

## ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

### Agenda

October 22, 2008

Turlington Bldg, 1721/25

Tallahassee, FL

**\* 9:30-11:30 a.m. – 1721/25 Joint meeting of Standing Committees on Postsecondary Transition and Postsecondary Articulation Policy**  
**12:30 – 3:00 p.m. -1721/25 Full ACC Meeting**

1. Chairperson's welcome and new member recognition	Dr. Ed Massey
<b>Approval</b>	
2. Approval: Minutes from May 28, 2008 Meeting	Dr. Ed Massey
3. Approval: Common prerequisite revisions	Ms. Lynda Page
4. Approval: Common Transcript Subcommittee recommendations	Dr. Dennis Dulniak
5. Approval: Proposed language for s.1008.38, F.S. on articulation accountability process	Dr. Heather Sherry
<b>Discussion</b>	
6. Workshop on articulation accountability measures	Mr. Matthew Bouck
7. ACC format and future schedule	Dr. Heather Sherry
8. Next Generation strategic initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gold Standard Career Pathways</li> <li>• Articulation Accountability Project</li> <li>• Common Prerequisite Revisions</li> <li>• Postsecondary Course Competencies</li> <li>• College and career readiness</li> <li>• State college system</li> </ul>	Ms. Lucy Hadi, Dr. Heather Sherry, and Dr. Judy Bilsky
9. Practical Arts courses for high school graduation	Ms. Lucy Hadi
10. High school grading formula	Mr. Juan Copa
11. Report from Standing Committee on FACTS.org	Dr. Connie Graunke

**Next ACC meeting: February 25, 2009.**

* Articulation Accountability Workgroups	Chair	Room
College/Career Transition and Readiness	Dr. Judy Bilsky	1721/25
Acceleration	Dr. Jill White	1360
2+2 Transfer and Readiness	Dr. Dottie Minear	1706
Workforce Education	Ms. Lucy Hadi	856/60

**MINUTES**  
**ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**May 28, 2008**

<p>A meeting of the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC) was held on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, at the Turlington Building in Tallahassee, Florida. At 1:00 p.m., Chairman, Dr. Edwin Massey, called the meeting to order.</p>	
Members Present	<p>Mrs. Carlene Anderson, Walton County Public Schools          Dr. Judith Bilsky, Division of Community Colleges          Dr. Stephen Calabro, Southwest Florida College          Dr. Walter Christy, Brevard Public Schools          Dr. Christine Cothron, First Coast Technical College          Ms. Anna Cowin, Lake County Public Schools          Dr. Frances Haithcock, Division of Public Schools          Dr. Bruce Janasiewicz, Florida State University          Ms. Lucy Hadi, Division of Workforce Education          Dr. Edwin Massey, Indian River Community College (Chair)          Dr. Dottie Minear, State University System, Board of Governors          Dr. Robert Sullins, University of South Florida          Dr. Heather Sherry, Office of Articulation (staff)</p>
Members Absent	<p>Dr. Charles Dassance, Central Florida Community Colleges          Ms. Brenda Dickenson, nonpublic secondary education          Mr. Christopher Krampert, Florida Student Association          Dr. Terry McMahan, Hodges University          Dr. Gita Pitter, Florida A&amp;M University          Dr. Jill White, Okaloosa-Walton College</p>
1. Chairperson's Comments	<p>Dr. Ed Massey welcomed the committee members and the audience and initiated introductions. He discussed Florida's history as a national model for 2+2 postsecondary articulation and reiterated that the state has a responsibility to continue to put students first during times of financial hardship. It is imperative that every effort is made to ensure that established student transfer guarantees are honored, despite current budget shortfalls.</p>
<b>Approval:</b>	
2. Approval of Minutes from February 27, 2008 Meeting	<p>Dr. Massey asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of the February 2008, meeting of the ACC. Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.</p>
3. Approval: Reconciliation of Dual Enrollment Equivalency List/Bright Futures Comprehensive Course Table (CCT)	<p>Dr. Heather Sherry discussed the process for reconciling the Bright Futures Comprehensive Course Table (CCT) with the Dual Enrollment-High School Subject Area Equivalency List (DE List). When discrepancies between the lists were identified, dual enrollment courses were reviewed to determine which courses should be added to or deleted from each list. After consultation with SUS admission directors and DOE K-12 curriculum specialists, the review of courses resulted in the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 8 dual enrollment courses were added to the DE List as 0.5 credits toward high school graduation requirements in social studies (AH=3, WH=2, EC=1, AG=2);</li> <li>2. All dual enrollment courses currently designated as PF on the CCT were added to the DE List as 0.5 credits toward the Performing/Fine Arts high school graduation requirement;</li> <li>3. All dual enrollment composition and literature courses on the CCT were added to the DE List as 0.5 EN credits. Specific literary genre courses designated as EN on the CCT were changed to English</li> </ol>

	<p>Elective (EE) credit;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. All dual enrollment science courses on the CCT that focused on scientific method and principles were added to the DE List as 0.5 science credits (1.0 credits if accompanied by a lab). Those science courses on the CCT that focused on the political, social and/or economic aspects of science were changed to Science Elective (SE) on the CCT;</li> <li>5. All dual enrollment courses designated as MA on the CCT and above the level of MAT 1033 were added to the DE List as 1.0 math credit;</li> <li>6. 2 dual enrollment courses that meet the wellness portion of the PE requirement were added to the DE List as 0.5 credit;</li> <li>7. Duplicate and discontinued courses on the CCT were identified and removed from consideration for the DE List;</li> <li>8. Titles of dual enrollment courses on the CCT were changed to match the SCNS statewide title; and</li> <li>9. A recommendation was made for the CCT to change programming to allow for all course numbers to start with an “X”, “C”, or “L”.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed changes were unanimously approved by the ACC members. The new DE List was approved by the State Board of Education in June.</p>
<p>4. Approval: Prerequisites for new community college baccalaureate programs</p>	<p>Ms. Judy Dial presented information about three new community college baccalaureate programs which were assigned to new CIP codes or tracks. Those programs included a new BAS program in Computer Networking offered by Florida Community College at Jacksonville; a new BS program in Educational Studies offered by St. Petersburg College; and a new BAS program in Interdisciplinary Health and Human Studies offered by St. Petersburg College. In addition, a list of other new baccalaureate programs (approved by the State Board of Education in February, 2008) which were assigned to existing CIP codes was provided.</p>
<p>5. Approval: Lower Division Teacher Education Experience</p>	<p>Ms. Pat Frohe informed the committee that the Education Discipline Committee for Common Prerequisites and the Lower Division Teacher Education Experience Work Group were charged with reviewing the three education prerequisites that are common to all lower division Education programs, required for transfer to an upper division Education program. These courses had been in place for over a decade, and it was time for a review and possible revision. Both groups concluded that the three courses continue to be valuable and relevant as prerequisites; and collaborated to develop new course definitions, course objectives, and student learning outcomes. A final version was prepared following several face-to-face meetings and conference calls, and input from the members. Oversight Committee members were also provided an opportunity to review the information. Following approval from the Oversight Committee, it was presented to the ACC members. The ACC members unanimously approved the prerequisites. The final version will be sent to the Office of Articulation to prepare for placement into the Statewide Course Numbering System.</p>
<p>6. Approval: Credit-by-Exam Equivalency List update</p>	<p>Mr. Matthew Bouck submitted changes to the ACC <i>Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies</i> list. The changes were minor, and were limited to the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). Notes were added to three exams with information that they have been terminated: Accounting (refer to <i>Financial Accounting</i> exam); Algebra-Trigonometry and Trigonometry (refer to <i>Precalculus</i> exam). In addition, the level 2 cut-scores for French Language, German Language (pending June, 2008), and Spanish Language have been changed by the College Board. These changes were the result of standard setting studies by a panel of content experts—the content of the exams has not changed. The American Council on Education has endorsed these changes in its credit award recommendations. These changes are:</p>

Year	Exam	Score Change
2007-2008	French Language	59 from 62
2008-2009	German Language	60 from 63
2007-2008	Spanish Language	63 from 66

These will apply to the level 2 awards in which the student will receive six (6) credits for the two introductory language courses. A scaled score of 50 will generate three (3) credits for one introductory language course.

This revised *Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies* list was approved by the State Board of Education in August.

7. Approval: Industry Certification in AAS/AS in Networking Services Technology Statewide Articulation Agreement; and Industry Certification to AAS/AS in Computer Engineering Technology Statewide Articulation Agreement

Mr. Duane Hume, State Supervisor for IT/Technology Education, submitted a proposed statewide articulation agreement based on the Cisco Certified Network Associate (CCNA) industry certification. The proposed agreement for 12 credits toward the Networking Services Technology AAS/AS degree (0507030401) was approved by the committee as revised during discussion. The revision removed any restrictions on how the articulated credits may be applied. For articulation, the CCNA certification must be current at the time of escrow.

Based on the Cisco Certified Network Associate (CCNA) industry certification, Mr. Hume submitted another proposed statewide articulation agreement for 12 credits toward the Computer Engineering Technology AAS/AS degree (0615040200) was approved by the committee as revised during discussion. The revision specified that the articulated credits may be applied only toward the AAS/AS degree, the Computer Specialist (0615040203), or the Network Systems Developer (0615040204) College Credit Certificate programs. For articulation, the CCNA certification must be current at the time of escrow.

**Discussion:**

8. Legislative update

Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chancellor for Public Schools, presented an overview of the substance of two bills that have a major impact on articulation, particularly in the K-12 arena. The first major bill was Senate Bill 1908, which focused on “Next Generation” standards, assessment, and high school grades.

Senate Bill 1908 (Education):

- ✓ Requires the State Board of Education to adopt “Next Generation Sunshine State Standards” for all subject areas by December 31, 2011. Recently adopted Math, Reading, and Science standards are considered Next Generation, but the Language Arts standards adopted in 2007 must be revised.
- ✓ Revises the high school grading formula and alternative school improvement rating system beginning in 2009-10. Fifty percent of a high school’s grade will be based on existing FCAT-related factors and the remaining fifty percent will be based on factors relating to: high school graduation rate, student participation and success in acceleration mechanisms, postsecondary readiness rates, high school graduation rates of at-risk students, and student performance on statewide standardized end of course examinations.
- ✓ Allows the Commissioner to incorporate end of course assessments into the statewide assessment program. Collaboration with the American Diploma Project in the adoption or development of examinations is permitted.
- ✓ Requires the Department of Education to purchase or develop

assessments to be used by high schools in evaluating the college readiness of selected students prior to grade 12, beginning with the 2008-09 school year. High schools are expected to provide 12<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring below minimum scores (set by the State Board of Education) with access to remedial instruction prior to graduation.

- ✓ Requires district school boards to establish a policy that addresses the annual review of each high school student's electronic education plan (ePEP).
- ✓ Stipulates that school districts must post dual enrollment grades assigned by postsecondary institutions to high school transcripts without changing them.

Senate Bill 1906 (Alternative High School Courses and Programs):

- ✓ Provides a framework for taking career and technical courses in high school that have a preponderance of the standards from a core course (i.e. Algebra, Geometry, or Biology) and supplementing the remainder of the material in order to prepare students to pass a standardized end of course exam and earn credit in both the CTE and the core course (for a total of 2 credits).
- ✓ Creates a pilot for 3 school districts to participate.
- ✓ Authorizes the Department of Education to develop or adopt new end of course examinations or utilize examinations developed by the Florida Virtual School.

Dr. Will Holcombe, Chancellor for Community Colleges, reiterated the importance of assessing high school students for postsecondary readiness in 11<sup>th</sup> grade so that remediation can take place before high school graduation (as provided for in Senate Bill 1908). This practice will result in more students being prepared for postsecondary success. In addition, Dr. Holcombe addressed two bills relating to community colleges that have a significant impact on articulation – Senate Bill 1716 relating to the State College System and House Bill 7105 relating to distance learning.

