

INDEX OF MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF EDUCATION  
MIAMI PALMETTO SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
MIAMI, FLORIDA  
JULY 23-24, 2001

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS .....	1
2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA, CHAIRMAN'S REPORT .....	2
3. SECRETARY'S REPORT .....	2
4. EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN FLORIDA .....	2
5. LEGAL GUIDELINES FOR BOARD MEMBERS, SUNSHINE LAWS, MEETINGS, OPEN RECORDS .....	3
6. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FLORIDA BOARD .....	4
7. EDUCATION IN FLORIDA, PUBLIC SYSTEMS, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES .....	5
8. INDEPENDENT EDUCATION, HOME EDUCATION, K-12 SCHOOLS, POSTSECONDARY CAREER EDUCATION, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES .....	6
9. THE WORK AHEAD, GUIDING PRINCIPLES .....	7
10. FLORIDA BOARD MEMBERS' ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	12
11. PERSONNEL DISCUSSION .....	13
12. DELIVERY SYSTEM ACTION ITEMS .....	14
13. COMMUNITY COLLEGE OPERATING BUDGETS .....	17
14. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAM HIGHLIGHT-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SERVICES .....	18
15. PLANNING BOARD PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES .....	18
16. CLOSING REMARKS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR FRANK BROGAN .....	20
17. ADJOURNMENT .....	20

MINUTES  
FLORIDA BOARD OF EDUCATION  
MIAMI PALMETTO SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
MIAMI, FLORIDA  
JULY 23-24, 2001

The Chairman, F. Philip Handy, convened the inaugural meeting of the Florida Board of Education in the Auditorium, Miami Palmetto Senior High School, Miami, Florida, at 9:00 a.m., July 23, 2001, with the following members present:

Linda J. Eads  
T. Willard Fair  
Charles P. García  
Julia L. Johnson  
William Proctor  
Carolyn K. Roberts

Members of the staff present were:

Jim Horne, Secretary  
John Winn, Assistant Secretary  
Lauren Cain, Director, Communications  
Georgia McKeown  
Laura Butler

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Handy welcomed members of the Board, staff and guests to Miami Palmetto Senior High School, noting that Dr. Linda Eads, a member of the Board, was a graduate. Ms. Janet Hupp, Principal of Miami Palmetto Senior High School, welcomed members of the Board to Miami Palmetto, an "A" school in Florida with a proud history.

The Board received greetings from Mr. Roger Cuevas, Superintendent, Miami-Dade County Public Schools, and from Ms. Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair of the School Board, Miami-Dade County.

Mr. Handy invited each member of the Board to comment. Each Board member described his or her interest in, and commitment to, excellence in education in Florida.

Commissioner Crist also addressed the Board on this exciting opportunity to reform education in Florida. He said that this Board of Education had the opportunity to shape all of education in Florida.

2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA, CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Handy said that as the inaugural meeting of the Board, the Agenda for this meeting was shaped to provide a framework for the members about education in Florida. He asked Mr. Horne to develop a policy for the Board with regard to public participation in the work of the Board. He said he certainly hoped this Board could provide a vision and a strategy for education in Florida to include accountability standards. He said he envisioned that the Board would provide the "big picture" for education in Florida. Mr. Handy admonished the Board members that they should not worry if they were not perfect; if they were perfect, there would be no opportunity to learn from their mistakes. He advised the Board members not to be afraid to make mistakes.

3. SECRETARY'S REPORT

Secretary Horne said that this was an exciting time to be at the helm of education in Florida. He introduced some members of his new staff, including Mr. John Winn, Assistant Secretary; Mrs. Georgia McKeown, Chief of Staff; Mr. Larry Wood, Budget Director; Ms. Lauren Cain, Director of Communications; and Ms. Carol Jinks and Ms. Laura Butler, Staff Assistants. He said that the office was located on the 16<sup>th</sup> floor of the Turlington Building, in Tallahassee.

Mr. Horne provided a background for this new Board. The voters had approved a Constitutional Amendment in 1998 creating a new and seamless system of education. He said that the Board members shared with him high expectations for performance and the opportunity for excellence. He said that Florida was known for taking on the tough issues. He said the fundamental premises for this Board would be first, that student learning was not confined to isolated delivery systems; and second, there would be accountability in an effective governance structure. He said that 25 states were watching Florida in creating this seamless system based on student needs, not system needs.

4. EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN FLORIDA

Mr. Winn described the background and the history leading to this new Board. He said that only ten months earlier, the Education Governance Transition Task Force had begun to address the structure for education, where it was and how it would be reorganized in this new system. He described how this new Florida Board of Education would be responsible for all of education and all the delivery

systems. He described the Blue Ribbon Commission, the legislation from the 2000 Session which prescribed the work of the Transition Task Force, and SB 1162 adopted by the 2001 Legislature, signed by the Governor in June, creating the current framework. The guiding principles for education in Florida would be that education delivery would be seamless and student centered with clear lines of accountability. He explained that in the next several months, the task for the Florida Board would be to develop a unified K-20 budget, to reorganize the Department of Education, and to rewrite the Florida School Code. In developing this system, Mr. Winn said the goal would be that every child could always be properly placed in any "sector."

Mr. Fair suggested that all the materials from the Florida Board of Education include the mission statement and the guiding principles. Mr. Horne commented that in terms of a seamless system, this was more than just interlocking the pieces. He said that this Board would be blending the responsibilities of three distinct and separate delivery systems, and the Board would take the best from each delivery system.

5. LEGAL GUIDELINES FOR BOARD MEMBERS, SUNSHINE LAWS, MEETINGS, OPEN RECORDS

Ms. Pat Gleason, General Counsel for the Attorney General's Office, described the requirements in Florida of the Open Meetings and Sunshine laws. She explained that meetings of a public board in Florida needed to be open meetings to the public, noticed, with minutes. She described that a meeting was any gathering of two or more members to discuss any matter on which foreseeable action was to be taken. The Agenda included materials describing these requirements, including the sanctions and penalties for violations of the Sunshine Law. She also described the Open Records provision that made a public record of any materials that were made or received by members of the Board. These materials were subject to public disclosure unless specifically exempted by Florida Statute.

Mr. García inquired about the opportunity for a Board member to participate on a task force. Ms. Gleason responded that a single member could engage in fact finding and information gathering. Mr. Handy suggested that requests for information from Board members be coordinated through the Secretary's Office so that all Board members would receive the same information. In addition, he suggested that the Office should coordinate the activities of Board members, e.g., speaking invitations.

6. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FLORIDA BOARD

Mr. Handy explained that the seven guiding principles for the Florida Board of Education could be described by the following terms: accountability, excellence, merit, competition, devolution, student-centered, and seamless. He explained the role of the Secretary of Education who would appoint the three Chancellors and the Executive Director of Independent Education. He noted that the Type II transfer transferred the responsibilities of the Board of Regents and of the State Board of Community Colleges to the Florida Board of Education.

Mr. Handy said the rules of the Board of Regents were also transferred to the Florida Board of Education. The rules could be amended and were, by statute, subject to the approval of the State Board of Education. He said the Articulation Coordinating Committee was in place as a vehicle to resolve disputes between the universities and the community colleges. Mr. Handy suggested that it would be helpful to have information on the articulation between the systems; the Articulation Coordinating Committee might no longer be needed. He described the reorganization of the Department of Education and that service functions, i.e., legal, technology, personnel, etc., would cover all four of the individual sectors. Responsibility for independent education would be through the Executive Director; the other three sector heads would be Chancellors.

Mr. García said it was important to ensure both accountability and responsiveness. Mr. Fair commented that the different nomenclature might create a problem. Mr. Horne responded that there was sensitivity to those institutions that were not within the public sector, but while maintaining their autonomy, they wanted to be at the table. He said it would be important to maintain the balance between autonomy and regulation.

Dr. Eads inquired whether all sectors would have the same opportunity for access. Mr. Horne responded that all would have equal access to the members of the Florida Board. He noted that there was not consensus about the extent to which government regulation was sought. In thinking about the tasks for the Florida Board of Education, Mr. Handy suggested that this Board should review the 11 mission statements of the universities and the 28 mission statements of the community colleges. The law also required performance-based funding for the education entities.

To implement the reorganization, the law put in place a group to include the Secretary of Education and the heads of the four sectors within the Department, the Chancellors of the universities, of community colleges, of K-12, and the Executive Director of Independent Education. Mr. Horne said this group had not yet met.

Mr. Handy identified the major tasks to be accomplished, as follows: the creation of the unified K-20 budget, the reorganization of the department and the rewrite of the school code. Ms. Johnson inquired about these tasks and where the recommendations would be made. Mr. Horne commented that, as Secretary, he would bring these recommendations on reorganization to this Board, which would then be presented to the State Board of Education. He noted that the statute established specific functions to be performed within the sectors; there may need to be further statutory revision to specify additional responsibilities. Mr. Handy noted that the initiative rested with this Board. Mr. García commented that it was important also to recognize the other dollars which were coming into education, such as federal funding and grants. He noted that the institutions should be required to fully disclose their sources of funds.

7. EDUCATION IN FLORIDA, PUBLIC SYSTEMS, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES

Ms. Betty Coxe, Deputy Director of the Florida Department of Education, described public education in Florida for students in the K-12 system. She said that public education for kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade was organized by the 67 school districts in the state. She described the Sunshine State Standards, the FCAT test and accountability. She noted that the Division of Blind Services had been added to the Department of Education in January 2001 and the Department had become responsible for the Vocational Rehabilitation program in June 2000.

