

ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda

May 23, 2007

Turlington Bldg, 1721/25

Tallahassee, FL

9:30-12:00- 1721/25 Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition

9:30-12:00 – 1706 Standing Committee on Course Numbering

***Standing Committee on Statewide Policies and Guidance will not meet. Members are encouraged to attend one of the other standing committee meetings.**

1:00 p.m.-4:00-1721/25 Full ACC Meeting

1. Chairperson's welcome and new member recognition	Dr. Ed Massey
Approval	
2. Approval: Minutes from Feb. 28, 2007 Meeting	Dr. Ed Massey
3. Approval: Expanded Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List	Dr. Heather Sherry
4. Approval: Teacher Education Common Prerequisites Template and Updates	Ms. Pat Frohe Ms. Lynda Page
Discussion	
5. Status Report: 2007 Legislative Updates	Ms. Carrie Fraser
6. Status Report: STEM Initiative, Secondary Math Standards. Postsecondary learning outcomes and competencies.	Ms. Mary Jane Tappen Ms. Dottie Minear
7. Status Report and Discussion: Go Higher, Florida! Task Force	Dr. Judith Bilsky
8. Status Report: Statewide Articulation Manual	Dr. Heather Sherry
9. Status Report: Update on IAA workshops	Dr. Pam Kerouac Dr. Sara Hamon
10. Status Report: Residency update.	Dr. Sara Hamon Lori Clark
11. Summary Report: Disability Survey Findings	Ms. Lynda Page Ms. Amy Albee
12. Status Report: Submission of policies to identify courses that meet Gordon Rule.	Mr. Matthew Bouck
13. Report from Standing Committee on Statewide Course Numbering	Dr. R.E. LeMon
14. Report from Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition	Dr. Ed Massey Mr. Ron Blocker

Next ACC meeting: Oct. 24, 2007

ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda

February 28, 2007

R.A. Gray Building Auditorium

Tallahassee, Florida

9:30-12:00 - Room 1505– Standing Committee on Statewide Policies and Guidance
 9:30-12:00- Gray Bldg. Auditorium- Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition
 9:30-12:00 – Not meeting - Standing Committee on Course Numbering
 1:00 p.m.-4:00-Gray Bldg. Auditorium, Full ACC Meeting

15. Chairperson's Welcome	Dr. Ed Massey
Approval	
16. Approval: Minutes from Oct. 25, 2006 Meeting	Dr. Ed Massey
17. Approval: PSAV to AAS/AS Articulation Agreements (Phase II)	Dr. Heather Sherry
18. Approval: Amendment to Current Structure of Residency Committee	Dr. Sara Hamon
19. Approval: Common Prerequisites and Teacher Education Updates	Ms. Pat Frohe Ms. Lynda Page
20. Approval: Updates to Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies	Mr. Matthew Bouck
21. Approval: Additions to Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List	Mr. Matthew Bouck
Discussion	
22. Status Report: Dual Enrollment Activities	Dr. Heather Sherry Dr. Sara Hamon
23. Status Report: High School Feedback Reports for 2005 Graduate Cohort and College Readiness Trends	Dr. Pamela Kerouac
24. Status Report and Discussion: Go Higher, Florida! Task Force	Dr. Judith Bilsky Dr. R.E. LeMon
25. Status Report: FACTS.org ePEP, Go Higher-Get Accepted Campaign, 2+2 Evaluation	Dr. Connie Graunke
26. Status Report: College Goal Sunday	Ms. Amy Albee
27. Status Report: Statewide Course Numbering of OCP Career Technical Education Courses	Mr. Matthew Bouck
28. Report from Standing Committee on Statewide Course Numbering	Dr. R.E. LeMon
29. Report from Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition	Dr. Ed Massey Mr. Ron Blocker
30. Report from Standing Committee on Statewide Policies and Guidance	Dr. Charles Dassance