Senate Bill 1716 (Postsecondary Education):

- ✓ Creates s. 1001.60, F.S., which establishes the Florida College System to consist of 2-yr and 4-yr public degree granting institutions. Institutions must retain their open admission policies and are not permitted to offer graduate degrees.
- ✓ Establishes the Florida College System Task Force within the Division of Community Colleges to develop findings and issue recommendations regarding the transition of community colleges to baccalaureate degree granting colleges.
- ✓ Creates the State College Pilot Project, which include 9 colleges to make recommendations to the Legislature regarding, approval processes, criteria for transition, and a funding model for the system.
- ✓ Changes the name of 5 community colleges and authorizes all community colleges to change name to "college" regardless of whether they offer 4 year degrees.

House Bill 7105 (Postsecondary Distance Learning):

- ✓ Establishes the Florida Distance Learning Task Force to make recommendations to facilitate access to undergraduate distance learning resources.
- ✓ Establishes the Florida Higher Education Distance Learning Catalog as an interactive, Internet-based central point of access to distance learning courses, degree programs, and resources offered by public

	<p>postsecondary education institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Exempts distance learning courses from student fees, other than per credit hour user fees.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Lucy Hadi, Chancellor for Workforce Education, discussed the codification in statute of the Ready to Work Program. The program was funded this year, under the leadership of Representative Joe Pickens, at \$7 million in recurring revenue and \$4 million in non-recurring revenue. Plus, funding that was going to be reverted was restored, so concerns about the program going away have been allayed. She encouraged institutions to seek the now available reimbursement of \$10 per test (assessment and placement tests) which will continue until the money runs out.</p> <p>In addition, Senate Bill 1908 included the addition of high school diploma designations that include AP, IB, AICE, dual enrollment, industry certification, and the Ready to Work credential.</p>
<p>9. General Articulation Discussion</p>	<p>Chancellor Will Holcombe raised some overall concerns relating to articulation and the 2+2 system that he wanted to share with the committee. He expressed that the seamless movement of students through our education system has always been a priority in the state of Florida and should remain a priority, even in difficult budget times. He described a recent discussion with Dr. Mark Rosenberg, Chancellor for the State University System of Florida, and the state university provosts regarding the impact of budget shortfalls on junior level access for community college students. The budget crisis has created potential problems for students wishing to transfer and occasions may arise where all students do not receive equitable treatment. Dr. Holcombe asked that the ACC be cognizant of any concerns that are expressed regarding transfer difficulties. The Community College Council of Presidents met at the end of May and several presidents expressed concern about the fair treatment of students and the viability of the 2+2 system during this time. Particular concern was raised regarding the opportunity for community college students to transfer to public universities in Florida, given that some state universities are considering policies that would halt acceptance of all community college transfer students in the next year. Dr. Holcombe suggested that the current laws and rules that govern articulation be shared with both community college and university presidents as a reminder of the intent of the 2+2 system in the state of Florida, which is built on student mobility. He shared some data that reflected a 10 year history of movement into the upper division of the state university system (including AA &amp; AS grads, SUS native students, and non-AA completers) to demonstrate the enormity of the issue if the pipeline were to be closed off to AA transfer students.</p> <p>Dr. Massey suggested that the ACC request a joint letter from the Commissioner of Education and the Chancellor for the State University System reinforcing the articulation rules in the state, which needs to be done periodically. Dr. Dottie Minear, Vice Chancellor for the State University System, stated that she believed that Chancellor Rosenberg would likely be amenable to coauthoring such a letter based on his comments at the Council of Academic Vice Presidents meeting and the commitment to the 2+2 that was reinforced by the provosts themselves. She also asked that specific concerns be brought to her attention. She suggested that we are at a point in Florida's evolution where we may need to take a few steps back and ask which articulation policies will serve our students best given our current structure, the introduction of the Florida College System, our financial situation, and the new challenges presented by the successes at all of levels of education that result in better student preparation and retention, which lead to access issues.</p>

	<p>All of these should be looked at with the primary goal of not putting arbitrary barriers in the way of students.</p> <p>Dr. Judy Bilsky, Executive Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, also mentioned the articulation of students with Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) degrees into graduate programs within the state university system as an issue that should be addressed. The BAS Task Force made a concerted effort to ensure that the BAS degree was not a “baccalaureate light” and should be considered equivalent to other baccalaureate degrees. However, several instances have occurred where BAS graduates were told by state universities that they would not recognize the BAS degree as a bachelor’s degree in Florida. Dr. Bilsky explained that she has discussed this issue with Dr. Minear who asserted that the issue has been placed on BOG staff agenda for further discussion.</p> <p>Dr. Massey asked for an official motion to request a joint letter from Commissioner Smith and Chancellor Rosenberg (as discussed earlier). A motion was made and seconded with a unanimous vote for approval.</p> <p>Dr. Bob Sullins, Dean of Undergraduate Studies at the University of South Florida, added a comment regarding the perception that the articulation agreement does not guarantee admission to a particular institution. Although this is technically correct, the reality is such that many students who are not mobile due to family situations do not have the option to attend any other university, so that should be taken into consideration as well.</p> <p>Dr. Frances Haithcock asked if data is available to accurately assess the unmet need of AA graduates for upper division programs. It was discussed that the SUS has some data in their Fact Book relating to admission applications compared to acceptance of transfer students, but that does not provide a complete picture. It is difficult to assess the number of students who might be interested in transferring to the SUS, but never apply for a variety of reasons. Dr. Haithcock expressed a big picture concern regarding Florida’s lack of focus on funding for upper division programs as well as the many missed opportunities in high skill/high wage areas that do not require a baccalaureate. In addition, open admission policies increase access, but only if students can get access to courses, so it is imperative to have adequate support for the big picture of all of the systems together.</p>
<p>10. Go Higher! Florida/American Diploma Project</p>	<p>Dr. Judith Bilsky discussed Florida’s involvement with the American Diploma Project and the efforts underway to address college readiness and alignment between K-12 and postsecondary. She also described the requirements of Senate Bill 1908 and the associate remediation project which includes CPT testing all 11<sup>th</sup> graders who express an interest in postsecondary education. If students do not meet the appropriate cut scores on the CPT to enter into college-level coursework, districts are required to provide remediation prior to high school graduation. The plan includes driving community college prep courses in math and English down into the high schools so that high school students have the opportunity to graduate meeting “college ready” exit standards. The goal is to significantly drop the remediation rate for recent high school graduates entering postsecondary education immediately following high school graduation.</p>
<p>11. Common Prerequisite survey update</p>	<p>Ms. Lynda Page provided a brief update on the status of the common prerequisite project underway. Over 400 baccalaureate program faculty members from Florida’s universities and community colleges are currently working together by discipline to determine what should be the common prerequisites for their respective baccalaureate programs in 2008. Once a</p>

	<p>discipline group comes to a consensus, its recommendation will move through the ACC common prerequisite process for approval, hopefully at the October, 2008 meeting. The common prerequisite project is a collaborative project involving the staffs from the Board of Governors, Division of Community Colleges, Office of Articulation, Florida Center for Advising and Academic Support, and faculty members from both, state university and community college systems.</p>
<p>12. FACTS update</p>	<p>Dr. Connie Graunke reported that the final OPPAGA report on FACTS.org had been released and found that only 11% of community college students were using the 2+2 Evaluation. She said they had used a cohort group to derive the 11% and using another (backward-looking) methodology the usage rate was 21%.</p> <p>The report went on to say that the reasons the community colleges gave for not using the system were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inaccurate data—due to the universities not complying with the common pre-requisites. FACTS get that information from the Common Pre-Requisite Manual so any deviations would not be picked up.</li> <li>• Internal Systems—Community Colleges reported they were mostly using their own internal systems; and</li> <li>• Counselors couldn't access the 2+2 system—students can get a report, but counselors could not see what information they students received because they do not have access to the student ID and password.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Graunke reported that several focus groups had been held to discuss the report and how to address the community college concerns. The 2+2 system will be modified by fall 2008 to include: Transfer Admissions Information from University catalogs; Common Pre-requisites from the university audit system (not the pre-requisite manual); Access to the information will be provided through a Guest Audit; and the information will be in able to be downloaded into institutions internal systems.</p> <p>Once the changes have been completed, there will be a series of Articulation Workshops throughout the state to build support and training counselors on the modified system. In addition a Joint memorandum from Chancellor Holcombe and Rosenberg will be going out to the SUS and community colleges on the changes and their need to provide the information to support the system. The addition of 4-year Colleges will be undertaken in fall 2009.</p> <p>Dr. Graunke also announced that the FACTS.org Board will be reconstituted as a Standing Committee under the Articulation Coordinating Committee.</p>
<p>13. Workforce update</p>	<p>Ms. Loretta Costin presented an overview of the process that will be used to develop new workforce education curriculum frameworks and to revise existing curriculum frameworks. Ms. Costin indicated that the curriculum frameworks for each workforce education program must contain the academic and technical competencies/skills that an individual must know and be able to do, in order to become employed in the specific occupation. In order to insure that the programs are responsive to the needs of business and industry, business and industry will play a key role in the development/revision of the curriculum frameworks. Ms. Costin indicated that a Steering Committee, comprised of representatives from all the major stakeholders, has been</p>



	<p>established. The Steering Committee will provide oversight and guidance to the project and will develop a three year program of work for implementing the process.</p> <p>Ms. Costin further stated that Florida’s Workforce Education programs are classified into 16 career clusters and working groups comprised of stakeholders will be established for each of the career clusters. The working groups will be responsible for the review/revision of the programs contained in the cluster. This process will result in the next generation of standards for career and technical education programs in Florida.</p> <p>Ms. Beth Gladden and Ms. Jennifer Roberts provided an update on the Statewide Course Numbering System project. This project will require Technical Centers to utilize course numbers from the Statewide Course Numbering System for Post-Secondary Adult Vocational programs in order to comply with the law (F.S. 1007.24). Geographically diverse review committees worked with program specialists within the Division of Workforce Education to evaluate program and course length. Changes to programs and courses will be submitted to the Statewide Course Numbering System office this summer. All documents will be made available to the field by January 2009. It is projected that for the 2009-2010 school year, all Technical Centers will use the Statewide Course Numbering System for student registration, student transcripts, and front-end data reporting.</p> <p>Ms. Belinda Chason presented an update on the status of the Career and Technical Education Centers common Electronic Transcript designed to facilitate portability and flexibility for students. The K20 Applications Development Group has developed a mock transcript which was sent to the pilot sites for their review. The group plans to have it ready for the pilot sites to implement in August of 2008.</p>
<p>14. Report from Standing Committee on K-12 to Postsecondary Transition</p>	<p>Dr. Heather Sherry provided an overview of the Committee’s discussion regarding the following: (1) the process by which courses were selected for addition to the Dual Enrollment Course - High School Subject Area Equivalency List (DE List); (2) current practices relating to Credit-in-Escrow and the appropriateness of this as an alternative to the dual enrollment program; (3) CLEP for teacher certification and foreign language cut score; (4) Implementation of 2008 legislation (Specifically SB 1908 and SB 1906).</p> <p>The committee went step by step through the process that was used to reconcile the Bright Futures Comprehensive Course Table (CCT) and the Dual Enrollment-High School Subject Area Equivalency List. Recommendations were discussed in depth and are listed in section 3 above.</p> <p>The committee discussed the appropriateness of Credit-in-Escrow policies as an alternative to dual enrollment. Credit-in-Escrow is the practice that allows high school students to enroll in college courses while still in high school, but the courses do not count toward high school graduation. Therefore, they are not considered to be dual enrollment courses and students are required to pay for tuition and books (because school districts do not claim FTE funding for those courses). This practice has typically been used to accommodate students who do not meet dual enrollment eligibility requirements; however, requiring students to pay tuition may create concerns relating to equity of opportunity. This practice has been discouraged as an alternative to dual enrollment when dual enrollment courses options are available (given statutory requirements that dual enrollment options be available to all eligible students). However, there is no common state policy regarding this issue.</p>

