher Education partnership repeatedly pointed out in its series of reports, it makes good economic sense for the state to make some targeted investment in these institutions. The state, to its credit, has steadily increased the Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) to its current level of \$3,000, which is the amount advocated by the Business/Higher Education Partnership in the late 1990's. It also provides some of the strongest financial support in the nation for its independent colleges (6th in overall funding at \$1,431 per FTE compared to the national average of \$923). So any additional investments to increase access for Florida residents should be highly targeted.

- a. The state should consider including the independent colleges and universities in the proposed expanded, forgivable loan programs (see page 26, State High Need Programs section) with both Florida and non-Florida resident students, eligible in designated high state need academic program areas. Students would need to remain in the state to work for a prescribed number of years to have their loan forgiven. The loan amount should not be tied to tuition cost.
- b. The Board of Governors should include any independent college or university that wishes to be part of its Distance Education Consortium (DEC). Wherever an independent college provides either a unique academic program or a unique part of the DEC, it should be provided course and faculty development support. For example, if the DEC decides to develop a degree in Homeland Security and one of the independent colleges has an existing unique strength in one of the units to be offered, it would be supported to put that unit in a distance format consistent with the standards of the DEC.
- c. Long-term, the state should examine whether, in very specified circumstances, it should provide capital funds to an independent college or university who could demonstrate to do so would increase significantly their capacity to serve Florida undergraduate students. Any such programs should be on a matching basis. New

Jersey, for example, another high population and high growth state with few public universities (12), provides some capital support to independent colleges.

Any independent college or university that participates in any of the new programs in (a), (b), or (c) above would be required to adopt the common course numbering system and the common prerequisite program and meet certain state accountability requirements.

This report has sought to lay out, based on our professional experience, the obstacles and opportunities that face Florida and its higher education community. The original proposal asked a number of questions that did not become the focus of this report but which deserve some commentary.

- Q.** What are the major models of system-level structure in our peer state/countries? Which have proven most successful and is there a clear relationship between structure and success?
- A.** When you've seen one higher education system, you have seen one. As Aims C. McGuinness illustrates in his "Models of Postsecondary Education Coordination and Governance in the States" (2002), the number of variations is almost infinite. There are, however, two general patterns:
- 1. Governance**
 - 2. Coordination**

The ECS 1997 "State Postsecondary Education Structures Sourcebook" lists the essential functions of a governing board as distinctive from a coordinating board.

Governing Board:

- Governing a single corporate entity, including all the rights and responsibilities of that corporation as defined by state law and encompassing all institutions within a system. Individual institutions within the board's jurisdiction usually do not have separate corporate status.
- Carrying out coordinating functions related only to the institutions with the board's jurisdiction. These functions include planning, setting a public agenda, policy analysis and problem resolution, academic program review and approval, budget development, and maintaining information and accountability.
- Developing and implementing policy.
- Advocating for the needs of the institutions under its jurisdiction to the legislature and governor.

- Appointing, setting the compensation for and evaluating both system and institutional chief executives.
- Establishing faculty personnel policies, including approving awarding of tenure and serving as the final point of appeal on faculty grievances.
- Allocating and reallocating resources between and among the institutions within its jurisdiction.
- Establishing policies for, and sometimes setting, tuition and fees, often within policies established by the governor and state legislature.

Coordinating Board (as distinguished from governing boards):

- Do not govern institutions....
- Appoint, set compensation for, and evaluate only the Coordinating Board's executive officer (usually called a Commissioner) and staff, but not the institutional chief executives. In several states, the governor is the final appointing authority for the executive but usually with recommendations from the coordinating board.
- Do not have corporate status independent of state government.
- Focus more on state and system needs and priorities than on advocating the interests of a particular institution or system of institutions.
- Plan primarily for the state postsecondary education system as a whole. In most coordinating board states, this planning includes both public and private institutions.
- May or may not review and make recommendations on budgets for the state system as a whole rather than only for one part of that system. Most coordinating boards have responsibility to implement budget policy only for funds appropriated specifically to the agency for its operations, for special initiatives or for reallocation to the institutions for performance, incentives or other purposes.
- May or may not review or approve proposals for new academic programs, and may or may not have authority to require institutions to review existing programs.
- Are not involved directly in setting or carrying out faculty personnel policies, except to carry out legislative mandates for studies of issues such as faculty workload and productivity or tenure policy.

A governing board, by its very nature, has considerably more authority and leadership capacity than a coordinating board. The key levers for that authority and leadership tend to be:

- its separate corporate (or in some instances constitutional) status, which provides the Board a degree of political independence.
- its ability to hire a Chancellor and institutional Presidents.
- its capacity to allocate and reallocate resources.

A coordinating board, by its very nature, often has closer links to the Governor and legislature. It is also often regulatory in its functions and limited in the levers available to it, with academic program approval often being the primary authority.

Florida presents a unique case. It has the constitutional authority of a governing board but, because of past actions of delegation to the institutional boards of trustees, acts more as a coordinating board. This hybrid creates considerable ambiguity that will not easily be resolved. Furthermore, the political energy needed to resolve governance issues could prove to be yet another distraction from the key matters of access and excellence.