Next ACC meeting: May 23, 2007

MINUTES
ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING
Feb. 28, 2007

A meeting of the Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC) was held on Wednesday, February 28, 2007, in the Gray Building in Tallahassee, Florida. At 1:05 p.m. the meeting was called to order by Chairman, Dr. Edwin Massey.	
Members Present	Dr. Judith Bilsky, Division of Community Colleges Dr. Walter Christy, Brevard Public Schools Ms. Christine Cothron, First Coast Technical Institute Ms. Brenda Dickinson, Nonpublic Secondary Education Dr. Arthur Kirk, Jr., St. Leo University Dr. Bonnie Marmor, Division of Workforce Education Dr. R.E. LeMon, State University System, Board of Governors Dr. Edwin Massey, Indian River Community College (Chair) Dr. Gita Pitter, Florida A & M University Mr. Alan Ramos, proxy for Dr. Cheri Yecke, Division of Public Schools Dr. Diane Solms, proxy for Dr. Joseph Joyner, St. Johns County Public Schools Dr. Robert Sullins, University of South Florida Dr. Jill White, Okaloosa-Walton College Dr. Heather Sherry, Office of Articulation (staff)
Members Absent	Mr. Ronald Blocker, Orange County Public Schools Dr. Charles Dassance, Central Florida Community College Mr. Jim Patch, Jones College Dr. Martha Pelaez, Florida International University
1. Chairperson's Comments	Dr. Edwin Massey began the meeting by welcoming members and all in attendance. He asked the committee and audience for introductions. Dr. Massey complemented the work of the standing committees and the continued importance of the work of the ACC.
Approval:	
2. Approval of Feb.28, 2007 Minutes	Dr. Massey asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of the February 2007, meeting of the ACC. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.
3. Approval of PSAV to AAS/AS Articulation Agreements	Dr. Heather Sherry presented the second phase of Postsecondary Adult Vocational (PSAV) to Associate in Applied Science (AAS)/Associate in Science (AS) Articulation Agreements for approval. Thirty agreements were reviewed and Dr. Sherry agreed to provide a list of the institutions that offer these programs and the institutions to which they articulate at the next ACC meeting. There was discussion regarding additional proposed agreements that are linked to existing AS to BA/BS statewide agreements. The plan is to delay approval of those agreements until they can be further reviewed by faculty committees with representation from technical centers, community colleges, and state universities. The committee further discussed the issue of faculty credentials relating to the transferability of credits from one level to another. Since faculty credential guidelines are different for varying levels of instruction, the initial committees who reviewed the agreements attempted to establish a validation mechanism for each program that must be used before transfer credit is granted. The ACC members expressed a desire to ensure that those validation mechanisms were sufficient to measure quality of instruction and student learning outcomes. Dr. Sullins asked for more information at the

	<p>next meeting that would identify how credits would be articulated on the transcript.</p> <p>In addition, there was some discussion by the committee regarding a change in the name of “PSAV” programs and the need for the new agreement to reflect that change. According to Chapter 6A-14.030, F.A.C., the new name for a PSAV program is a “Career and Technical Certificate” (CTC). Dr. Massey asked for a motion to approve the Phase II PSAV to AAS/AS Articulation Agreements. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.</p>
<p>4. Approval of Amendment of Current Structure of Residency Committee</p>	<p>Dr. Sara Hamon provided a brief status report of the residency rule withdrawal from the State Board of Education and Board of Governors agendas, as a result of the need for additional technical changes. She presented a proposed amendment to the current structure of the Residency Committee to include additional members for broader representation from higher education. To include key constituent groups, the proposed expansion of the Residency Committee will include Vice Presidents of Student Affairs/Enrollment Management and Financial Aid Directors from state universities, community colleges, and member institutions from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. Membership recommendations will be sought from respective vice chancellors. Dr. Gita Pitter inquired about recommendations sought from offices of graduate admissions. The response indicated that members represent the entire institution and its programs, including the residency concerns for graduate admissions. Dr. Massey asked for a motion to approve an amendment to the <i>Current Structure of Residency Committee</i>. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.</p>
<p>5. Approval of Common Prerequisites</p>	<p>Ms. Pat Frohe presented three additional community college baccalaureate program prerequisites that were approved by the appropriate common prerequisite discipline committee co-chairs and the Oversight Committee for the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BS – Technology Education at SPC – New CIP 13.1309 - BAS – Paralegal Studies at SPC – Existing CIP 22.0302 (Track 2 of 2) - BAS – Technology Management at SPC – New CIP 11.1099 <p>Dr. Sullins suggested that the Art Education and Music Education programs be reviewed, having had success in tailoring their programs. Ms. Frohe encouraged all institutions to update their catalogues to reflect important changes. Dr. Massey asked for a motion to approve the new program common prerequisites to be added to the <i>Common Prerequisites Manual</i>. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.</p> <p>Ms. Frohe also provided information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Updates for the 2 + 2 degree audit information at FACTS.org will continue to be updated as soon as possible and through the summer. Since State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.066, F.A.C., was revised in March 2006, institution staff are responsible for providing the updated information. Ms. Frohe has held discussions with staff from FACTS.org and will inform the ACC members of any new developments or issues. 2) A Lower Division Teacher Education Experience Workgroup has been formed to carefully review and possibly revise the three current education course prerequisites required of all lower division education majors for admission to the upper division. The first meeting was held on February 1 and a subsequent meeting will be held on March 13. Once the Workgroup has completed its activities, detailed recommendations for the course competencies will be provided to the Education Discipline Committee for Common Prerequisites, to the Oversight Committee, and then for consideration by the ACC.