	<p>The committee suggested that credit-in-escrow be used only in special circumstances when courses are not available via dual enrollment. It was recommended that the DOE review statute relating to dual enrollment and draft a recommendation for the committee to review prior to requesting a policy statement from the ACC.</p> <p>Dr. Pamela Kerouac with the College Board addressed the committee regarding the use of CLEP examinations for purposes of renewing teacher certification. Florida statute currently requires that academic credit earned via CLEP be listed on an official transcript from a valid postsecondary institution. However, colleges do not credit transcripts for test takers that are not admitted/enrolled at the institution due to cost factors. It was determined that a statutory amendment would be necessary to allow the teacher certification office to accept CLEP scores from another entity (i.e. ACE or College Board). In addition to the CLEP issue, Dr. Kerouac explained that foreign language cut scores for the CLEP examination in French was now 59 and that the score for German would be changing in June 2008.</p> <p>Additional committee discussion addressed the implementation of 2008 legislation (see section 8 above for detail), the effects of accelerated courses in middle school on high school students, the reduction of performance funding for AP, IB, and AICE in the 2008 General Appropriations Act, and the passage of a Board of Governors Regulation in March 2008 that requires dual enrollment courses that meet core SUS admissions requirements be weighted the same as AP, IB and AICE courses for purposes of calculating high school GPA for SUS admission consideration.</p>
<p>15. Report from Standing Committee on Postsecondary Articulation Policy</p>	<p>Dr. Dottie Minear presented the Committee’s discussion regarding the following items: (1) a review of the AS-BS Articulation Agreements; (2) updating the survey regarding general education courses offered or accepted by all institutions; (3) admissions requirements and limited access programs; and (4) compliance with s. 1008.38 Articulation Accountability.</p> <p>The Associate in Science to Baccalaureate (AS-BS) articulation agreements, enacted in 1998, guarantee lower-level general education and professional courses and credits in transfer to a baccalaureate degree program. Because these agreements have been in effect for nearly ten years it is appropriate to conduct a review of not only the agreements but also the broader issue of AS degree student transfer. The Committee reviewed AS-BS enrollment data: for 2000-2005 there were 18,386 students who completed one of the selected AS degrees, with 1,607 or 9%, of those students going on to enroll in the corresponding baccalaureate program. The Committee agreed that the AS-BS agreements are still viable options, and should be reviewed. The Committee further suggested that this review consider transfer with a broader scope: track student pathways after the AS degree—use of the agreements, a capstone program, to community college baccalaureate programs, to Bachelor of Applied Science programs? Finally, the Committee decided this review should wait until the Common Prerequisite Manual revision is completed, as this may affect upper division program requirements.</p> <p>A 2004 general education course survey sought to determine which courses identified as general education would be offered or accepted as general education by all institutions. This would be useful as an advising tool, mainly for dual enrollment students who do not typically finish an associate’s degree at the same institution. This survey has resulted in the identification of 20 courses that are offered or accepted as general education by all community colleges and universities. This survey is now four years old, and so an update</p>

	<p>is appropriate. The Committee suggested that the new survey attempt to present a more sophisticated look at general education offerings: (1) comparing this list with courses from the Common Prerequisite Manual to find courses that will serve multiple purposes; (2) presenting information regarding institution-specific general education requirements; and (3) including in the survey those courses that may meet an institution requirement that is not part of the 36-hour general education requirement. For example, SPC X016 <i>Speech Communications</i> is not offered or accepted as general education by many institutions, but is an institution requirement at FSU, and so is a useful course for students.</p> <p>Dr. Connie Graunke presented an issue regarding the definition of limited access and its impact on FACTS.org advising. The FACTS.org 2+2 Audit displays information about admission requirements—identifying those programs that are limited access. There is, however, a disconnect between the definition of limited access as ‘space-limited,’ and that of the Board of Governors regulation 6C-8.013 that defines programs as limited access due to space limitations or those with additional requirements (GPA, audition). The Committee determined that, while there are several ‘tiers’ of limited access (from those that guarantee student acceptance who complete requirements to competitive admissions programs where student completion of requirements does not ensure admittance), there does not need to be a naming convention applied to each—FACTS.org can simply present the information regarding the admissions requirements. The Committee also discussed that program admission requirements should be ‘locked’ for two years, similar to a ‘catalog-in-effect’ to allow students to work toward meeting these requirements.</p> <p>Finally, the Committee discussed the statutory mandate from s. 1008.38, F.S., which requires the State Board of Education and Board of Governors to develop measures to assess the effectiveness of statewide programs in such areas as secondary to postsecondary transition, acceleration mechanisms, community college to university articulation, degree program hours, and the CLAST exam. The ACC completed such an articulation accountability report in 1994, but none since then. The Committee discussed the ACC taking a leadership role in these measures to present articulation measures, rather than leave to the sectors. The Committee discussed existing data and items for consideration. The primary point made was that a useful report would not simply display snapshots of student performance for single years, but would follow a cohort of students from middle school on through postsecondary education to determine the impact of specific articulation policies.</p>
<p>16. General updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course Code Directory</li> <li>• BOG Regulation 6.006 – Acceleration Mechanisms, High School Feedback Report, Performance on Common Placement Tests, University of Florida statewide dual enrollment agreements</li> </ul>	<p>Dr. Heather Sherry made an announcement that materials relating to recent publications and memorandums were included in the ACC agenda packet for information purposes.</p>

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Announcements: The next ACC meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2008.

Articulation Coordinating Committee

October 22, 2008

Item 3

**Subject: Common Prerequisite Revisions**

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Approval: Common Prerequisite revisions.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials provided at the meeting

Facilitator/Presenter: Ms. Lynda Page

Articulation Coordinating Committee

October 22, 2008

Item 4

**Subject: Common Transcript Subcommittee Recommendations**

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Approval: Common Transcript Subcommittee recommendations.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials included in the packet

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Dennis Dulniak

## Common Transcript Subcommittee Executive Summary

### List of Participants:

Dennis Dulniak (UCF) - Chair  
Debbie Bullard (PHCC)  
Kathy Cecil (HCC)  
Harry DeMik (FAU)  
Susan Fell (SPC)  
Steve Pritz (UF)

*The purpose of the group is to review, discuss, and recommend to the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC) any changes to the latest (1977, as amended) Common Transcript Standard Form.*

- A. There is an expectation that specific standard information will be on the printed official transcript at all educational institutions in the State of Florida.
- i. This subcommittee will make recommendations to the ACC to reach an updated consensus on the standard information that should be on official transcripts.
  - ii. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO) has published recommendations for transcripts and created a national professional guideline for academic records and transcripts (2003).
- B. Common Transcript Standard Form
- The subcommittee considered whether a state standard for printed official transcripts is required, since FASTER/SPEEDE have set the standard for electronic transcripts. The standards of FASTER/SPEEDE can be used with output as an official paper transcript.
- i. The transmission of transcript information from State of Florida institutions to other State institutions is mandated to be through FASTER or SPEEDE.
  - ii. Institutions meeting FASTER/SPEEDE requirements have the same minimum requirements as the paper official transcript.
  - iii. Deregulating the Common Transcript Standard Form would allow institutions to have flexibility in printed official transcript format while meeting professional standards.
- C. Issues, Questions, and Discussions
- i. Considerations made for whether paper official transcripts should carry SSNs or not, or if the student should determine this to protect their identity. SSNs are a required element for FASTER and SPEEDE.
  - ii. Standardization was originally determined for State of Florida institutions to exchange printed transcripts by the Common Transcript Standard Form. It was not intended to govern requests from out-of-state institutions or private entities.

- iii. The focus of this subcommittee was on transcripts sent from institution to institution in the State of Florida, rather than the format of paper transcripts.
  - a. The purpose of standardization should be so that the transcript that is received at an educational institution can be easily identified to the student, for admission or transfer credit purposes.

**Suggested Subcommittee Recommendation:**

*The current SPEEDE/FASTER electronic transcript formats required of all public post-secondary institutions in Florida meets the requirements previously included in the Common Transcript Standard Form, as amended. It is recommended that any printed official transcripts follow the professional standards as included in “The AACRAO 2003 Academic Record and Transcript Guide” or subsequent publication by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.*

The recommendation was unanimously endorsed by all SUS and CC institutions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dennis J. Dulniak  
UCF University Registrar

## Common Transcript Subcommittee

### Recommendation:

*The current SPEEDE/FASTER electronic transcript formats required of all public post-secondary institutions in Florida meets the requirements previously included in the Common Transcript Standard Form, as amended. It is recommended that any printed official transcripts follow the professional standards as included in “The AACRAO 2003 Academic Record and Transcript Guide” or subsequent publication by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.*

Dennis Dulniak (UCF) – Chair  
 Debbie Bullard (PHCC)  
 Kathy Cecil (HCC)  
 Lori Clark (DOE)  
 Harry DeMik (FAU)  
 Susan Fell (SPC)  
 Steve Pritz (UF)

### Unanimous Approval

SUS	CC
Janet Johnson, FAMU	Karen Lee Murphy, BC
Harry DeMik, FAU	Stephanie Burnette, BCC
Susan Byers, FGCU	Christy Jones, CFCC
Renee Peterson, FIU	Jayne Roberts, CC
Kim Barber, FSU	Richard Pastor, DSC
Kathy Allen, NCF	Bilee Silva, ESC
Dennis Dulniak, UCF	Lori Collins, FCCJ
Steve Pritz, UF	Cheryl Ann Malsheimer, FKCC
Andrea McLeod, UNF	Sharon Todd, GCCC
Angela DeBose, USF	Kathy Cecil, HCC
Ann Dziadon, UWF	Karen Chapdelaine, IRSC
	Gayle Hunter, LCCC
	Mark Swearingen, LSCC
	MariLynn Lewy, MCC
	Dulce Beltran, MDC
	Mary Anne Wheeler, NFCC
	Christine Bishop, NFSC
	Edward Muller, PBCC
	Debra Bullard, PHCC
	Kathy Bucklew, PCC
	Martha Cauhey, PJC
	John Scarpino, SCC
	Lynn Sullivan, SFC



	Deborah Fuschetti, SFCC O'Neal Williams, SJRCC Susan Fell. SPC Katherine Nerona-Balog, TCC Renee Simpson, VCC
--	---

October 8, 2008

Articulation Coordinating Committee

October 22, 2008

Item 5

**Subject: Proposed language for s.1008.38, F.S. on articulation accountability process**

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Approval: Proposed language for s.1008.38, F.S. on articulation accountability process.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials included in the packet

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Heather Sherry

## **Student Transition Accountability Process General Outline for Proposed Legislation**

The proposed legislation will amend section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, to include the following:

1. Establish authority for SBE (in consultation with BOG) to define student transition accountability measures and a formal reporting process in rule.
2. Redefine the minimum elements that must be addressed by the measures.
3. Require the Department of Education to formally report trend data based on reporting procedures established in rule - findings should be used as a basis for making policy recommendations regarding student transition issues.

**1008.38 Articulation accountability process.**--The State Board of Education, in consultation ~~conjunction~~ with the Board of Governors, shall adopt rules creating articulation accountability measures ~~which that~~ assess the status of systemwide articulation processes authorized under s. 1007.23 and establishing an articulation accountability process for the formal reporting of trend data. ~~which at a minimum shall address:~~

The articulation accountability measures shall address at a minimum:

- (1) The progression of students from secondary education into and through public and private postsecondary education and the workforce. ~~The impact of articulation processes on ensuring educational continuity and the orderly and unobstructed transition of students between public secondary and postsecondary education systems and facilitating the transition of students between the public and private sectors.~~
- (2) The adequacy of preparation of public secondary students to smoothly who matriculate articulate to a public postsecondary institution.
- (3) The effectiveness utilization of articulated acceleration mechanisms available to secondary students.
- (4) The smooth transfer of community college transition of associate in arts degree graduates to a state university four-year baccalaureate degree programs.
- (5) The adequacy of preparation of lower division undergraduate students for success in upper division programs. ~~An examination of degree requirements that exceed the parameters of 60 credit hours for an associate degree and 120 hours for a baccalaureate degree in public postsecondary programs.~~
- (6) The transition of career and technical education students into and through programs of study with established articulation agreements. ~~The relationship between the College Level Academic Skills Test Program and articulation to the upper division in public postsecondary institutions.~~

**History.**--s. 383, ch. 2002-387; s. 128, ch. 2007-217.

Articulation Coordinating Committee

**October 22, 2008**

**Item 6**

**Subject:** Workshop on articulation accountability measures

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials included in the packet

Facilitator/Presenter: Mr. Matthew Bouck

**Articulation Coordinating Committee  
Articulation Accountability Workshop  
October 22, 2008  
Tallahassee, Florida**

---

Section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, mandates the State Board of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors, to develop articulation accountability measures to assess Florida's statewide articulation process. Currently, identification of measures and data collection is conducted primarily by the various education sectors. This project seeks to create a comprehensive data reporting system to assist policymakers in decisions that will facilitate student transition.