Mr. García commented that in the information provided, it was hard to determine whether or not the schools were efficient. He said that perhaps they needed some efficiency ratios, such as the ratio of administrative staff to teachers. He emphasized that the members of the Board might need data to be able to set guidelines or benchmarks.

Mr. David Armstrong, Executive Director, Division of Community Colleges, provided an overview of the 28 community colleges in Florida. He described the community colleges and their role. He said that SB 1162 created an opportunity at St. Petersburg College, formerly St. Petersburg Community College, to offer a limited number of baccalaureate offerings. In response to a question about full-time equivalency, Mr. Armstrong commented that a full-time student, for purposes of the funding formula, was a student taking 40 credit hours. In response to a question about fee-setting at the community colleges, Mr. Armstrong responded that the community colleges were given authority to set a fee greater or less within a range specified by the Legislature. Mr. Armstrong said that in looking at high school graduates going into the community colleges, at least 60 percent needed at least one remedial course. He noted that if students did not take algebra in their high school curriculum, they would probably need some form of remediation.

Ms. Loretta Costin, Director, Division of Workforce Development in the Department of Education, and Mr. Lanny Larson, Deputy Executive Director, Workforce Development, Division of Community Colleges, explained workforce development education. Ms. Costin noted that in terms of workforce development programs in secondary education, 29 percent of those students moved on to the State University System, and 60 percent moved on to community colleges.

Dr. Blackwell, Acting Chancellor, Division of Colleges and Universities, explained the state universities to the members of the Board. He said with the Type II transfer the Florida Board of Education was now in place of the Board of Regents for purposes of approving the operating budget, the facilities plans, tenure nominations, collective bargaining agreements, new degree programs, and lobbying activities. He described the enrollment and size of Florida's public universities. Mr. Horne commented that in the costs of university education, the State supported almost 75 percent of the cost; 98 to 99 percent of the students enrolled at the University of Florida and at Florida State University were Bright Futures Scholarship recipients.

8. INDEPENDENT EDUCATION, HOME EDUCATION, K-12 SCHOOLS, POSTSECONDARY CAREER EDUCATION, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The members of the Board heard from Mr. Patrick Heffernan, President, Floridians for School Choice. He said that the purpose of his group was to facilitate education for the learners, and to shift the focus from those providing the schools to those providing the students. He said that solutions were not just answered by the public sector, but also with private sector participation.

Ms. Brenda Dickinson, President, Home Education Foundation, described home education in Florida. About one percent of all children in Florida were home educated; no state dollars were provided for this education.

Mr. Skardon Bliss, Executive Director, Florida Council of Independent Schools, and President, Florida Association of Academic Non-public Schools, described the group which served as an umbrella for the non-public schools. He noted that approximately 12 percent attended non-public or non-government schools.

Mr. Cecil Kidd, Executive Director, Florida Association of Postsecondary Schools and Colleges, described the independent postsecondary career schools. He said that this included some 600 institutions representing 150,000 students.

Mr. George Kirkpatrick, Executive Director, Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, described the 27 ICUF schools in Florida which were four-

year SACS accredited not-for-profit schools. He noted that 43 percent of Florida residents receiving the Florida Resident Access Grant were minorities. He said in structuring education, these institutions were partners with the Florida Board of Education. He admonished the members of the Board that as they moved from process to outcome, that they should not flinch.

9. THE WORK AHEAD, GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A. Development of a Coordinated Budget

Secretary Horne said that the staff of the Florida Board of Education had three major tasks ahead: the development of a K-20 coordinated budget; revising the Florida school code; and reorganizing the Department of Education. Mr. Horne said it was somewhat backwards to work on the budget before the Board had adopted a strategic vision or plan, but that in terms of the prescribed state deadlines, the Board needed to recommend its budget by August 31. He said he wanted to construct a coordinated budget, and one that was realistic for Legislators. He said that in his past experience, the budgets presented from the Department of Education had been almost irrelevant. He said that the education sectors had traditionally presented a wish list which the Legislators had reviewed, but had then developed their own budgets. He said that the Florida Board of Education would be the ultimate arbiter of the budget, and would have to vote on its budget at its next meeting. He said he hoped in the next budget cycle to follow a different course.

Mr. Larry Wood, Director of Budgets for the Florida Board of Education, described the process for developing the FBOE budget. He described the current appropriations and the expected expenditures. He noted that there would be fewer dollars next year in non-recurring revenue. He described the revenue sources for education. In the past year, K-12 had received 68 percent of the total education budget, the community colleges had received 6 percent of the budget, and the State University System had received 14 percent of the budget.