6. Approval of Updates to Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies	Mr. Matthew Bouck presented the results of the review of the new exams by Statewide Course Numbering System (SCNS) faculty discipline committees and their recommended postsecondary course and credit equivalencies. Eight new exams were reviewed: six from the Advanced Certificate of Education (AICE), one from the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and one from the International Baccalaureate (IB) Program. The revised Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies Chart identifies the new exams with background shading. Following ACC and State Board of Education approval, the new exam equivalencies will be effective Spring, 2007. Dr. Massey asked for a motion to approve the updates for the Credit-by-Exam Equivalencies Chart. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.
7. Additions to Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List	Mr. Matthew Bouck presented the results of the SCNS faculty discipline review of proposed additions for the <i>Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List</i> and the recommended high school subject area and credit equivalencies. There were four new additions in the Language Arts subject area. Mr. Bouck explained that the Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List is an academic advising resource that identifies ACC-approved high school subject area requirements and credit. Mr. Bouck added that current law allows for any course within the Statewide Course Numbering System, with the exception of physical education skills and remedial courses, to be offered for dual enrollment. Students have access to dual enrollment courses beyond what is identified in the list. There are hundreds of dual enrollment courses that count as high school electives. Dr. Massey asked for a motion to approve the updates for the additions to the Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.
Discussion:	
8. Status Report: Dual Enrollment Activities	<p>Dr. Heather Sherry reported that the Office of Articulation staff has been involved in discussion regarding the need to expand the <i>Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List</i> to include honors courses and additional courses that satisfy postsecondary general education requirements. A draft of the proposed expansion will be presented at the May 23, 2007 ACC meeting. Dr. Sara Hamon reported on the success of the regional Dual Enrollment Workshop held for college advisors and administrators in February 2007 at Valencia Community College. Dr. Sherry, Dr. Hamon, and Dr. Kerouac provided a Power Point presentation and facilitated discussion. Information shared included policy issues, technical assistance, and ideas about textbook management and cost sharing. The workshop was very well attended and further plans are underway to provide additional workshops in May.</p> <p>A “Dual Enrollment Statement of Standards,” outlining the methods in which community colleges ensure quality of dual enrollment instruction (particularly for courses taught on the high school campus), was adopted by the Community College Council of Presidents in February, 2007 and presented to the ACC for information. Upon explanation of the document, Dr. Massey suggested that the ACC take action to endorse this document. The members voted unanimously to endorse it.</p>

<p>9. Status Report: High School Feedback Reports for 2005 Graduate Cohort and College Readiness Trends</p>	<p>Dr. Pamela Kerouac shared copies of the recently released High School Feedback Reports for the 2005 graduate cohort. Dr. Kerouac indicated that districts had password-protected access for the month of February to review their reports before public release on February 26th, 2007. Online access is available at this site, http://data.fldoe.org/readiness/. The reports allow for comparison of 2004 and 2005 high school, district, and state indicators of college readiness. The 2005 reports have four new indicators: two pre-graduation measures of the percent of students taking dual enrollment courses in Math and Science and two post-graduation measures of the percent of students enrolled in out-of-state postsecondary institutions and students found enrolled in Independent Colleges of Education in Florida. Comparison of the 2004 and 2005 reports indicate achievement increases in: students scoring at Level 3 on the FCAT in Reading and Mathematics, enrollment in Algebra I prior to grade nine, eligibility for the maximum Bright Futures Scholarship award, enrollment in at least one accelerated mechanism course, and passing rates for entry-level and advanced college math and English courses. Contrasting areas of weakness indicate the need to increase student participation in the PSAT or PLAN and the need to improve students' college admission test scores. The feedback reports provide a comprehensive snapshot of college readiness for Florida's public high schools to use for strategic planning and improvements. Dr. Jill White commented on the value of the reports. Dr. Walther Christy commented on the usefulness of the data and Brevard School District's appreciation of the information.</p>
<p>10. Status Report and Discussion: Go Higher, Florida! Task Force</p>	<p>Dr. Judith Bilsky presented a status report of the Go Higher, Florida! Task Force efforts. The task force is comprised of representatives from all levels of public and private education: the State University System, the Community College System, independent postsecondary institutions, public schools, and career and technical education to advance postsecondary readiness and K-20 progression. Dr. Bilsky reported highlights of the first meeting held January 31, 2007 that included specific goals and strategies to address improving students' college readiness in Florida. Jay Pfeiffer and Pat Windham presented data from the Division of Accountability, Research, and Measurement that identified "leaks" in the K-20 pipeline. Mary Jane Tappen and Chancellor Yecke reported on high school reform initiatives and spoke about the need for students to improve college readiness skills in mathematics and the challenges of recruiting and retaining highly qualified teacher candidates. The next meeting, scheduled at the Turlington Building, March 12, 2007, will include a report on alignment issues from Dr. David Spence from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Dr. R.E. LeMon added that the national focus on K-20 progression has compelled a renewed focus, uniting a number of sectors from middle school to postsecondary in the effort to better define "college readiness". Dr. LeMon complimented Florida's recognition as a national model for statewide course numbering, but reminded everyone that Florida also needs to pay respect to the Statewide Course Numbering System by funding the preservation of this model in terms of needed updates and affordable maintenance. Florida is poised to develop learning competencies for statewide courses that do not impinge on faculty control, but can provide needed validation of learning outcomes.</p>