In order to recommend articulation accountability measures to the State Board of Education, and to the Board of Governors, the Articulation Coordinating Committee will conduct a series of workgroups to address a number of existing and proposed measures that address aspects and levels of student transfer. Each workgroup will discuss the efficacy of those measures, and more importantly, articulation issues that would benefit from more focused research. The identification of such issues will lead to measures that can be addressed by the ACC and linked to policy goals of the State Board of Education and Board of Governors.

The ACC workshop will be held from 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., with the ACC meeting following from 12:30 – 3:00 (see below for workgroup room assignments). All meeting participants will begin the morning session at 9:30 a.m. in room 1721/25 for introductory comments. Workgroups will commence at 10:15 a.m. in their respective rooms. For those wishing to participate in the workgroups, but unable to travel to Tallahassee, each workgroup has a conference call option. Please call the number below and enter the appropriate conference access code for the workgroup of your choice.

<b>Articulation Accountability Workgroups</b>	<b>Chair</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>Conference Call Number</b>	<b>Conference Call Access Code</b>
College/Career Transition and Readiness	Judy Bilsky	1721/25	(888) 808-6959	2459543*
Acceleration	Jill White	1360	(888) 808-6959	2459483*
2+2 Transfer and Readiness	Dottie Minear	1706	(888) 808-6959	2459544*
Workforce Education	Lucy Hadi	856/60	(888) 808-6959	2457820*

\*Reminder: these numbers will not be available until 10:15 a.m.

Articulation Coordinating Committee

October 22, 2008

Item 7

**Subject: ACC format and future schedule**

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: None

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Heather Sherry

Articulation Coordinating Committee

**October 22, 2008**

**Item 8**

**Subject:** Next Generation strategic initiatives: Gold Standard Career Pathways, Articulation Accountability, Common Prerequisite Revisions, Postsecondary Course Competencies, College and Career Readiness, and State college system

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials included in the packet

Facilitator/Presenter: Ms. Lucy Hadi, Dr. Heather Sherry, and Dr. Judy Bilsky

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



**Gold Standard Career Pathways  
Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Lucy Hadi, Project Lead**



### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Eric Smith

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy Hadi

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Loretta Costin

## **Team Members**

The following lists the project team members:

Project Sponsor	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Lead	Lucy Hadi
Project Manager	Loretta Costin (WFE)
Core Team Member	Heather Sherry (Articulation)
	Julie Alexander (CC)
	Tara Goodman (WFE)
	Mark Baird (WFE)
	Andrea Latham (FACTS)

## **Key Stakeholders**

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

Business and Industry Representatives	Tony Carvajal, Florida Chamber of Commerce
Economic Development representatives	Linda Kever, Florida Trend
Workforce development representatives	Sena Black, Enterprise Florida
	Dale Brill, OTTED
	Monesia Brown, AWI Director
	Andra Cornelius, Workforce Florida
	Tom Shiner, Workforce Florida
Education partners	Dr. Joseph Joyner, Superintendent, St. Johns County Schools
	Mary Jane Tappen, Vice Chancellor, K-12
	Dr. Judith Bilsky, Community Colleges
	Jeff Stevenson, Gulf Coast Community College
	Marsan Carr, FACTE
	Frank Fuller, Banner Center for Career Academies
	Barbara Sloan, Tallahassee Community College
Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC)	State Board of Education/Board of Governors/Legislature (for rules, regulations, and/or legislation)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	28
II.	Scope.....	29
III.	Objectives .....	29
IV.	Project Approach .....	29
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	30
VI.	Success Criteria.....	31
VII.	Milestones .....	31
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	32
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	32

## I. Introduction

What students and parents need from articulation agreements and practices within Florida's education system is fairness, consistency, and predictability. According to several OPPAGA studies, barriers continue to impede articulation and must be overcome in a systemic way in order for students to progress through Florida's postsecondary education system in a seamless and efficient manner.

In line with the State Board of Education goal of Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, the Department has identified several objectives that focus on eliminating unnecessary barriers to student transitions from high school to postsecondary and among postsecondary institutions. Under the strategic focus area of expanding opportunities for post-secondary degrees and certificates, this project relates specifically to the identification of "Gold Standard" industry recognized credentials in an effort to establish educational pathways to promote student movement up the college and career ladder.

Since the passing of the *Career and Professional Education Act* and the reauthorization of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act* in 2006, the Department has initiated projects and initiatives to address the new federal and state legislative requirements. One such requirement deals with the availability of industry-recognized certifications (including professional licensures for regulated industries) and accountability mechanisms to track certifications received by students at the secondary and postsecondary levels. In October 2007, OPPAGA reported that the percentage of high school students attending career academies that lead to identified industry certifications earned a higher median income than their peers in the 2003 graduating class. [OPPAGA Report No. 07-40](#) *Career Academy Students Perform Better Than Other Students During High School; Later Outcomes Vary* (October 2007)

Since 2006, 43 Postsecondary Adult Vocational Certificate (PSAV) to Associate in Applied Science/Associate in Science (AAS/AS) statewide agreements have been created. In addition, 3 Industry Certification to AAS/AS statewide articulation agreements have been approved (approved by SBE on 8/19/08). These agreements allow students who are progressing to the next level of education to earn a guaranteed number of college credits toward the AAS or AS degree. Each agreement ensures the student has met a specified level of competency as validated by a third party (i.e. industry certification, professional licensure, etc.). Given the increase in the number of students who are pursuing industry credentials in a variety of areas, these agreements will become increasingly important. Articulation agreements provide incentives for students to pursue a higher level of postsecondary education and eliminate the need for students to repeat coursework to obtain competencies that have already been mastered and documented. This reduction of required credit based on demonstration of competencies will save money for both students (tuition & lost

earnings as a result of delayed employment) and the state (funding for repeat instruction).

Project start date = July 2008

## **II. Scope**

The scope of the Gold Standard Career pathways Project includes the following:

- a. Identification of the specific “Gold Standard” industry certifications for which the development of articulation agreements are best suited
- b. Codification of identified gold standard career pathways agreements in State Board of Education Rule

The project scope does not include:

- a. Monitoring student usage of “Gold Standard” career pathways agreements
- b. Monitoring of institutional compliance with articulation agreements

## **III. Objectives**

1. Using the Agency for Workforce Innovation’s (AWI) published list of industry certifications that are considered to be the “gold standard,” identify the certifications for which articulation agreements should and will be developed.
2. Establish educational pathways based on gold standard certifications to promote student movement up and across the college and career ladder.

## **IV. Project Approach**

The following approach will be taken to produce the project’s deliverables:

The Department, in cooperation with business and workforce development partners, will identify credentials that are industry-recognized and granted based on third-party testing (considered “gold standard” under Perkins IV).

Recommendations will be made by the Next generation Occupations Initiative Committee (consisting of 16 members representing various educational and workforce entities) regarding the gold standard credentials for which statewide articulation agreements should be developed.

Through collaborative efforts with community college and career center faculty representatives, identified gold standard industry credentials will be compared against degree programs in related fields to determine where articulation agreements should be established. The goal will be to strengthen educational pathways that combine academic and career and technical education components to accelerate student movement up the career ladder. Faculty workgroup recommendations for new articulation agreements will move through the established approval process of the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC), and the ACC will make recommendations to the State Board of Education for final approval.

## **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. The Next generation Occupations Steering Committee will come to agreement on specific certifications that should be considered “Gold Standard.”
- b. Discipline committees will have adequate participation in the process of drafting gold standard articulation agreements.
- c. The Articulation Coordinating Committee will make recommendations to the State Board regarding identified Gold Standard articulation agreements.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- a. The rule-making process requires specific timelines for advertising and rule development workshops.
- b. Travel for committee members may be limited due to fiscal constraints.

## VI. Success Criteria

The project will be considered successful when the number of statewide career and technical articulation agreements increases by 20% each year (over a 2 year period) based on identified “gold standard” credentials.

## VII. Milestones

- |    |                            |   |
|----|----------------------------|---|
| a. | July 2008                  | Develop action plan and present to Next Generation Workforce Curriculum Steering Committee      |
| b. | July 2008                  | Charge curriculum work groups to identify Gold Standard certifications in their career clusters |
| c. | September 2008             | Steering Committee approves Gold Standard recommendations                                       |
| d. | October 22, 2008           | ACC approves 2009-10 Gold Standard proposal   |
| e. | November 2008 – March 2009 | Drafting of 2009-10 articulation agreements for identified Gold Standard Certifications         |
| f. | May 27, 2009               | ACC approves first round of proposed articulation agreements                                    |
| g. | August 2009                | State Board of Education approves proposed gold standard articulation agreements for 2009-10    |
| h. | August 2009                | Work groups submit 2010-11 Gold Standard recommendations to Steering Committee                  |
| i. | September 2009             | Steering Committee approves 2010-11 Gold Standard recommendations                               |
| j. | October 2009               | Present Gold Standard recommendations to ACC for approval                                       |
| k. | November 2009 – May 2010   | Develop 2010-11 articulation agreements for Gold Standard certifications                        |
| l. | May 2010                   | ACC approves 2010-11 Gold Standard articulation agreements                                      |
| m. | August 2010                | State Board of Education approves proposed gold standard articulation agreements for 2010-11    |

## **VIII. Summary Budget**

Expenses related to the project will be absorbed by the Division of Workforce Development operating budget.

## **IX. Supplemental Documents**

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

- a. [Report No. 07-40](#) Career Academy Students Perform Better Than Other Students During High School; Later Outcomes Vary (October 2007)
- b. [Report No. 07-23](#) Community Colleges Generally Are Consistent in Awarding College Credit for Certificate Programs (April 2007)
- c. Agency for Workforce Innovation Comprehensive Industry Certification list [http://www.floridajobs.org/CAPE/WFI\\_Comprehensive\\_CAPE\\_Certifications.pdf](http://www.floridajobs.org/CAPE/WFI_Comprehensive_CAPE_Certifications.pdf)



# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

**T. WILLARD FAIR**, *Chairman*

**Members**

**DR. AKSHAY DESAI**

**ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ**

**PHOEBE RAULERSON**

**KATHLEEN SHANAHAN**

**LINDA K. TAYLOR**

**Dr. Eric J. Smith**  
**Commissioner of Education**



**Articulation Accountability Project**  
**Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Lucy Hadi, Project Lead**

### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Eric Smith

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy Hadi

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Heather Sherry

## **Team Members**

The following lists the project team members:

Project Sponsor	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Lead	Lucy Hadi
Project Manager	Heather Sherry
Project Coordinator	Matthew Bouck (Articulation) Dottie Minear (BOG)
Core Team Member	Jay Pfeiffer (ARM) Judy Bilsky (CC) Julie Alexander (CC), Lynda Page (BOG), Tara Goodman (WFE) Mark Baird (WFE), Connie Graunke (FACTS) Jeff Sellers (ARM)

## **Key Stakeholders**

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC)  
ACC Standing Committee on Postsecondary Articulation Policy  
State Board of Education/Board of Governors/Legislature  
Students  
Parents  
Business Community

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	37
II.	Scope.....	37
III.	Objectives .....	38
IV.	Project Approach .....	38
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	38
VI.	Success Criteria.....	39
VII.	Milestones .....	39
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	40
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	40

## **I. Introduction**

What students and parents need from articulation agreements and practices within Florida's education system is fairness, consistency, and predictability. According to several OPPAGA studies, barriers continue to impede articulation and must be overcome in a systemic way in order for students to progress through Florida's postsecondary education system in a seamless and efficient manner.