Mr. Horne noted that funding was provided to the three systems in three different ways; that created fragmentation. He said that K-12 was appropriated on a per student basis, and the SUS was funded on the basis of enrollment. He said that as they built a coordinated budget, the staff would have to figure out ways to mesh these different appropriation methodologies. Mr. Horne said the budget created an awkward situation this year because there had not been six months to construct this new budget. He said that in terms of the new budget, in order to have credibility, it would have to be done

a new way. In its budget guidelines, the Florida Board would need to move in a fundamentally different direction. He noted that as a part of the rewrite of the school code, the Florida education funding formula would have to be rewritten. He observed that the cultures and the missions of the sectors were different, but that there would be economies of scale in creating this coordinated budget. He said that he intended to visit each Board member to help them understand the budget process.

Dr. Proctor sought clarification on the types of funding. Mr. Horne responded that the K-12 sector was funded per student; the community colleges were funded on the basis of previous enrollment; the SUS was funded based on a determination of the enrollment to be funded plus additional issues; and independents were funded, if at all, through the Florida Resident Access Grant.

Mr. Horne said that in terms of the guidelines to construct the current budget, there would be three principles: to fund the continuation budget, to fund enrollment growth, and in changing the culture of the budget, to produce a budget which was not irrelevant. In developing the new budget, he said there were issues that could possibly be coordinated and developed as recommendations across sectors, e.g., student financial aid, technology for purposes of instruction, teacher training and workforce development. Mr. Handy inquired whether the Governor's proposal for education would be different. Mr. Horne said that that was not expected.

Dr. Eads inquired about the continuation of types of funding, such as district cost differentials. She noted that these were very important in South Florida. She inquired when the Board could expect to modify the strategy for funding education. Mr. Horne said that that was one of the tasks to be completed by the Board. He added that there could not just be different funding arrangements. He said that there were clearly different missions among the sectors. From his experience with appropriations, money changed behavior. Mr. Handy said that Board members certainly needed to understand the funding formulas in order to be players in this process. Mr. García said that it was important to reflect reality but, at this point, the Board was working backward. Mr. Horne said that by August 31, the Board needed to approve the budget to be sent forward to the State Board of Education which the Governor would then use in building his budget. The Governor was required to submit his budget to the Legislature 45 days prior to the beginning of the Session and was also required to submit a balanced budget. He said the only thing the Legislature was required to do each year was to pass a budget. The Legislature was at an advantage as it had the last opportunity to receive the most updated revenue forecast. He noted that

with the Legislative Session to begin in January in 2002, final budget approval would occur sometime at the end of March. He said he was concerned that the Florida Board of Education be an effective body, and that it was important to have an effective plan.

Mr. Fair asked that the staff avoid the use of acronyms and describe the commonly used terms. He said it was important for the Board members to know the common terms used in developing the budget. He also asked that the staff explain the Constitutional mandates and prohibitions. He said it was important for the members of the Florida Board of Education to have a sense of personal ownership of the issues the Board should be addressing. He asked that the staff explain the guiding issues for developing the budget. Mr. Horne said he had described the four areas he felt could be developed with some commonality across sectors. He said that it would certainly be a challenge for the staff to develop a budget for this Board so quickly, but that they would work very hard to do that.

Mr. Handy asked the Board members to try to prioritize the issues to be addressed, and not just to think about the available revenues which seemed to be reasonably constrained this year. He said that it was also important to focus on the allocation of scarce resources. Dr. Eads inquired about the Board's opportunity to look at specific programs. Mr. Handy responded that it was important that the Board members try not to micro manage these issues; this Board should focus on the broader vision. He said he would encourage the delivery systems to focus on their priorities rather than on seeking new revenues.

Ms. Johnson inquired about the "wish list" budgets presented by the different entities. Mr. Handy responded that the previous governing boards did not have the obligation to balance the budget, but had presented three advocacy budgets. He said that he and the Secretary had met with the University Presidents and had asked them not to submit wish budgets, but to address their budget needs within a sense of revenue reality. He noted that in the past, the Board of Regents budget had advocated for the universities. He said he was trying to begin to change the culture where the systems would be working together. Mr. Handy suggested that the Florida Board's budget could provide the priorities; the rewards would be obtained by meeting those priorities.

B. School Code

Mr. Winn explained that the legislation, SB 1162, required the Board to recommend a new Florida School Code to the Legislature by January

2002. He commented that the question for the workgroup on this project was whether only appropriate pieces of the statutes needed to be revised to accommodate the changes made by SB 1162, or whether to look at every single section of the Florida School Code for total revision. He said in order to do the latter project, staff would need certain guiding principles. The revision would address structure, but the guiding principles for this project would be to create a seamless system, to focus on students, to reduce the over prescriptive nature of the law, to make it user friendly, and to provide appropriate statutory authority for state and local policy development. He also commented that the group proposed to reorganize the chapters from the current amalgamation of statutes to a code which was organized by content area. Members of the Board said this was an excellent approach.