<p>11. Status Report: FACTS.org ePEP, Go Higher-Get Accepted Campaign, 2+2 Evaluation</p>	<p>Dr. Connie Graunke, Executive Director for FACTS.org, provided an update of recent activities. The community college/university 2+2 Transfer Evaluation, ePersonal Education Planner (ePEP), and Educator Preparation Institute Career Portfolio became available to users on FACTS.org. The A++ Bill changed high school and middle school graduation requirements affecting the ePEP. A new version of the ePEP is scheduled for release in April 2007 for students entering grade 9 in 2007-2008 and beyond. In addition, FACTS.org has been promoting the "Go Higher Florida, Education Pays" message to increase postsecondary enrollment. Two "Go Higher" campaigns are underway: "Go Higher, Get a Plan" focuses on middle and high school students preparing an academic plan using FACTS.org's ePEP; and, "Go Higher, Get Accepted" focuses on high school seniors who have not applied or been accepted to a postsecondary institution. Twenty-two community colleges and 100+ high schools are participating to work with these students to choose a degree program, apply for admission, and complete financial aid applications.</p>
<p>12. Status Report: College Goal Sunday</p>	<p>Ms. Amy Albee presented an update on College Goal Sunday, a nationwide financial aid event aimed at assisting low-income and first generation students. During its first year, 2006, Florida was recognized as one of the top performing states for attendance and in 2007 served as the national training site for state coordinators. Florida's second College Goal Sunday was held on February 25, 2007 at 49 locations around the state. Twenty six of the community colleges, the University of Central Florida, school districts, and community outreach groups hosted the event. Preliminary numbers estimated that 4,600 students attended the event at one of the 49 locations; this is a 360% increase over 2006 attendance. This event could not have been as successful without the partnerships of K-12 and the university system, as well as the ICUF institutions. Further collaboration is planned for next year to reach even more students in 2008.</p>
<p>13. Status Report: Statewide Course Numbering of OCP Career Technical Education Courses</p>	<p>Mr. Matthew Bouck reported that in 1981, law required that all Postsecondary Adult Vocational courses be designated by Statewide Course Numbering System course numbers, not program numbers. However, districts continue to report certificate courses and programs by program number only. The SCNS, in conjunction with the Division of Workforce Education, has assigned course numbers based on occupational completion points (OCP). For those OCPs with over 450 hours, multiple course numbers have been assigned. In this process, 4,202 courses were added to the SCNS and assigned to Career and Technical Education Centers. Next steps will be to establish occupation completion point numbers in the K-12 Course Code Directory to allow for state reporting by districts. Mr. Bouck will update the ACC as progress continues.</p>
<p>14. Report from Standing Committee on Course Numbering</p>	<p>The Committee on Course Numbering did not meet. Dr. RE LeMon gave an update of the interim activities of the committee during an earlier topic, so there was no further update.</p>
<p>15. Report from Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition</p>	<p>Dr. Massey provided a summary report of the agenda items addressed in the Standing Committee for Postsecondary Transition:</p> <p>Ed Cisek, from the Division of Community Colleges provided an explanation of the funding calculation for dual enrollment for Community Colleges. The handout provided clarified the distribution of funding for dual enrollment, with the focus on the acceleration outcomes that reduce the number of credit hours that postsecondary students needed to earn an Associate or Baccalaureate degree. Another section of the handout provided a bar graph representation of the number of dual enrollment students identified by each community college, which emphasized the important service provided to the local school districts in the state's rural areas.</p>