The simple answer to the question is that no pattern emerges of one structure that provides more success than another.

Proponents of a single consolidated system (all higher education under one board and Chancellor) can point to the success of the University of Wisconsin System. Proponents of a sector system (separate state boards for different types of institutions) can point to the three California systems. Proponents of individually governed institutions with a state coordinating board can point to Virginia. Proponents of a state governing board with shared responsibility with local Boards of Trustees can point to North Carolina. Proponents of individually governed institutions with no state governing or coordinating board can point to Michigan (which actually has elected boards). All these states have one or more world class universities, yet each is structured very differently. Leadership, context, resources, and vision all count for more than structure.

While a number of other countries, especially in Europe, have had success in overtaking the United States in participation in higher education, they have done so as part of a national policy initiative. Very few countries operate in as decentralized a higher education environment as does the U.S. with its state by state based policies and structures. The federal government can influence state directions through, for example, its financial aid policies and funding and through its research priorities and funding. However, as the recent Spelling's Commission demonstrated, the federal government has limited policy leverage. On the positive side, the decentralized approach results in the rich diversity of institutions, including a far greater number of distinguished independent

universities than most countries have. On the negative side, the decentralized approach limits national consistency.

Interestingly, many of the international initiatives have borrowed extensively from the U.S. experience. For example, participation rates were increased in some countries by increasing faculty productivity to closer to U.S. levels. Resources have been increased by introducing a version of tuition (“top-up fees”) for the first time and encouraging organized fundraising for the first time. The massive European transfer of credits project also borrows from the U.S.

While it is no time to be complacent, especially with the emergence of massive commitments to higher education in places like China, the U.S. higher education “system” remains much envied and imitated. It continues to draw students in enormous numbers from around the world (and distinguished faculty) and continues to have very highly-ranked institutions in recent international rankings.

One interesting international initiative worth following is the United Kingdom’s conversion of its polytechnics into universities, again accomplished at the national level, in its efforts to accelerate the participation of its population in higher education and to increase dramatically the number of universities and the number of bachelor degrees. Some researchers draw parallels (and resultant cautions) between this expansion of mission and the expansion of mission of some U.S. community colleges to include bachelors degrees.

On the whole, however, Florida should not expect that any other state or nation can provide a structural model that can simply be adopted and that will guarantee success. It can look to other states and nations for certain programmatic best practices, but in the final analysis the best overall solutions for Florida will be those that fill its own context and that respond to its own unique future challenges.

This report identifies many of those challenges and offers a starting point for the discussions that must result this time in a concerted effort to increase and equalize educational opportunities in Florida. If the state’s economy is to be further transformed from its historical emphasis on tourism and many low-wage jobs into a rich and diverse economy that takes advantage of Florida’s “gateway to international” location, takes advantage, through education, of its diverse population, and connects that economic future to the intellectual capital that exists in its universities then there will need to be a level of cooperation and stewardship never seen before in the state. The Blueprint offers an approach to increasing access to bachelors degrees, for example, that cuts across several sectors of higher education to establish a new state college system. The Blueprint also calls for the legislature to work with the Board of Governors to establish new funding approaches to support state needs. Distance Education expansion with the

possible inclusion of community colleges and independent colleges and universities, also calls for new partnerships. Finally, the Blueprint suggests a modest expansion of the role of the independent colleges and universities in educating Florida students. All of these suggestions depend on expanding collaboration rather than on establishing new entities or new governance structures.

As Governor Crist said in his inaugural address: “Our challenge: To recognize our common future, our common destiny. To understand that we are stronger in cooperation than in competition. That the work we need to do, we can only do together.” Without the cooperation of many parties, within and external to higher education, this report will join the many others cited on some lonely faraway shelf. With cooperation and leadership from a number of key individuals and organizations, this report can be a catalyst for creative and constructive change. Florida deserves nothing less.

APPENDIX A

Required Documentation

**ENROLLMENT DIVERSITY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
(FALL 2006 PRELIMINARY HEADCOUNTS)**

	TOTAL	UNDERGRAD	GRADUATE	UNCLASSIFIED
GRAND TOTAL	292,403	227,626	51,825	12,952
FEMALE	57.1%	56.9%	57.4%	59.3%
MALE	42.9%	43.1%	42.5%	40.3%
WHITE	58.6%	58.5%	60.2%	54.7%
BLACK (NON-HISP)	13.8%	14.8%	9.6%	13.1%
HISPANIC	16.9%	18.2%	11.0%	17.9%
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	4.7%	4.8%	4.5%	4.4%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
NON-RESIDENT ALIEN	3.8%	1.6%	12.8%	5.5%
UNKNOWN RACE	1.7%	1.6%	1.7%	4.1%
PART-TIME	28.3%	22.8%	40.1%	79.5%
FULL-TIME	71.7%	77.2%	59.9%	20.5%
OUT-OF-STATE	8.6%	5.6%	21.2%	11.6%

Office of Data Analysis and Institutional Research, Division of Colleges and Universities, 2007-01-10 System Structure Data Appendix.xls

Commentary

When examining SUS student diversity, several data points exist, including in comparison to the general population (least relevant), to the 18-24 age population (more relevant), and to high school graduates (most relevant). In all three categories, SUS “underperforms” the data points. There are fewer Black students overall (13.8%) and at the undergraduate level (14.8%) than high school graduates (18.6%), 18-24 years olds (21.2%), and in the general population (15.5%). The same pattern is true for Hispanic students, SUS overall (16.9%) and undergraduate (18.2%) compared to high school graduates (19.0%), 18-24 year olds (21.9%), and general population (19.1%).