Dr. Proctor recommended that the group proceed without going into the specific programmatic statutes which the Board was not yet prepared to address. Mr. Winn said that the group needed to proceed on a section-by-section basis to provide some overall analysis.

Dr. Proctor inquired whether significant statutory revision would be made as recommendations to the Legislature; he inquired whether Board members would be alerted of those changes. Mr. Winn assured the Board members that they would receive regular monthly progress reports on all three of these projects: the budget, the school code and the reorganization of the Department, so the Board's principles were reflected in these documents.

Dr. Eads inquired specifically as to the individuals involved in these workgroups. She said she wanted to understand the process and the participants and whether all interested individuals or groups were included. Mr. García suggested that the members of the workgroups ought to include representatives from the K-12 sector, student organizations, the superintendents, the Legislature, the Department of Education, the community colleges and the universities. He inquired whether there should be a Board member included on each one of these workgroups. Mr. Handy said that there were only seven members of the Board, and he suggested that it would not be wise if one Board member became an advocate or expert on any single issue. He said it was important for the Board members to work together on these three major projects. They should be cohesive and ecumenical as to all issues, not become an advocate for any system or geographic place. Mr. Winn assured the members of the Board that the individuals currently serving on these workgroups did reflect the suggested representation.

Ms. Johnson commented that she had received a letter from the NAACP, and she wondered where it was appropriate for groups to be involved in the rewrite of the school code. Mr. Winn said the process was open; there was great awareness of these activities. Mr. Handy commented that in terms of the scope of the work, this Board initiated the process. Mr. Winn commented that the groups were meeting every other week, and all were welcome. Mr. Fair said it was clear that the Board needed to have ownership in this process.

Mr. Horne said the Board would receive progress reports on these projects at every Board meeting, and that was the appropriate opportunity for the Board to be informed and to be part of the process. Mr. Handy reminded the Board that these discussions at the Board level be kept at the macro level. Dr. Proctor suggested that in terms of the work to be completed by December, and the many affected statutes, that it was important first to address the essential reorganization and then take on the next steps.

Mr. Winn said that the Legislature had requested a product by the end of this year. He said the Legislature would be doing much of the redrafting as there were so many cross references that would be affected by looking at certain parts. He said it was key to build in credibility so the Board could achieve its goals and accomplish the goals of SB 1162.

Mr. Handy asked that the staff provide the Board with the names of the members of the workgroups, and the schedule of their meetings, and that the staff provide a detailed monthly progress report to the Board for the Board to provide appropriate direction. Dr. Eads asked for the resumes of the workgroup members.

C. Reorganization of the Department of Education

Mr. Winn also reported that the Secretary and the Commissioner of Education were required to begin the process of reorganizing the Florida Department of Education. He said this workgroup was chaired by Mr. Horne, with the three Chancellors and the Executive Director of Independent Education. He advised the members of the Board that the group had not yet met formally, but that Secretary Horne had been meeting with Commissioner Crist to look at the functions of the Department. He suggested that the Board might want to hire a consultant to help with this task. He said he was currently working with Dr. Blackwell to define the criteria for an RFP.

He said that he had been meeting with the SUS presidents, the community college presidents, and the school superintendents to inquire what the Department should look like and what services it should provide. He said that the implementation plan of that reorganization would be presented to the Board and regular updates provided. Mr. Fair asked for a timeline for completion for all three projects. Mr. Horne advised the members of the Board that in December the Board would be asked to vote on the proposed reorganization plan which would include the timeline for the merger of the functions within the DOE.

Mr. Fair moved that the Board hire a consultant to work with the reorganization workgroup, as described in statute, that the Board receive monthly updates and propose a reorganization plan in December with a timeline for the merger of functions of the Department of Education. Dr. Proctor seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred. Mr. Handy asked that the staff provide this detail at the Board's August meeting, to include the appropriate timelines.

#### 10. FLORIDA BOARD MEMBERS' ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. Jerry Martin, Executive Director of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, provided the Board members helpful information on the appropriate behavior of members of Boards. He advised them to be statesmanlike and judicious, and to remember the "big picture." He advised them to be bold, that lay boards provided new ways of thinking in their governance. He suggested that they rise above their personal interests, and that they be civil in their disagreements. He said it was alright for Board members to take votes, that sometimes they may not be unanimous on an issue. He reminded the Board that it was the responsibility of the Board to set policy. As members of the Board, they spoke in a different voice than they would as private citizens. He suggested that they not take questions off the phone from reporters directly, and that they construct a well conceived response rather than conveying their idle passing thoughts.