	<p>Ms. Lynda Page presented the results of a recent survey of state universities and student disability services. Commonly identified obstacles and challenges will help to focus further discussion and strategies that may help to overcome barriers for students with disabilities.</p> <p>Mr. Bouck provided a chart that graphically identified the most common courses that are offered and/or accepted by public postsecondary institutions as meeting general education requirements. There are currently 17 courses that are offered or accepted as meeting general education requirements by all public institutions and approximately ten courses that are offered or accepted by all but one or two public institutions. The intent is to follow up with the institutions to verify that these transfer of credit policies are accurate.</p> <p>Dr. Kerouac shared updates that have been recently posted online for the Florida Counseling for Future Education Handbook, that reflect some needed deletions of old courses that are no longer offered from the section on course distribution requirements for state university admission.</p> <p>A new workgroup will be reviewing the Major Areas of Interest (MAI) to add the appropriate dual enrollment courses that were omitted from a number of the approved areas. Progress on this task will be reported at the May meeting.</p>
16. Report from Standing Committee on Statewide Policies and Guidance	<p>Dr. Heather Sherry provided a summary of the agenda items covered in the Standing Committee on Statewide Policies & Guidance. The committee reviewed the updated draft of the new Statewide Articulation Manual (including all added web links) and provided feedback on the document. The committee made some recommendations for enhancements to the document. Once these changes are completed Dr. Sherry will send the final draft out to the committee before posting to the web or making CDs for distribution. The finalized Manual will be shared with the full ACC at the May meeting where Dr. Sherry will do a web demonstration and provide digital and hard copies to committee members. The committee also discussed several legislative issues including: the role of the ACC; Dual Enrollment – expansion of DE Equivalency List, student access, high school Major Areas of Interest, funding, textbooks, articulation agreements; Common Prerequisites Compliance (reviewed memo, and addressed procedures for issue resolution); and general transfer of credit issues.</p>

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Announcements: The next ACC meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2007

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 3

Subject: Expanded Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Approval of additional courses from the Statewide Course Numbering System to enhance Dual Enrollment Course options.

Supporting Documentation: Handout provided at the meeting

Facilitators/Presenter: Dr. Heather Sherry

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 4

Subject: Teacher Education Common Prerequisites Template

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Approval of template designed to track Teacher Education Common Prerequisites

Supporting Documentation: Handout provided at the meeting

Facilitator/Presenters: Ms. Lynda Page & Ms. Pat Frohe

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 5

Subject: Status Report: 2007 Legislative Updates

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Handouts provided at the meeting.

Facilitator/Presenter: Ms. Carrie Fraser

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 6

Subject: Status Report: Secondary math standards, STEM initiative, and proposed postsecondary learning outcomes and competencies.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Handouts provided at the meeting.

Facilitator/Presenters: Ms. Mary Jane Tappen & Dr. Dottie Minear

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 7

Subject: Status Report: Go higher, Florida Task Force

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Handout included in packet.

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Judith Bilsky

Dave Spence
SREB
April 2007

The Development of Statewide College and Career Readiness Standards and Assessments

Goal: All students are ready to begin college or preparation for occupations leading to their independent economic success

- Similar reading, writing and math skills are needed to succeed in both academic and career-preparation programs

Problem: Up to 70% of the nation's college-bound high school graduates are not ready for further learning (ACT, 2005)

Core Solution:

To have all schools in a state teaching all students to meet effective, statewide college readiness standards. This requires that each state:

- Recognizes the keys to increasing readiness lie in the school classroom.
- Has specific readiness standards adopted as part of the required statewide curriculum standards
- Helps all school teachers understand the specific performance expectations of the state standards (beyond content description to level of performance required)
- Provides state school and student accountability assessments that include these readiness standards

Needed Steps:

5. Statewide recognition of magnitude and nature of the college-readiness problem
 - a. Problem masked by lack of common, substantial readiness standards across all of postsecondary education
 - Individual campuses or systems set their own readiness standards
 - b. Readiness (placement) standards are often confused with admission standards
 - Readiness (placement) standards often applied after admission
 - Admissions criteria focus on courses, grades and ACT, SAT admissions tests
 - However, most students (70-80%) attend open or broad-access institutions; a relatively small proportion of colleges and universities are selective
 - c. Readiness standards focus on the threshold skills needed to learn at the postsecondary level
 - Reading with comprehension
 - Writing (clearly, analytically, persuasively)
 - Mathematics (capacity for logical, symbolic and multidimensional thinking)
 - Readiness standards should indicate not only a description of the needed skills, but the level of performance required (how well something is done or known)
 - Readiness standards are related to taking the "right courses", which is necessary, but

taking the “right courses” (and getting B’s and A’s) does not ensure readiness.