In line with the State Board of Education goal of Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, the Department has identified several objectives that focus on eliminating unnecessary barriers to student transitions from high school to postsecondary and among postsecondary institutions. Under the strategic focus area of increasing access to postsecondary degrees and certificates, this project relates specifically to strengthening the articulation accountability process by identifying appropriate new measures and updating current ones in statute, while providing authority for a State Board of Education rule.

Section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, currently directs the State Board of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors (BOG), to develop articulation accountability measures and establish an articulation accountability process. However, several of the required elements listed in statute are outdated and key educational pathways are excluded. In addition, the current statute does not provide for an established comprehensive reporting requirement. Since the establishment of the statute in 1993, data relating to articulation accountability has been collected by various entities, but without a formal reporting requirement, the information has not been fully utilized to effectively drive policy decisions. Instead, policy recommendations have often been made based on anecdotal evidence. This practice has not allowed for data-driven decision making and has limited the effectiveness of strategic planning relating to student transitions.

Project Start Date = May 2008

## **II. Scope**

The scope of the Articulation Accountability Project includes the following:

- a. Work through the legislative process to propose an amendment to section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, to provide authority for the State Board of Education to adopt specific articulation accountability measures and a process for reporting on those measures in rule.
- b. The adoption of a State Board of Education rule that includes specific articulation accountability measures (this will be completed in next steps, given the amendment to statute is successful)
- c. Implementation of a fully operational articulation accountability process.

### **III. Objectives**

Amend the Florida Statutes, adopt a rule, and implement supporting departmental processes that provides for the collection of relevant data to enable data-driven policy decisions regarding student transitions.

### **IV. Project Approach**

The following approach will be taken to produce the project's deliverables:

Department staff (including representatives from Government Relations, ARM, K-12, Community Colleges, Workforce Education, and Articulation) will develop a comprehensive legislative proposal under the umbrella of "Next Generation Accountability" to include revisions to the articulation accountability process outlined in section 1008.38, Florida Statutes.

Proposed statutory amendment language will be vetted through the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC, which includes K-20 sector representation), via a workshop to be held on October 22, 2008. Recommendations will then be forwarded to the State Board as part of the proposed Legislative Agenda for the 2009 Legislative Session.

Upon revision of section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, during the 2009 Legislative Session, the State Board of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors, shall adopt specific measures in rule that will guide the establishment of a comprehensive accountability report and a formal reporting process to identify data trends. Trend data will be used as the basis for policy recommendations to the Governor's Office and the Legislature regarding articulation issues.

### **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. The Legislature will support policies that strengthen K-20 articulation and eliminate barriers to successful student transition.
- b. The Articulation Coordinating Committee will make recommendations to the State Board regarding appropriate updates to the current statute.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- a. The Legislature must amend statute to provide rule-making authority for the State Board of Education to adopt specific articulation accountability measures and reporting processes in rule.
- b. The rule-making process requires specific timelines for advertising and rule development workshops.

## **VI. Success Criteria**

The project will be considered successful if the Legislature amends Section 1008.38, Florida Statutes, to update the required articulation accountability elements and provide authority for the State Board of Education to adopt a rule relating to the articulation accountability process.

In addition, the State Board of Education will adopt a rule which identifies specific articulation accountability measures and establishes reporting requirements and timelines.

## **VII. Milestones**

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| a. March 2008            | Meet with DOE internal stakeholders to determine current collection methods and existing gaps in data collection.  |
| b. May 2008              | Discuss existing structure with ACC Standing Committee on Articulation Policy and plan to consolidate DOE/BOG efforts to collect articulation accountability data (as required by s. 1008.38). |
| c. August 2008           | Draft Legislative Proposal to be included in Next Generation Accountability package  |
| d. August – October 2008 | Convene workgroup to establish draft of measures to be included in initial report  |
| e. October 22, 2008      | ACC Standing Committees for workshop on proposed statutory change and initial discussion relating to possible measures   |
| f. November 2008         | Share any suggested statutory changes to s. 1008.38, F.S., (based on gap analysis and feedback from ACC) with DOE Government Relations Office and Leadership team.                             |
| g. January - May 2009    | Work approved proposal through the legislative process.  |
| h. July 1, 2009          | Begin rule making process  |

## VIII. Summary Budget

Expenses related to the project will be absorbed by the Office of Articulation and Accountability, Research & Measurement (ARM) budget.

## IX. Supplemental Documents

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

- a. [Report No. 08-25](#) Postsecondary Student Use of the Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students (FACTS) Is Low (April 2008)
- b. [Report No. 08-11](#) Inconsistent Implementation of Common Prerequisites Creates Barriers to Effective 2+2 Articulation (March 2008)
- c. [Report No. 07-49](#) Students Encounter Barriers When Transferring Credit from Non-Public Institutions to Community Colleges (December 2007)
- d. [Report No. 07-23](#) Community Colleges Generally Are Consistent in Awarding College Credit for Certificate Programs (April 2007)
- e. [Report No. 07-22](#) Institutions Do Not Have to Accept Transfer Credit for Many of the Courses in the Statewide Course Numbering System (March 2007)

OPPAGA articulation-related projects underway:

- f. Common Course Numbering – Examines the common course numbering system among Florida’s community colleges and universities.
- g. Articulation – Acceleration Mechanisms – Examines Florida’s acceleration mechanisms and how they affect articulation of students among institutions.
- h. Section 1008.38, Florida Statutes  
[http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=Ch1008/SEC38.HTM&Title=->2008->Ch1008->Section%2038#1008.38](http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=Ch1008/SEC38.HTM&Title=->2008->Ch1008->Section%2038#1008.38)
- i. Legislative Proposal for amendment to s. 1008.38, Florida Statutes.



# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



**Common Prerequisite Revisions  
Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Lucy Hadi, Project Lead**

### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Eric Smith

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy Hadi

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Heather Sherry

## **Team Members**

The following lists the project team members:

Project Sponsor	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Lead	Lucy Hadi
Project Manager	Heather Sherry
Project Coordinator	Lynda Page (BOG)/Judy Dial (CC)
Core Team Member	Matthew Bouck (Articulation)
	Shruti Graf (Articulation)
	Judy Bilsky (CC)
	Julie Alexander (CC)
	Andrea Latham (FACTS)
	Richard Stevens (BOG)

## **Key Stakeholders**

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

- Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC)
- Statewide Course Numbering System faculty discipline committees
- Common Prerequisite Faculty Discipline Committees
- Oversight Committee (postsecondary institution representatives – CC & SUS)
- SUS and CC Instructional affairs organizations

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	45
II.	Scope.....	46
III.	Objectives .....	47
IV.	Project Approach .....	47
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	48
VI.	Success Criteria.....	49
VII.	Milestones .....	49
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	50
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	50

## **I. Introduction**

What students and parents need from articulation agreements and practices within Florida's education system is fairness, consistency, and predictability. According to several OPPAGA studies, barriers continue to impede articulation and must be overcome in a systemic way in order for students to progress through Florida's postsecondary education system in a seamless and efficient manner.

In line with the State Board of Education goal of Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, the Department has identified several objectives that focus on eliminating unnecessary barriers to student transitions from high school to postsecondary and among postsecondary institutions. Under the strategic focus area of increasing access to postsecondary degrees and certificates, this project relates specifically to revising the Common Prerequisites for baccalaureate degrees to ensure that students receive accurate and up-to-date information that will reduce their time-to degree.

Section 1007.25, Florida Statutes, requires the Department to identify common prerequisite courses and course substitutions for degree programs across all institutions. Common prerequisites must be offered and accepted by all state universities and community colleges, and the department is required to develop a centralized database that lists the courses and substitutions for each baccalaureate degree program. These common prerequisite courses are maintained in the Common Prerequisite Manual which can be accessed online at [FACTS.org](http://FACTS.org). The state's common prerequisites policy is intended to facilitate articulation for students transferring from community colleges to universities by establishing common courses needed for admission to upper division programs at any of the state's universities or state colleges. However, OPPAGA recently found that for nearly two-thirds (65%) of the degree programs examined, universities were implementing prerequisites in ways that could create barriers for students who followed the approved common prerequisites. [OPPAGA Report No. 08-11](#) *Inconsistent Implementation of Common Prerequisites Creates Barriers to Effective 2+2 Articulation* (March 2008).

Universities Were Not Consistently Implementing the Common Prerequisites for 14 Popular Degree Programs

Degree Program	Florida A&M University	Florida Atlantic University	Florida Gulf Coast University	Florida International University	Florida State University	University of Central Florida	University of Florida	University of North Florida	University of South Florida	University of West Florida	Problem Rate by Programs
Accounting	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
Biology	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	80%
Business Administration	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	90%
Civil Engineering	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	✓	n/a	67%
Elementary Education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0%
English	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	40%
Finance	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	89%
History	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	60%
Hospitality	n/a	X	✓	X	X	✓	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	43%
Marketing	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	89%
Nursing	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	50%
Political Science	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓	60%
Psychology	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	✓	X	✓	70%
Sociology	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	✓	X	n/a	67%
Problem Rate by University	91%	86%	29%	93%	57%	71%	92%	23%	50%	58%	

X - University prerequisites could create articulation barriers for students following the common prerequisites.

✓ - University prerequisites did not create articulation barriers for students.

Source: OPPAGA analysis of university prerequisites and common prerequisites.

All public institutions with baccalaureate degree programs are required to go through a state-level approval process for determining common prerequisite courses for each program. Lower division students that are planning to transfer to a specific baccalaureate degree program rely on advising information that is provided via the Common Prerequisite Manual. It is imperative that this information be accurate and that institutional requirements do not vary from the approved manual. If all similar baccalaureate programs (i.e., Nursing) require the same prerequisite courses for admission, then students can complete those prerequisites within the number of credits required to earn an associate degree at any college. When upper division program entrance requirements can be met within the requirements of the AA degree, students are able to shorten their time to degree, resulting in a cost savings for both the student and the state.

Project Start Date = March 2008

## II. Scope

The scope of the Common Prerequisites Project includes the following:

- a. Revision of Common Prerequisites to include a comprehensive update for all baccalaureate programs to ensure alignment with current institutional practice.
- b. The accurate publication of newly approved, commonly agreed upon prerequisite courses in the Common Prerequisite Manual which is housed on [FACTS.org](http://FACTS.org).
- c. Plan for communicating changes to institutions – down to the academic department level.
- d. Monitoring of institutional compliance with adopted Common Prerequisites.

### **III. Objectives**

Revise the common prerequisite courses for each baccalaureate degree program in the state to strengthen current statutory protections for students transitioning from an associate's degree to the upper division at a 4-year public institution.

Establish a process for monitoring institutional compliance with approved prerequisites and implement a formal communication plan to ensure that institutions (at the department level) are aware of the state-level approval process for proposed changes.

### **IV. Project Approach**

The following approach will be taken to produce the project's deliverables:

Faculty from universities and colleges offering a baccalaureate degree within a 2-digit classification of instructional programs (CIP) code will meet primarily via conference call and email to determine the common prerequisites appropriate to recommend to the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC) Common Prerequisite Discipline Committee for approval. Currently, there are 28 major discipline committees plus a number of subcommittees associated with specific majors within each discipline. Common Prerequisite discipline committees are formed by 2-digit CIP with ½ community college and ½ state university faculty representations. The number of faculty on each committee ranges from two to ten, depending upon the number of institutions offering a degree program within that 2-digit CIP.

Each recommended change to the common prerequisites will go through the regular ACC process. This involves the Common Prerequisite Discipline Committee review as well as Oversight Committee and full Articulation Coordinating Committee approval. The goal will be to identify as much commonality among the 2-digit CIP programs as possible.

Staff from the Board of Governors and the Department will work together to develop a cross-sector communication plan and a common prerequisite compliance monitoring process that periodically checks for inconsistencies in the application of common prerequisite requirements.