He said that Board members should not serve as ombudsmen nor be involved in the disputes occurring on any particular board. He reminded the Board members of the player who had the most strike outs, Babe Ruth, and to keep that in mind.

Mr. Randy Hanna, formerly a member of the State Board of Community Colleges and presently a Trustee on the Florida A&M University Board, described the relationship of the Florida Board of Education and the local university boards. He commented on the perspectives of a local governing board and of the statewide policy board. He suggested that the Board did not select presidents, or provosts,

or football coaches, did not select programs, or award construction contracts. He noted that the individual board trustees would jealously guard their statutory duties.

He said it was important that the Board develop priorities, develop the overarching budget, and have measures to reward those who break down the barriers. He suggested that it was important that they be sensitive to funding, that the funding be fair, and that there be a fair opportunity for all to compete for the dollars, and to make the best decisions for Florida. He suggested that in terms of the priorities, that the Board focus on the budget and on the Florida school code, and that the rules and policies provide appropriate flexibility. He suggested that it was important for the Board of Education to provide a clear and concise voice on statewide policy. He noted that there might not always be agreement among the stakeholders. While it was for the Board members to make the decision, it was important to let the stakeholders have a voice.

#### 11. PERSONNEL DISCUSSION

Mr. Horne said the Agenda included the job descriptions and the salaries, a range of \$175,000 to \$225,000, for the three Chancellors and the Executive Director of Independent Education. He recommended that the Board hire an executive search firm or firms to do the searches for the four positions. He said that normally those positions would be filled, after 2003, by the Secretary of Education.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Board move forward to hire the search firm(s) to conduct the four searches for the three Chancellors and the Executive Director. Mr. Fair seconded the motion.

Mr. García said that in looking at these initial searches, he felt it important to state that he did not want the salary for these positions to be merely a "comparable" salary, he said he wanted Florida not to be "merely comparable" but to be at the highest level. With the base salary and performance incentives, these positions could become the highest paid positions in the country because the Board set the highest accountability standards. He suggested that the search firm find those with the ability to perform at that expected level. Dr. Proctor commented that, in the future, the Secretary would have the opportunity to hire these individuals, but that in these initial searches, this Board would be responsible. He said he would have the utmost respect for the Secretary's recommendation. There were no further comments, and members of the Board concurred unanimously.

Mr. Handy commented that in terms of the four slots to be filled, the Board would undergo searches for all three Chancellors and one Executive Director. He noted that two of the positions were filled by Interim Chancellors and two positions were currently not filled.

Mr. Handy said that in looking at the salary for the Secretary of Education, the Education Governance Transition Task Force had recommended a comparable salary range for the position, from \$250,000 to \$400,000. Mr. Handy recommended to the Board that Secretary Horne be paid \$225,000, with an opportunity to receive bonuses for outstanding performance, by measures determined by the Board. Mr. García said it was important that Florida lead by its example, and that the Board should be identifying the benchmarks for this outstanding performance. Mrs. Roberts added that any incentives should be tied to the implementation of the Board's goals.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Secretary of Education be paid a base salary of \$225,000, with the opportunity for additional bonuses based on performance, as determined by measures adopted by the Board. Dr. Eads seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

## 12. DELIVERY SYSTEM ACTION ITEMS

### A. Consideration of Request to Name the Florida International University Graduate School of Business

Dr. Blackwell explained that the Board of Regents had in place a Chancellor's Memorandum which required that naming schools or colleges in the University System in recognition of special individuals required approval of the Florida Board of Regents, now the Florida Board of Education. He said that Florida International University sought to name its graduate school of business, the Alvah H. Chapman Jr. Graduate School of Business.

Mr. Handy said that this was clearly an issue that should be devolved to the University Boards of Trustees, and he hoped to be able to accomplish that devolution as quickly as possible.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Board approve the request from Florida International University to name its graduate school of business, the Alvah H. Chapman, Jr. Graduate School of Business. Mr. García seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

Mr. Handy said he hoped that by the next Florida Board of Education meeting they could devolve some of these responsibilities to the University Boards of Trustees. He asked that the staff review the CMs for a report at the August meeting.

B. Authority to File Amendment to Certification with Public Employees Relations Commission to Name the Florida Board of Education as Successor to the Florida Board of Regents for Purposes of Collective Bargaining

Dr. Blackwell explained that this action would allow the staff to file an amendment to the certification with the Public Employees Relations Commission to name the Florida Board of Education as the successor to the Florida Board of Regents for the various collective bargaining agreements. Dr. Blackwell explained that the contracts with the police, the nurses and the faculty were currently at the state level; this was another issue that could become the responsibility of the Trustees with the appropriate statutory revision.