- d. State goals for increasing high school completion, strengthening minimum high school diploma requirements, and ensuring that all graduates are ready for college/careers are all needed and important. The likelihood that it will be some time before all of these goals converge in any state should not deter states from establishing college readiness initiatives. What is important is that significant progress is made on each of these goals.
- e. The standards, performance levels and range of the high school assessments associated with college readiness generally will need to be higher than current high school graduation and NCLB testing requirements.
- f. Postsecondary education must view the improvement of college readiness as a responsibility to the state and also in its own best interest.

5. Statewide, state-level leadership and commitment are needed to ensure that the same college readiness signals are given to all high schools in a state, and that college readiness standards and assessments are fully part of high school standards and tests.

- Action needs to be at the state level and statewide
- Must be systemic action to send same signals to all K-12 schools
- Must include all state postsecondary education and high schools
- Must commit to specific agenda and action steps

3. Adoption by public higher education and public schools of common college readiness standards within a state.

- a. One set of statewide threshold performance standards is needed to send the same signals from all of postsecondary education to all high schools in a state
- b. Postsecondary education should speak with one voice, including all open-door and broad-access institutions. These less-selective institutions (community colleges and regional universities) have the potential to send the strongest, most powerful and clear signals about college readiness because:
 - Admit 80% of first time students
 - Local and regional orientation and service; closest to the schools
 - Clarify that being less selective in admissions does not signify lack of readiness standards, or no standards
- c. All postsecondary institutions should adopt and apply these readiness standards in making placement decisions

4. Embed college readiness standards in state-adopted high school standards and curriculum.

- a. Align college readiness with school standards
 - By identifying matches with or revising existing school standards.
 - Must go beyond content description of standards to shared understandings of expected performance levels (requiring intensive interaction among school and college staff)

- b. Identify any needed additions (of college readiness standards) to existing school standards
- c. Have the state formally adopt and identify the aligned and new college readiness standards as full components of the required statewide curriculum and standards.

5. Make college readiness assessment part of the high school testing program.

- a. Use statewide school-based high school assessments as basis, if possible
 - School teachers teach to state standards and assessments
 - Achievement of college readiness standards is reinforced by their inclusion in school based accountability testing
 - Preferable to supplement or revise existing high school state assessments (or create them) to include college readiness standards rather than add external college assessments into high schools, which do not have the force of school-based state assessments.
 - Goal is to make college readiness standards fully part of high school standards, not introduce a different or parallel set of standards or tests
 - Using school-based tests:
 - Gives more force to high school standards/tests
 - Guards against too much testing
 - Applies to all high school students
- b. College readiness assessments should address directly the specific readiness standards rather than relying on other tests that only indirectly address the core readiness standards
 - Any test scores can be cross-walked or correlated with other test results
 - What is needed is for the specific standards to be taught in the classroom and embraced and understood by school teachers. ACT or SAT standards and assessments are not transparent enough to connect concretely to the classroom
 - Most important, school teachers teach first to state standards and tests
- c. State high school assessments should include all college readiness standards and range high enough in difficulty to indicate mastery at the threshold levels
 - Range need not extend to highest performance levels addressed by selective admissions tests
 - Exit, high student stakes tests probably not suitable because they do not address performance levels which are high enough
 - End-of-course 11th grade English and mathematics tests are the best candidates because they have the strongest connection to classroom instruction
- d. High school assessments should be available no later than 11th grade to give early signals to students about readiness for college
 - Allows at least senior year to prepare further

7. Make the performance of schools and teachers in helping students meet readiness standards a significant component of the state school accountability process.

- Set student readiness goals for each school

- Recognize school progress to these goals in both absolute and growth terms

7. Embed college readiness standards into grades 8-12 teaching, curriculum and assessments.

- Sequence the college readiness standards into school curriculum and assessment progressively from grades 8-12
- Formally adopt and highlight as a key part of the state's academic standards for K-12 schools
- Develop teacher understanding and use of performance expectations through preservice and inservice training
- Revise curriculum and instruction to make college readiness standards a priority
- Entrance into school-college dual enrollment programs should depend on students meeting the state college readiness standards.