## **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. All faculty discipline committees will reach agreement upon common prerequisites for each baccalaureate degree program.
- b. Public colleges and universities will “buy-in” to the stated goals of the project and engage in practices that support easing student transitions.
- c. The Articulation Coordinating Committee will serve as the advisory group that can facilitate policy discussions among appropriate K-20 stakeholders, make recommendations regarding K-20 articulation policies to the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors and the Legislature, and increase communication of those policies to all interested parties once policies are adopted.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- a. Faculty discipline committee meetings must take place via conference call due to geographical distribution and lack of funding for travel.
- b. Adequate communication of state policies to all front-line individuals at institutions is impacted by staff turnover.
- c. Current state law/rule does not provide for consequences in the event of deliberate institutional non-compliance with state policies



## VI. Success Criteria

The project will be considered successful when all of the baccalaureate degree program prerequisites have been reviewed and revised by faculty discipline committees, the Oversight Committee, and the Articulation Coordinating Committee.

In addition, the Common Prerequisite Manual will be updated and FACTS.org will be provided with on going access to accurate and up-to-date information regarding any changes to the common prerequisite requirements. A formal process will be established for both communicating with institutions and monitoring institutional compliance with approved common prerequisites.

## VII. Milestones

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| a. March 2008                | BOG/DOE staffs meet to develop action plan for Common Prerequisites Project.  |
| b. April 2008                | Conference calls with institutional liaisons to describe scope of project and process for revisions.                                    |
| c. April - August 2008       | Faculty from SUS and DCC baccalaureate programs begin meeting (focus first on programs studied by OPPAGA [Report No. 08-11])            |
| d. July 2008 - February 2009 | ACC Common Prerequisite Discipline Committees meet to review faculty committee recommendations  |
| e. October 8, 2008           | ACC Oversight Committee reviews first set of recommendation   |
| f. October 22, 2008          | ACC reviews first set of proposed prerequisites   |
| g. December 2008             | Newly approved prerequisites posted to 2009-10 Common Prerequisite Manual (CPM) to meet December/January institutional catalog deadline |
| h. February 25, 2009         | ACC reviews proposed prerequisites for remaining programs   |
| i. March 2009                | Add all remaining prerequisites to the CPM  |

- and begin process of changing the format of the CPM to an interactive approach.
- j. March - July 2009      Develop a communication plan for sharing information with institutions (at the academic department level) and establish a process for monitoring institutional compliance.

### **VIII. Summary Budget**

Expenses related to the project will be absorbed by the Office of Articulation and the Board of Governors - State University System of Florida operating budgets.

### **IX. Supplemental Documents**

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

- a. Common Prerequisite Manual - [http://facts23.facts.org/navigation/detail\\_ext/cpp\\_intro.do?pageId=070505](http://facts23.facts.org/navigation/detail_ext/cpp_intro.do?pageId=070505)
- b. [Report No. 08-25](#) Postsecondary Student Use of the Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students (FACTS) Is Low (April 2008)
- c. [Report No. 08-11](#) Inconsistent Implementation of Common Prerequisites Creates Barriers to Effective 2+2 Articulation (March 2008)

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



**Postsecondary Course Competencies  
Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Lucy Hadi, Project Lead**

### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Eric Smith

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy Hadi

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Heather Sherry

## **Team Members**

The following lists the project team members:

Project Sponsor	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Lead	Lucy Hadi
Project Manager	Heather Sherry
Project Coordinator	Matthew Bouck (Articulation)/Judy Bilsky (CC)
Core Team Member	Julie Alexander (CC)
	Dottie Minear (BOG)
	Connie Graunke (FACTS)
	Richard Stevens (BOG)

## **Key Stakeholders**

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

- Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC)
- Statewide Course Numbering System faculty discipline committees
- Faculty Discipline Committees (postsecondary institution representatives – CC & SUS)
- SUS and CC Instructional affairs organizations
- ACHIEVE/American Diploma Project

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	55
II.	Scope.....	56
III.	Objectives .....	56
IV.	Project Approach .....	57
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	57
VI.	Success Criteria.....	58
VII.	Milestones .....	59
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	59
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	59

## I. Introduction

What students and parents need from articulation agreements and practices within Florida's education system is fairness, consistency, and predictability. According to several Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) studies, barriers continue to impede articulation and must be overcome in a systemic way in order for students to progress through Florida's postsecondary education system in a seamless and efficient manner.

In line with the State Board of Education goal of Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, the Department has identified several objectives that focus on eliminating unnecessary barriers to student transitions from high school to postsecondary and among postsecondary institutions. Under the strategic focus area of expanding opportunities for postsecondary degrees and certificates, this project relates specifically to redefining postsecondary course descriptions based on student learning outcomes.

The Statewide Course Numbering System (SCNS) is a national articulation policy model in that students are guaranteed course transferability for equated courses at participating postsecondary institutions in Florida. Other states may have numbering systems in place that facilitate student transfer, but the SCNS is generally cited as the most comprehensive course-to-course articulation mechanism in the country. Currently, institutions supply the SCNS with course descriptions and objectives that are generally copied from a faculty member's course syllabus. This course information is topic driven and does not address the depth of student learning. While it assists faculty discipline committees in determining course equivalencies, many times the information is not sufficient to ensure that appropriate course equivalencies are established.

The trend in higher education is toward greater accountability for student learning outcomes. Several national discussions and reports have emphasized the importance of identifying competencies associated with postsecondary courses:

*Postsecondary education institutions should measure and report meaningful student learning outcomes...Accreditation agencies should make performance outcomes, including completion rates and student learning, the core of their assessments as a priority over inputs or processes.*

- A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education  
U.S. Department of Education

*...[A]ccreditors should establish standards and review processes that visibly and clearly expect accredited institutions and programs to...Regularly gather and report concrete evidence about what students know and can do as a result of their respective courses of study, framed in terms of established learning outcomes and supplied at an appropriate level of aggregation (e.g., at the institutional or program level).*

- Statement of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs (Council for Higher Education Accreditation)

*The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in ...educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.*

- The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement  
Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Greater reliance on competencies and student learning outcomes will result in more robust course equivalencies, that is, a more thorough review of student knowledge across institutions. The appropriate equating of courses is essential in ensuring that students who take equivalent courses at different institutions are sufficiently prepared to succeed in the subsequent course.

Project Start Date = June 2008

## **II. Scope**

The scope of the Postsecondary Course Competencies Project includes the following:

- a. Revising Statewide Course Numbering System introductory level college courses in math and English to better define the expected student learning outcomes associated with each course.

The project scope does not include:

- a. Establishing a common set of standards for all postsecondary courses in the SCNS.
- b. The impact of course competency revisions on lower-level assessments and readiness for upper-division coursework.

## **III. Objectives**

- a. Create more robust postsecondary course equivalencies by redefining SCNS course descriptions based on competencies, thereby ensuring that students are expected to achieve the same learning outcomes in entry level postsecondary courses across all institutions.
- b. Ensure alignment with postsecondary readiness standards.



#### **IV. Project Approach**

The following approach will be taken to produce the project's deliverables:

In order to facilitate equivalency determinations and better align entry and exit course expectations for students, the Department will engage in an extensive project to redefine SCNS course descriptions based on competencies and student learning outcomes.

This portion of the project will take place subsequently (but with some overlap) to the College and Career Readiness Project because it is dependent upon the establishment of common postsecondary readiness benchmarks. Faculty committee members will significantly overlap to ensure continuity and alignment.

The SCNS will initiate this project with specified lower-level courses in mathematics and English. In each instance, the SCNS will solicit from each participating institution a copy of their course syllabus that will include course competencies and student learning outcomes.

Discipline faculty committees will convene to review these course descriptions and determine the set of competencies and student learning outcomes that are appropriate for that course. The SCNS employs a number of volunteer faculty representatives to serve on discipline committees. These faculty members represent the participating institutions to include universities, community colleges, career and technical centers, and nonpublic institutions.

Once the competencies of the course are set, the committee will then determine if the institution courses at that course number remain equivalent (based on the syllabus description). Courses deemed not equivalent under this more 'robust' course description will be recommended for a course number change— institutions will be given the opportunity to alter their course to fit the statewide course description, and remain at the equivalent course number.

#### **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. The project coordinators will work closely with ACHIEVE and the American Diploma Project to ensure postsecondary course competencies are identified in conjunction with the identification of postsecondary readiness standards.
- b. The Legislature will continue to support the statutory guarantees provided by the SCNS and provide enforcement authority for adopted policies.
- c. College and university faculty (with input from K-12 representatives) will participate in the review of selected courses and come to consensus on expected learning outcomes.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- a. The number of face-to-face faculty committee meetings may be limited due to financial constraints.

## **VI. Success Criteria**

The SCNS Course descriptions for entry-level mathematics and English courses will include agreed upon expected student learning outcomes across all postsecondary institutions. SCNS course equivalencies will be revised with equivalency determination based on competencies, rather than content.

## **VII. Milestones**

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| a. June 2008             | Identify first grouping of general education courses to begin the course review process.                 |
| b. August 21, 2008       | ADP Orientation session (DOE staff)  |
| c. September 19, 2008    | Faculty Workgroups hold 1 <sup>st</sup> meeting in Orlando (in conjunction with Project Get Ready – ADP) |
| d. October 20, 2008      | ADP Alignment Institute #1 (Washington DC)   |
| e. October-December 2008 | Faculty committees meet to discuss recommendations   |
| f. May 2009              | Faculty finalize recommendations regarding expected student learning outcomes                            |
| g. July 1, 2009          | Course equivalency updates completed on the SCNS.  |

## **VIII. Summary Budget**

Redefining SCNS courses and equivalencies based on competencies and student learning outcomes will require a number of face-to-face meetings between faculty representatives from mathematics as well as English language and literature. Meeting participants are typically reimbursed for travel expenses. In order to ensure the best possible representation, travel costs may vary.

Portions of this project that relate to readiness will be covered by a grant administered by the Division of Community Colleges (to support the ADP/ACHIEVE Project).

It is anticipated that an additional 1-2 meetings will be needed for the math faculty group and 1-2 meetings will be needed for the English faculty group (depending upon progress made at each meeting) to revise course competencies. Each meeting would require between \$5,000 and \$8,000 (approximately 10 people at \$500 each).

Staff travel (Staff will be covered by Office of Articulation budget and SCNS budget can support some travel for representatives. However, SCNS budget will not be sufficient to cover all other travel.)

Minimum anticipated amount = \$10,000

Maximum anticipated amount = \$32,000

## **IX. Supplemental Documents**

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education

U.S. Department of Education (2006)

<http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>

Proposing a Blueprint for Higher Education in Florida: Outlining the Way to a Long-term Master Plan for Higher Education in Florida

Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. (2007)

[http://www.flbog.org/about/\\_doc/fbd/StructureReport.pdf](http://www.flbog.org/about/_doc/fbd/StructureReport.pdf)

The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement

Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2008)

<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2008PrinciplesofAccreditation.pdf>

Statement Of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes:  
Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2003)

<http://www.chea.org/pdf/stmntstudentlearningoutcomes9-03.pdf>

OPPAGA articulation-related projects underway:

- a. **Common Course Numbering** – Examines the common course numbering system among Florida's community colleges and universities.

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

Members

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



**College and Career Readiness Alignment Project  
Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Dr. Willis Holcombe, Project Lead  
Dr. Frances Haithcock, Project Lead  
Lucy Hadi, Project Lead**

### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Smith  
Date

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Willis N. Holcombe  
Date

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frances Haithcock  
Date

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy Hadi  
Date

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judith Bilsky  
Date

## Team Members

The following lists the project team members:

Project Sponsor	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Lead	Chancellor Will Holcombe Chancellor Frances Haithcock Chancellor Lucy Hadi
Project Manager	Vice Chancellor Judith Bilsky
Project Coordinator	Julie Alexander
Core Team Member	Jay Pfeiffer, ARM Mary Jane Tappen, K12 Loretta Costin, Workforce Dr. Heather Sherry, Office of K20 Articulation Dr. Cornelia Orr, Assessment Office Matt Bouck, Statewide Course Numbering System

## Key Stakeholders

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

School Districts	Community Colleges
High School Students	Parents
Board of Governors	Dr. Dottie Minear, State University System
<b>Other stakeholders:</b>	State Board of Education Board of Governors Florida Business and Industry Sector (Workforce) Florida Legislature Citizens of Florida

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	65
II.	Scope.....	65
III.	Objective.....	65
IV.	Project Approach .....	65
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	66
VI.	Success Criteria.....	67
VII.	Milestones.....	68
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	69
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	69



## **I. Introduction**

The purpose of the College and Career Readiness Project is to improve the college and career readiness rate of high school students and reduce the percent needing postsecondary remediation in reading, writing and mathematics after graduation. This project is fully aligned with the Department of Education's strategic goals promoting highest student achievement, seamless articulation and maximum access, and workforce development. The College and Career Readiness Project encompass a variety of collaborative (K12-Workforce-Community Colleges-State University System) efforts to define college and career readiness and to ensure students earning standard high school diplomas meet that definition. Initiatives include, but are not limited to implementation of select components of recent (2008) education reform legislation (SB 1908) as well as taking action on the related recommendations of the *2007-2008 Go Higher, Florida Task Force*.