Mr. Fair moved that the Board authorize the Secretary to execute and file an amendment to the certification with the Public Employees Relations Commission naming the Florida Board of Education the successor to the Florida Board of Regents for the purpose of collective bargaining, as presented. Dr. Eads seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

C. Equity/Accountability Program Progress Report

Dr. Blackwell explained that Section 240.2475, Florida Statutes, requires each university to develop and maintain an annual EAP plan to support the employment of women and minorities in senior-level administrative positions and in tenured or tenure-earning faculty positions. The law further states that these plans are to be approved by the Chancellor and by the Florida Board of Education in an annual report to the Legislature by August 1, 2001.

Ms. Johnson inquired whether the report was complete. Ms. Gallay reported that one university would be reporting further details. She asked that the Board approve the report and provide any further direction for the preparation of the final report. Ms. Gallay reported that the Board had been provided summary tables but that the final published report would include all the data. She noted that certain goals might not be met, since categories of employees were dependent on the supply. Ms. Johnson asked that the Board members receive copies of the final report to be submitted.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Board review and approve the Equity/Accountability Program Progress Report and authorize the Chancellor to approve any remaining issues and prepare the final report, as

presented. Mr. Fair seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

- D. Resolution of the Florida Board of Education Authorizing the Issuance of Not to Exceed \$35 Million University System Improvement Revenue Bonds to Finance Capital Improvement Fee Projects

Dr. Blackwell explained that this action would request the Division of Bond Finance to proceed with the issuance of revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed \$35 million for Capital Improvement Fee Projects appropriated by the 2001 Legislature. Mr. Handy explained to the members of the Board that at some point the issuance of bonds would be on the table for discussion in terms of whether the universities would act singly or in consortia to issue bonds. Mr. Fair suggested that this might be a topic for a Board workshop.

Mr. Fair moved that the Board adopt a resolution requesting the Division of Bond Finance of the State Board of Administration to proceed with the issuance of revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed \$35 million to partially finance Capital Improvement Fee Projects appropriated by the 2001 Legislature, as presented. Mrs. Roberts seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

- E. Approval of Campus Development Agreement Between the Florida Board of Education and the City of Tallahassee

Dr. Blackwell explained that in accordance with Section 240.155, Florida Statutes, following the adoption of the campus master plan, the Board of Regents was required to enter into a campus development agreement with each host local government. He said that the campus development agreement was important for two reasons. First, all concurrency management responsibilities of the Board of Regents are fulfilled if the Board pays its fair share for improvements as identified in the agreement. Second, once the agreement is executed, all on-campus development may proceed without further review by the host local government as long as it is consistent with the adopted campus master plan and the campus development agreement. He noted that, at this point, the Trust Fund was kept centrally and used by all the universities. Again, this might be an opportunity for an issue to be devolved to the universities. Mr. Handy suggested that this was an opportunity for a workshop issue on the devolution of the campus master plans.

Mrs. Roberts moved that the Board approve the Campus Development Agreement between the Florida Board of Education and the City of Tallahassee, and authorize appropriate signatures to execute the Campus Development Agreement with the City of Tallahassee, as presented. Ms. Johnson seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

- F. 2002-2003 Legislative Budget Policy Guidelines for the State University System

Secretary Horne said this item was withdrawn.

- G. SUS 2002-2003 Legislative Budget Request Schedule VIII-B

Secretary Horne commented that as part of the Legislative Budget Request, each department was required by the Constitution and statutes to submit a priority-order reduction plan to be considered in the event projected state revenues failed to materialize. The instructions require each agency to submit reductions equaling at least 1.5 percent of the General Revenue appropriation. This was an opportunity to direct the universities to determine how to address these reductions.

Mr. Fair moved that the Board review the Chancellor's allocation for the reduction plans for the universities and the general office budgets as required for the 2002-2003 Legislative Budget Request, as presented. Dr. Eads seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

- H. Long Range Program Plans

Secretary Horne also explained that as part of the instructions for the 2002-2003 Legislative Budget Request, state agencies were also required to prepare draft Long Range Program Plans by August 31. These focus on agency priorities to achieve their goals and objectives for the next five years. He noted that the universities would be phased in to zero-based budgeting in the 2004-2005 fiscal year. There was no further discussion, and members of the Board reviewed the proposed allocation of the five percent reduction, as presented.

13. COMMUNITY COLLEGE OPERATING BUDGETS

Secretary Horne explained that the State Board of Community Colleges had been required to approve the college operating budgets. This task had been delegated by the Board to the Executive Director since 1983. This responsibility

had now been transferred to the Florida Board; the approval of the college operating budgets, therefore, was now the responsibility of the Florida Board. Mr. Handy said that this had previously been delegated to the Executive Director of the State Board of Community Colleges, and should probably now be delegated to the Chancellor of the Division of Community Colleges who would then be authorized to help the institutions correct any errors in the budgets. This approval was to be sure that the community college budgets were in the correct budget categories.