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 8

Subject: Status Report: Statewide Articulation Manual

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Materials provided at the meeting.

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Heather Sherry

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 9

Subject: Status Report: Update on Regional IAA workshops

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Materials provided at the meeting.

Facilitator/Presenter: Dr. Sara Hamon & Dr. Pam Kerouac

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Jeanine Blomberg

Commissioner of Education



May 4, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: District School Superintendents
Community College Presidents

FROM: Jeanine Blomberg, Commissioner

SUBJECT: Updated Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements

In support of Florida's goals to promote the highest student achievement, seamless articulation, and maximum access, school districts and community colleges are required to annually update their Articulation Agreements. Agreements must be "completed before high school registration for the fall term" and submitted to the Florida Department of Education, Office of Articulation, for review. (Section 1007.235(2)(5), Florida Statutes)

The Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement (IAA) provides evidence of cooperative and collaborative secondary to postsecondary partnerships and commitment to seamless K-20 education. This year, two resources are available to help guide the process of developing an effective Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement: the attached sample template and the *Community College Statement of Standards for Dual Enrollment/Early College*.

The sample template provides formatted information related to the required components of an agreement. This resource also serves as the Department review guide. Please remember to reference successful strategies and activities that have reduced the need for remediation at the postsecondary institution, as this represents one of the key elements identified as promising practice.

The Department of Education is urging joint school district and community college articulation committees to use the attached *Community College Statement of Standards for Dual Enrollment/Early College* in the process of revising the IAA. In February 2007, the *Statement of Standards* was approved by the Community College Council of Presidents and endorsed by the K-20 Articulation Coordinating Committee. This *Statement of Standards* was developed as a tool for communicating the Florida Community College System's commitment to ensure that Dual Enrollment/Early College courses are high-quality and rigorous postsecondary courses. This is consistent with the same accreditation standards

and academic requirements for all postsecondary courses, irrespective of delivery location, as required by the standards of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and by Florida law. The *Statement of Standards* defines Dual Enrollment/Early College and summarizes the role of each community college in providing oversight for this acceleration option. We hope that this document will provide a better understanding for school districts, universities, and other constituent groups regarding the postsecondary criteria which serve as the framework for Dual Enrollment/Early College. We strongly encourage community colleges and school districts to fully incorporate this *Statement of Standards* into the local IAA.

These partnerships demonstrate a commitment to program quality and increased student access to a broad range of curricular options. The time and energy invested through the process of negotiation and collaboration is greatly appreciated.

District agreements should be electronically submitted to Dr. Pamela Kerouac at Pamela.Kerouac@fldoe.org by **Friday, August 17, 2007**. Agreements can be sent via fax or mail to:

Dr. Pamela Kerouac
Florida Department of Education, Office of Articulation
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1401
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400
Fax: 850-245-9542

For additional assistance, please e-mail Dr. Kerouac or call (850) 245-9558.

HRS/pka

Attachments

c: Chancellor Cheri Yecke
Chancellor J. David Armstrong, Jr.
Chancellor Mark Rosenberg
State University System Admissions Directors

SAMPLE FORMAT

Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements

The Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement, as required by section 1007.235, Florida Statutes, should begin with an introductory section that clearly identifies the parties involved, the term (a beginning and ending date) of the agreement, the make-up of the Articulation Committee involved in negotiating and drafting the agreement, and a description of the process by which the agreement is renewed or terminated. Following the introductory information, consider these required components:

1. Ratification of articulation agreements between the community college and school district.

This section attests to the ratification and modifications of all other agreements between the community college and the school district. Such agreements might include plans involving career education center/community college transfers, Tech Prep, placement, testing, and dual enrollment agreements beyond the scope of this document (such as agreements unique to a specific magnet program, academy or school). As provided by law, this section should include a list of these agreements and any additional agreements with state universities or eligible independent colleges and universities.

2. Courses and programs available to students eligible for dual enrollment, including a plan for the community college to provide guidance services.

A brief description of the dual enrollment program, including statutory requirements (such as exemption from the payment of tuition and fees) is an appropriate introduction to this section of the agreement. The following reference to the 2006 legislative changes can be addressed in this section. Beginning with students entering grade 9 in the 2006-07 school year, the revised language for section 1007.271, F.S., requires school districts to:

“weigh dual enrollment courses the same as advanced placement, International Baccalaureate, and Advanced International Certificate of Education courses when grade point averages are calculated. Alternative grade calculation, weighting systems that discriminate against dual enrollment courses are prohibited.”