College and Career Readiness Project start date: April 2008

## **II. Scope**

The scope of the College and Career Readiness Project includes the following:

- a. Adoption of a definition of college and career readiness.
- b. Participation in the American Diploma Project (ADP) "Alignment Institutes."
- c. Development and adoption of postsecondary assessments which are clear in purpose and function.
- d. Provide college-readiness assessment/evaluation before beginning of 12th grade for high school students who indicate an interest in postsecondary education.
- e. Facilitation of collaborative effort between secondary and postsecondary educational institution to provide 12th grade students access to appropriate remedial instruction prior to high school graduation.

## **III. Objective**

There are two primary objectives of the College and Career Readiness Project. The first is to define college and career readiness and submit that definition to inform the department's other strategic efforts to align standards, curriculum, materials, and professional development. The second objective is to provide assessment and remediation, as needed, to students while they are still in high school in reading, writing, and mathematics.

## **IV. Project Approach**

The College and Career Readiness Project consist of multiple, related steps that will converge to meet the singular objective of preparing high school students for success in college and career.

The first step is aligning secondary and postsecondary curriculum so that students exiting high school are ready for college-level coursework upon entry to a college or university. This approach will be facilitated through Florida's participation in the Achieve/American Diploma Project.

The second step relates to testing high school students for college and career readiness through the adoption or continuation of a postsecondary readiness assessment tool which is aligned with Florida's standards of postsecondary readiness.

The third step directly relates to specific provisions contained within Senate Bill 1908 requiring districts and colleges to expand postsecondary readiness assessment administrations to 11<sup>th</sup> grade students who indicate an interest in college.

The fourth step involves facilitating a collaborative effort between the high schools and community colleges to make postsecondary remedial curriculum in math and language arts available to 12<sup>th</sup> grade students prior to high school graduation.

Cross-sector collaboration is a key factor to each approach.

## **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. Working partnership with American Diploma Project Network to align secondary and postsecondary curriculum resulting in a definition of college and career readiness.
- b. Receipt of a federal College Access Challenge Grant (2008-2009) to facilitate 1) American Diploma Project faculty workgroup meetings and 2) communications with stakeholders (\$100,000).
- c. Distribution of 2008-2009 appropriated funds (\$700,000) to the colleges for expanded postsecondary readiness assessment.
- d. Implementation of expanded postsecondary readiness and remediation in high school requires district and college collaboration and evidence of the collaboration will be documented in the Inter-institutional Articulation Agreement.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- a. Adequate financial support for the expanded postsecondary readiness assessment.
- b. Statewide contract with College Board for the administration of Accuplacer/College Placement Test (CPT) ends May 2009, the Department will seek a one-year extension.
- c. Current State Board Rule 6A-10.0315 only authorizes administration of Accuplacer/CPT, SAT or ACT.

## **VI. Success Criteria**

- a. Approval and widespread acceptance of the definition of college readiness with stakeholders.
- b. Adoption of definition of college and career readiness by State Board of Education.
- c. Identification of “gaps” between Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Standards of Postsecondary Readiness for General Education Core with assistance of ADP team.
- d. Alignment of secondary/postsecondary curriculum with assistance of ADP team.
- e. Selection of postsecondary assessment aligned with ADP benchmarks/Florida benchmarks.
- f. Collaborative development by K-12 and Community Colleges of pilot high school postsecondary readiness courses.
- g. Districts and Community Colleges imbed assessment and remediation plan in local Inter-institutional Articulation Agreement.
- h. Community Colleges statewide recognize and accept success in high school postsecondary readiness (remediation) course as fulfillment of remediation requirements.
- i. Districts and Community Colleges work collaboratively to solve logistics of expanded college-readiness assessment testing of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students.

## VII. Milestones

The following are the key project milestones:

- |    |                        |  |
|----|------------------------|--|
| a. | August 21, 2008        | Achieve ADP/Alignment Institute Launch                               |
| b. | September 19, 2008     | Postsecondary Outreach   |
| c. | October 23 – 24, 2008  | Florida Team in Alignment Institute with California and Illinois     |
| d. | November - December    | K-12 and Postsecondary Outreach                                      |
| e. | November - February    | Business and Industry Outreach (Division of Workforce Education)     |
| f. | November - February    | Achieve Visit  |
| g. | December 2008          | Begin expanded postsecondary readiness testing of 11th graders       |
| h. | January 5, 2009        | Florida Submits Mathematics Standards to Achieve for Review          |
| i. | January 2009           | First offering of high school postsecondary remediation courses      |
| j. | March 2009             | Florida Team in Alignment Institute with California and Illinois     |
| k. | March 1, 2009          | Draft Florida English Standards Submitted to Achieve                 |
| l. | April 2009             | Achieve Visit  |
| m. | May 5, 2009            | Final Florida English and Mathematics Standards Submitted to Achieve |
| n. | June 17, 2009          | Language Arts Standards Adopted by Florida State Board of Education  |
| o. | July 19 – 21, 2009     | Florida Team in Alignment Institute with California and Illinois     |
| p. | July 2009              | Identification of postsecondary readiness benchmarks                 |
| q. | July 2009              | Alignment of K-12 and postsecondary core competencies                |
| r. | July 2009              | Definition of college and career readiness                           |
| s. | August – November 2009 | Achieve Visit  |
| t. | December 31, 2009      | Florida Completes Alignment Process                                  |
| u. | June 2010              | Adoption/continuation of postsecondary readiness assessment tool     |

### **VIII. Summary Budget**

Receipt of a federal College Access Challenge Grant (2008-2009) to facilitate American Diploma Project faculty workgroup meetings and communications with stakeholders.	\$100,000
Distribution of 2008-2009 appropriated funds to the colleges for expanded postsecondary readiness assessment.	\$700,000
09-10 LBR request for continued funding of the postsecondary readiness assessment for 11 <sup>th</sup> graders	\$1,000,000

### **IX. Supplemental Documents**

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

- a. Background information and statistics
- b. **Zoom 2008-02:** [Access and Success: Traversing the Academic Pipeline](#)

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

---

T. WILLARD FAIR, *Chairman*

**Members**

DR. AKSHAY DESAI

ROBERTO MARTÍNEZ

PHOEBE RAULERSON

KATHLEEN SHANAHAN

LINDA K. TAYLOR

Dr. Eric J. Smith  
Commissioner of Education



**State College System Task Force and Pilot  
Project Charter**  
Version 1.0

**Dr. Willis Holcombe, Project Lead**

### Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author
10/07/2008	1.0	Original	

### Project Charter Approvals

Project Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Smith

Project Leader

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Willis N. Holcombe

Project Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judith Bilsky

## **Team Members**

The following lists the project team members:

Project Lead	Commissioner Eric Smith
Project Manager	Chancellor Will Holcombe
Project Coordinator	Vice Chancellor Judith Bilsky
Core Team Member	Kasongo Butler
	Patricia Frohe

## **Key Stakeholders**

The following are the project's key stakeholders:

### **Florida College System Task Force**

Commissioner, Department of Education	Eric J. Smith, Chair
President, Broward College	David Armstrong
President, Central Florida Community College	Charles Dassance
President, Palm Beach Community College	Dennis Gallon
President, Pasco-Hernando Community College	Katherine Johnson
President, Tallahassee Community College	William Law
President, Florida Community College at Jacksonville	Steve Wallace
President, Seminole Community College	Ann McGee
President, University of South Florida	Judy Genshaft
President, St. Leo University	Arthur Kirk
President, Keiser University	Art Keiser
Special Education Advisor to Governor Charlie Crist	Dean Colson



### **State College Pilot Project**

*The State College Pilot Project is being led by the nine institutions named as pilot state colleges in SB 1716.*

Chipola College	Northwest Florida State College
Daytona State College	Polk College
Edison State College	Sante Fe College
Indian River State College	St. Petersburg College
Miami Dade College	

*Chancellor Willis N. Holcombe is serving as facilitator for the group. All of these colleges except for Polk and Santa Fe have current baccalaureate-degree granting authorization for select programs.*

### **Other stakeholders**

State Board of Education  
Board of Governors  
Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida  
Florida Legislature  
Florida Business and Industry Sector (Workforce)  
Citizens of Florida

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	75
II.	Scope.....	75
III.	Objectives .....	76
IV.	Project Approach .....	76
V.	Assumptions and Constraints.....	76
VI.	Success Criteria.....	77
VII.	Milestones .....	77
VIII.	Summary Budget .....	78
IX.	Supplemental Documents .....	78

## **I. Introduction**

In response to data which showed Florida ranked 46<sup>th</sup> in the nation in the production of baccalaureate degrees, concern for postsecondary access, and the future of the state's economy, the 2008 Legislature established the Florida College System (FCS) with Senate Bill (SB) 1716. The FCS encompasses the existing 28 community colleges, including 10 that are already authorized to grant limited baccalaureate degrees. In addition, the legislation created the State College Pilot Project, designating 9 community colleges as "pilot state colleges" under the Florida College System.

In order to thoroughly explore and make recommendations to the 2009 Legislature regarding the transition of a community college to a state college, CS/SB 1716 authorized the creation of two Task Force groups: The Florida College System Task Force, chaired by the Commissioner of Education, and the State College Pilot Project, a collaborative body led by the presidents of the 9 pilot state colleges. The charge of both groups includes providing options to the Legislature regarding Governance, Transition Criteria, Program Approval, and Funding for the proposed state colleges.

The Florida College System Transition Project was initiated to facilitate and staff these legislative mandates and specifically supports the Department's strategic plan to expand access to post-secondary degrees and certificates. The project started in June 2008.

## **II. Scope**

The scope of the Florida College System Transition Project includes the following:

- a. Creating and providing operational support for the Florida College System Task Force.
- b. Creating and providing operational support for the State College Pilot Project.
- c. Compiling findings and recommendations that identify critical issues regarding the transition of community colleges to baccalaureate-degree granting colleges, including governance, mission and vision.
- d. Compiling options for the approval process of baccalaureate degree programs within the Florida College System.
- e. Compiling criteria for the transition of institutions in the Florida Community College System to state colleges.
- f. Providing support for the development of funding model options for the Florida College System.

The project scope does not include monitoring of the 2009 legislative process or implementation of any resulting legislative mandates.

### **III. Objectives**

The objective of the effort is to facilitate the timely delivery of reports from both the Florida College System Task Force and the State College Pilot Project to the State Board of Education and the 2009. The report of the State College Pilot Project is due no later than January 2009; the report of the Florida College System Task Force is due no later than March 2009.

### **IV. Project Approach**

The Florida College System Transition Project approach will consist of a series of meetings facilitated by Chancellor Holcombe between June 2008 and December 2008. The project will also utilize a funding work group to examine the funding model in greater detail. All meeting materials and results will be available on the DOE website on the Division of Community Colleges home page:

<http://www.fldoe.org/cc/college-task-force.asp> and

<http://www.fldoe.org/cc/scpp.asp>. The Chancellor will facilitate communication between the Pilot Project group, the members of the Florida College System Task Force, and the Commissioner of Education.