Mr. Fair moved that the Board approve the operating budgets for all 28 community colleges, with the contingent requirement that Daytona Beach Community College file a budget amendment to account correctly for High Demand - Return on Investment appropriations, as presented. Dr. Proctor seconded the motion, and members of the Board concurred.

14. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAM HIGHLIGHT-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SERVICES

Ms. Andrea Willet provided an overview of the Office of School Improvement Services, an office which provides direct school improvement systems to public schools throughout the State. She provided an overview of the role of the Department in helping produce dramatic improvement in school grades over the past several years. Mr. García inquired whether the standards were too low, and the percentage of good and bad schools. Mr. Handy suggested that the Board might want to consider A+ schools and their criteria at a future meeting.

15. PLANNING BOARD PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. Handy suggested that the meetings of the Board last approximately one and a half days, beginning on the first day at 9:00 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m., and then 8:00 a.m. to noon the second day. He said that the Agenda included proposed meeting dates for August, September, October, November and December. Ms. Johnson indicated that she had a conflict with the proposed August date and asked that staff change that date.

Mr. Handy distributed a document describing the Guiding Principles for the Florida Board of Education identified, as follows: excellence, merit, accountability, competition, seamlessness, student-centered, devolution. Mr. García suggested that the discussion of these Guiding Principles should be on the August agenda and that the Board give them a priority order. Mrs. Roberts suggested that excellence should always be number one. She said these should not be identified by number but should be weighted equally. Mr. Handy said these Principles should be crystal clear to the lay person, and that these would be the subject of ongoing conversation.

Mr. Handy suggested that these were not exclusive issues, but that they should certainly stimulate discussions of the Board.

For future topics, Mrs. Roberts suggested that there be a discussion of the fees charged students by the several delivery sectors. Mr. Handy commented that the key to accountability would be measures and data. He advised the members of the Board that the Data Warehouse was in formulation.

Mr. Handy inquired whether Board members had other topics that should be on the Board's agenda. Mr. García said it was important to look at the crisis in Hispanic education. He noted that 35 percent of Hispanic children were not graduating from high school. He suggested that the Board spend some time on a future agenda discussing the Hispanic Dropout Project.

Dr. Eads suggested that the Board should discuss the state of technology in Florida, the use of technology in schools, etc. She said it was important that the Board's benchmarks be in sync with the Guiding Principles. Mr. García suggested that there should be measurable standards for all programs and that the Board would recommend the criteria to assess programs. In terms of the best performing schools, he wondered about the ratio of teachers to students and whether there were standards for these nationally and in Florida. He suggested that the ratio of administrators to teachers might be another valid measure.

Mr. Fair commented that it was important that the Board gain a sense of what it needed to know and the relationship to the Board's opportunities with regard to implementation. He also suggested that Board members should not bring their personal interests to the table, and that personal issues not get in the way of their responsibilities as Board members. Mrs. Roberts said it was important that Board members be diligent in reading the material sent to them.

Dr. Proctor suggested that it was important that the Board hold a budget workshop prior to the August meeting so that Board members had a context for making budget decisions. Dr. Eads suggested that the Agenda be organized by topics related to the Guiding Principles.

Mr. Handy suggested that in addition to the three major tasks on the Board's Agenda for the next year, that they add as a fourth major topic, strategic planning. He suggested that the Board members take a day to focus on the priority issues. He also commented that in terms of the structure of the work of the Board that it was important for the Board to stay together and stay focused as a Board.

Mr. García suggested that they had been advised that they could appoint committees to look into other issues. Mr. Handy concurred, and added that the

Board certainly did have access to national experts on many related issues. Mrs. Roberts commented that given the size of the Board, it would be helpful for the Board often to act as a "committee of the whole."

16. CLOSING REMARKS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR FRANK BROGAN

Lieutenant Governor Brogan addressed the Board. He said that in his former role as Commissioner of Education, he had been a member of the State Board of Education, of the Board of Regents, of the State Board of Community Colleges, and of the Workforce Development Initiative. He said that in Florida every student deserved the best education. He said the members of this Florida Board of Education stood on the shoulders of those who had gone before to make it better. He thanked the members of the Board for agreeing to take on this public task, and thanked them for their commitment to making education better in Florida.

17. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, Chairman Handy adjourned the meeting of the Florida Board of Education at 3:55 p.m., July 24, 2001.

---

Mary-Anne Bestebreurtje

---

F. Philip Handy  
Chairman