However, on another level, the “performance” is quite impressive when one considers the significant proportion of students who begin their higher education at the community colleges (which tend to serve high percentages of minority and lower income students). It also appears that SUS must be “capturing” a significant proportion of high-performing minority students since the average SAT scores for minority groups fall far below the average SAT scores at most SUS institutions, although more analysis would be needed to confirm this.

The “warning” signs in these data, that confirm the earlier comments in the report, include the shifting demographics, and the continuing participation gap. For example, whites currently constitute 62.9% of the general population, but only 53.6% of the 18-24 age group, and 57.9% of the high school graduates, and 58.6% of the SUS participation (essentially a “positive” gap of plus 0.7). Yet Blacks have 18.6% of the high school graduates, but only 13.8% of the SUS participation (a minus 4.8%). Hispanics have 19.0% of the high school graduates, but only 16.9% of the SUS participation (a minus 2.1%). As these percentages shift to higher proportions of Black and Hispanic high school graduates, which seems certain when one compares even the present contrast between general population and 18-24 year olds, any continuation of this participation gap will present serious educational, economic, and social challenges for Florida.

SUS DEGREES AWARDED, ALL LEVELS AND INSTITUTIONS, BY BROAD PROGRAM AREA (2-DIGIT CIP CODE)

	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
Total	34,564	36,591	38,801	39,950	41,424	43,077	44,431	46,154	46,742	47,825	48,956	52,306	54,863	58,554	59,771	61,215
BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT	23.1%	22.9%	22.1%	20.9%	20.1%	18.8%	19.1%	19.3%	20.4%	21.1%	22.0%	23.0%	24.1%	23.7%	22.7%	21.9%
EDUCATION	17.5%	16.9%	17.0%	16.3%	16.2%	16.6%	16.6%	16.7%	16.4%	14.8%	13.0%	13.1%	12.5%	11.7%	11.2%	10.7%
HEALTH PROFESSIONS & REL. SCI.	6.5%	6.7%	7.1%	7.4%	7.9%	8.7%	9.3%	9.9%	10.1%	10.4%	10.5%	9.7%	9.0%	9.0%	9.6%	9.9%
SOCIAL SCIENCES	8.2%	8.3%	7.9%	8.0%	7.9%	7.9%	7.6%	7.2%	6.8%	6.6%	6.7%	6.8%	7.4%	7.8%	8.0%	8.2%
ENGINEERING	6.9%	6.6%	6.9%	7.0%	7.6%	7.5%	6.9%	6.5%	6.7%	6.5%	6.3%	6.4%	6.4%	7.1%	6.6%	6.2%
PSYCHOLOGY	4.6%	5.0%	4.9%	5.5%	5.7%	5.7%	5.5%	5.6%	5.4%	5.3%	5.3%	5.4%	5.4%	5.4%	5.6%	5.7%
MASS COMMUNICATIONS	5.5%	5.1%	4.9%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	3.9%	4.2%	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.5%
LIFE SCIENCES	2.2%	2.3%	2.3%	2.6%	2.9%	3.2%	3.5%	3.3%	3.0%	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	2.7%	2.8%	3.0%	3.4%
LETTERS	3.3%	3.5%	3.5%	3.4%	3.6%	3.4%	3.3%	3.3%	3.2%	3.2%	3.2%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%	3.3%	3.3%
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS	2.1%	2.5%	2.5%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.9%	3.0%	2.8%	3.1%	3.1%	3.3%	3.2%
PROTECTIVE SERVICES	1.8%	2.3%	2.5%	2.6%	2.6%	2.7%	2.8%	2.5%	2.5%	2.6%	2.6%	2.8%	2.6%	2.7%	2.9%	3.0%
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION & SERVICE	2.2%	2.2%	2.7%	3.1%	3.1%	2.9%	3.1%	3.4%	3.0%	2.9%	2.9%	2.5%	2.5%	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%
LIBERAL/GENERAL STUDIES	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	2.0%	2.2%	2.2%
COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCE	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	2.5%	2.9%	2.6%	2.7%	2.5%	2.5%	2.1%
LAW	2.3%	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%
HISTORY	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%
PHYSICAL SCIENCES	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%
HOME ECONOMICS/HUMAN SCIENCES	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%
PARKS/RECREATN/LEISURE/FITNESS	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	1.1%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
AGRIBUSINESS & AGRIC. PRODUCTN	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%
ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONM DESIGN	1.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%
LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
MATHEMATICS	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%