### **V. Assumptions and Constraints**

The following assumptions apply to the project:

- a. The Task Force and Pilot Project will conduct their work in a strategic and transparent manner.
- b. The Task Force and Pilot Project will maintain open communication with constituent groups.
- c. The State Board of Education will adopt/endorse the recommendations of the Task Force and Pilot Project in time for consideration during the 2009 legislative session.
- d. The open door admission policy, outreach, remediation and statewide articulation in both colleges and state colleges will remain.

The following constraints apply to the project:

- e. Adequate financial support for both 2 + 4 year degree programs will be provided by the legislature.
- f. Funding for Certificate and Associate degree programs will not be adversely impacted by start-up or implementation costs of state college programs.
- g. Programmatic scope for state college baccalaureate degrees will be linked to state and local need/demand.

## VI. Success Criteria

The ultimate success of the project would result in legislative action establishing the framework for the Florida College System, (community colleges, junior colleges, public colleges and state colleges) in regards to the following:

- Governance
- Transition Criteria
- Program Approval
- Funding Model

## VII. Milestones

The following are the key project milestones:

- |    |                    |  |
|----|--------------------|--|
| a. | June 12, 2008      | Bill “signing” and organizational meeting Pilot Project Presidents |
| b. | June 2008          | Pilot College Presidents appoint Business Officers<br>Workgroup    |
| c. | August 31, 2008    | Appoint Florida College System Task Force                          |
| d. | September 3, 2008  | State College Pilot Meeting – St. Petersburg                       |
| e. | September 4, 2008  | College Task Force Meeting – Tampa                                 |
| f. | September 19, 2008 | State College Pilot Meeting – Conference Call                      |
| g. | October 2, 2008    | Joint Meeting of College Task Force and State College Pilot        |
| h. | November 13, 2008  | College Task Force Meeting – Tallahassee                           |
| i. | November 2008      | State College Pilot Meeting – time and location TBD                |
| j. | December 4, 2008   | College Task Force Meeting – Tallahassee                           |
| k. | December 2008      | State College Pilot Meeting – time and location TBD                |
| l. | January 2009       | Reports to State Board and Legislature                             |

### **VIII. Summary Budget**

The following are budget amounts approved for this project:

2008-2009 appropriation for State College Pilot Project/Pilot College for transition activities	\$40,000 per pilot college
2008-09 appropriation for Florida College System Task Force/support meetings and consultant fees	\$15,000
2009-2010 Legislative Budget Request for Community College System Baccalaureate Programs	\$19,635,530

### **IX. Supplemental Documents**

The following documents provide additional information about the project:

- a. SB 1716
- b. Meeting materials/information, Florida College System Task Force:  
<http://www.fldoe.org/cc/college-task-force.asp>
- c. Meeting materials State College Pilot Project:  
<http://www.fldoe.org/cc/scpp.asp>
- d. State College Pilot and Florida College Task Force Meeting Schedules

Articulation Coordinating Committee

**October 22, 2008**

**Item 9**

**Subject:** Practical Arts courses for high school graduation

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials provided at the meeting

Facilitator/Presenter: Ms. Lucy Hadi

Articulation Coordinating Committee

**October 22, 2008**

**Item 10**

**Subject:** High School Grading Formula

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials included in the packet

Facilitator/Presenter: Mr. Juan Copa



# Revising Florida's High School Accountability System

October 23, 2008



## Senate Bill 1908

- Beginning in the 2009-2010 school year, 50% of the school's grade will be based on the existing FCAT-related factors and the remaining 50% will be based on factors that include:
  - A school's **graduation rate**;
  - As valid data become available, the **performance and participation of students in AP, IB, Dual Enrollment, AICE, and industry-certification**;
  - The **postsecondary readiness** of the students as measured by the SAT, ACT, or CPT;
  - The high school **graduation rate of at-risk students**;
  - *The performance of a school's students on statewide standardized end-of-course assessments, when available*; and
  - **Growth or decline** in the data components from year to year.

## Timeline

Task	Start Date	Completion Date
Develop models	June 2008	September 2008
Vet with External Stakeholders	October 2008	December 2008
Regional Rule Development Workshops	January 2009	February 2009
Rule Approved		by June 2009 SBE Meeting
FYI Release of New School Grades (Model Run – Not Official)		June/July 2009
New School Grades Used for Official Purposes		June/July 2010

3

## New Component #1: Graduation Rate

Proposal:

- Use Florida High School Graduation Rate calculation that excludes GEDs (NGA rate)
- Use “current year” rate; not lagged measure.
  - For example, 2010 School Grade would use the graduation rate for the Class of 2010.

4

## New Component #1: Graduation Rate

Reactions:

- Count GEDs (especially GED Exit Option)
- Only include those students who were enrolled the full year (Surveys 2 and 3) at the school during the student's senior year.

5

## New Component #2: Performance & Participation in Accelerated Coursework

Initial Proposal

1. Separate Measures for Participation and Performance
2. Base measures (i.e., percent participating/performing) on all standard high school graduates at the school in a given year – capturing student participation/performance throughout their high school careers.
  - **Goal:** Increase the number of students graduating from high school earning at least some postsecondary credit.
  - **This method** holds schools accountable for all their graduating students; not just those who enroll in accelerated courses.
3. Weight the different types of accelerated coursework

6




## New Component #2: Performance & Participation in Accelerated Coursework

### Reactions

- Dual Enrollment and AP/IB should be weighted equally
- Dual Enrollment should be weighted less than AP/IB because of the lack of a standardized exams for Dual Enrollment courses
- Formula heavily weighted toward college readiness; not workforce readiness
- In using a cohort of graduates, what happens when a student graduates from High School B, yet took his/her accelerated coursework in High School A?

7



## New Component #2: Performance & Participation in Accelerated Coursework

### New Proposal

- Industry certification will be included in the formula in 2009-10; not phased-in a year later as previously proposed.
- Consideration of a new denominator
- For the **participation** measure, there will be no weights applied for different types of accelerated coursework.
- For the **performance** measure, a new weighting method is proposed, based on the logic used to award postsecondary credit by exam (as approved in rule).

8

## New Component #2: Performance & Participation in Accelerated Coursework

### Consideration of a New Denominator

- Original denominator (all standard high school graduates in a given) would not account for student performance or participation in accelerated coursework if it occurred at a different high school (i.e., one that he/she did not graduate from)
- New Option:
  - **Participation:** All 9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> graders in a given year enrolled in a particular high school.
  - **Performance:** All students in a given year (9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> grade) that enrolled in accelerated coursework.
- Please note: For a school to receive credit for participation in an accelerated course that ends in an exam (e.g., AB, IB, AICE), the student must enroll in the course and take the exam.

9

## New Component #2: Performance & Participation in Accelerated Coursework

### New Weighting Proposal for Performance

- Higher scores on the AP, IB, and AICE exams correspond to students earning credit for multiple college courses
- Dual Enrollment – by definition – can only lead to students earning credit in one course
- Industry Certification can also only lead to students earning one industry certification

10

## New Component #2: Performance in Accelerated Coursework

Successful Completions defined as:

AP	
Score of 3	1 Successful Completion
Score of 4 or 5	2 Successful Completions
IB	
Score of 4	1 Successful Completion
Score of 5, 6, or 7	2 Successful Completions
AICE	
Passing Score on an AS Level AICE Exam	1 Successful Completion
Passing Score on an A Level AICE Exam	2 Successful Completions
Dual Enrollment	
Passing grade of "C" or higher in the course	1 Successful Completion
Industry Certification	
Earning an industry certification by exam	1 Successful Completion

11

## Acceleration Performance

In the formula, schools would earn weighted credit for the number of successful completions each student earns. Here is the proposed weighting system to accommodate multiple successes by students:

Weight	Successful Completions
1.00	1 Successful Completion
1.10	2 Successful Completions
1.20	3 Successful Completions
1.30	4 Successful Completions
1.40	5 Successful Completions
1.50	6 Successful Completions
1.60	7 Successful Completions
1.70	8 Successful Completions
1.80	9 Successful Completions
1.90	10 Successful Completions
2.00	Over 10 Successful Completions

12

## Acceleration Performance – EXAMPLE

John Doe takes 3 Dual Enrollment courses; 2 AP courses; and 1 industry certification course (that culminates in an exam). Here are his results:

Accelerated Course	Score/Grade	Successful Completion
Dual Enrollment Course 1	"C"	1
Dual Enrollment Course 2	"C"	1
Dual Enrollment Course 3	"D"	0
AP Course 1	2	0
AP Course 2	4	2
Industry Certification Exam	Passed	1
Total Successful Completions		5
His Weight in the Formula		1.40

13

## New Component #3: Postsecondary Readiness

Proposal:

- Number of students scoring "ready" (as defined by state approved cut scores) on the ACT, SAT, or CPT **divided by** the total number of standard high school graduates in a given year.
  - Separate measures for Reading, Writing, and Math
  - If student takes multiple tests (ACT, SAT, or CPT), the students highest score by subtest is used.
    - This is consistent with the Bright Futures considerations and the current calculation of readiness.

14

### New Component #3: **Postsecondary Readiness**

#### Reactions

- Not all students take the SAT, ACT, or CPT
- Base calculation on test takers, not all high school graduates
- Component should be based on participation, not performance

15

### New Component #4: **Graduation Rate for At-Risk Students**

#### Proposal

- Use Florida High School Graduation Rate calculation that excludes GEDs (NGA rate)
- Subset of overall cohort – including only those students that earned a Level 2 or lower on both FCAT Reading and Math in 8<sup>th</sup> Grade.
- If a school does not have at least 30 students in that subgroup, the school's overall graduation rate will be substituted for this measure.
  - This is consistent with what is done currently in school grades in regard to the learning gains of the lowest performing students (bottom quartile).

16



## New Component #4: Graduation Rate for At-Risk Students

### Reactions

- Include GEDs
- Use a 5-year rate, rather than a 4-year rate
- Maintain consistency between the at-risk rate and overall rate (e.g., if the overall rate excludes GEDs and is a four-year rate, the at-risk rate should be the same.

17

## New Component #5: Growth or Decline in components

### New Proposal:

- Schools earn an escalating number of bonus points based on the magnitude of their improvement.
- Bonus Points would be awarded based on the following improvements (growth from prior year):

<b>5 to 9 percentage point improvement</b>	<b>5 bonus points</b>
<b>10 to 19 percentage point improvement</b>	<b>10 bonus points</b>
<b>20+ percentage point improvement</b>	<b>20 bonus points</b>

18

## New Component #5: Growth or Decline in components

New Proposal:

- Schools would lose 5 points if the school declined on the measure by 5 or more percentage points from the prior year.
- **The maximum points possible for any one component would be 100 (or 200 in the case of acceleration performance).**
- If the bonus points earned causes the point total to exceed the maximum (100 or 200 points), the school would earn the maximum number of points.

19

## Current FCAT School Grades Components, Total Points

READING	MATH	WRITING	SCIENCE
Performance 100 possible pts.	Performance 100 possible pts.	Performance 100 possible pts.	Performance 100 possible pts.
Learning Gains 100 possible pts.	Learning Gains 100 possible pts.	<b>TOTAL POINTS 800 POINTS</b>	
Learning Gains of Lowest 25% 100 possible pts.	Learning Gains of Lowest 25% 100 possible pts.		

**PLUS 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade retakes for possible bonus points (10)** – High schools earn ten bonus points when half of all 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders retaking the FCAT meet the graduation requirement.

20

## Proposed High School Grades Components, Total Points

GRADUATION	ACCELERATION	READINESS	
Overall Rate 100 possible pts.	Participation 100 possible pts.	Performance on Reading 100 possible pts.	
At-Risk Rate 100 possible pts.	Performance 200 possible pts.	Performance on Writing 100 possible pts.	
		Performance on Math 100 possible pts.	
Total Graduation Points = 200	Total Acceleration Points = 300	Total Readiness Points = 300	Total Points Possible = 800

21

## Comments/Feedback

■ [Juan.Copa@fldoe.org](mailto:Juan.Copa@fldoe.org)

22

Articulation Coordinating Committee

**October 22, 2008**

**Item 11**

**Subject:** Report from Standing Committee on FACTS.org

---

**PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION**

Information and discussion; No action required.

---

Supporting Documentation: Materials provided at the meeting

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Connie Graunke