It is important for the community college to provide and coordinate services with district guidance counselors regarding the selection of dual enrollment courses. When advising students about course availability, the *Dual Enrollment Course Equivalency List*, approved by the Articulation Coordinating Committee and State Board of Education, provides a great starting point. While this list identifies the college courses guaranteed for credit required for high school subject areas, it does not list all dual enrollment courses that count for subject area or practical arts elective credit. Current law allows for any course in the Statewide Course Numbering System, to be offered as dual enrollment, with the exception of remedial and physical education skills courses. The 2007-2008 implementation of the A++ Secondary Redesign Act requires high schools to offer “Major Areas of Interest” (MAI). Each year, districts can propose modifications and add courses that to Major Areas of Interest, which presents an important opportunity for postsecondary institutions to share with district partners suggested dual enrollment courses that can enhance the MAI. Using FACTS.org, students should develop an academic plan that includes courses that will result in a technology certificate, associates degree, or baccalaureate degree. If the student intends to seek a baccalaureate degree, the plan must include courses that meet general education and prerequisite requirements for entrance into the selected baccalaureate degree program. It is not advisable for students to take excessive courses that will meet neither general education nor common prerequisite requirements. The intent is to provide maximum access while guiding students toward a well planned program of study.

a. **The process by which parents and students are notified of the option to participate.**

This is the section to delineate the district and postsecondary institutional responsibilities for promoting the dual enrollment program and notifying parents and students of the option to participate? When and how will this be handled? Be specific. (Section 1007.271(5) F.S.)

b. **The process by which students and parents exercise their option to participate.**

Procedures for participation, along with firmly established deadlines, are essential to the agreement. Explanations should address the application and associated forms for admission to the program, required recommendations/signatures, designated contacts to whom parents and/or students submit their paperwork, the process by which students register and withdraw from courses, maximum course loads, grade forgiveness, weighting of dual enrollment course grades, and the process by which grades are distributed. Confusion and frustration often occur when the high school and the college share conflicting information about procedures and deadlines. Provide information about differing college and district term schedules and start dates. Without an official resource, parents seek resolution with their school board, the college president, or the DOE; none of which has the individual authority to make these decisions. Having these components clearly documented saves considerable time and inconvenience.

c. **Eligibility criteria for student participation in dual enrollment courses and programs.**

Section 1007.271, F.S., establishes that students eligible for dual enrollment have an unweighted GPA of 3.0 and demonstrate readiness for college coursework through scores on college placement tests. List the specific cut scores required for enrollment (particularly if they vary by discipline). Participation in career and technical dual enrollment requires a 2.0 unweighted GPA. Additional requirements shall not arbitrarily prohibit students from participating in dual enrollment courses. Clearly delineate any exception to the GPA requirement and/or any additional community college admission requirements (such as high school grade level). In this section, include promising practices, such as college reach-out or pilot programs that promote participation and increase underrepresented student access and address critical workforce needs.

d. **Institutional responsibilities for student screening prior to enrollment and monitoring enrolled students.**

Delineate the responsibility for the initial screening and ongoing monitoring of participants in this section or incorporate into “b” and/or “c” above. Point out the requirements for continued participation in the program. Clearly identifying which GPA is being considered (the college or high school), and how often the GPAs are reviewed. This will help avoid the potential dispute when a student is dismissed from the program. A key advising point to share with parents and students is that dual enrollment grades are calculated and recorded in the student’s college GPA and transcript. This is a permanent record that four-year universities review, and can affect admission decisions.

In addition to outlining the academic criteria for continued enrollment in the program, this section is a good place to inform students about college campus expectations. Colleges often require that dual enrollment students obtain parking permits and college library cards. College orientation information provides a helpful introduction to the college campus experience. This section of the agreement should identify behavioral expectations in dual enrollment courses taught on college campuses and the code of conduct and consequences enforced. Maturity/discipline issues arise and addressing them in the agreement leaves less room for dispute when these incidences occur.

e. **Criteria by which the quality of dual enrollment courses and programs are to be judged and maintained.**

Dual enrollment courses are college courses with the identical content and learning outcomes expected of all other college courses identified with the same statewide course prefixes and numbers. Teachers of dual enrollment courses have college teaching credentials established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). This agreement must outline the procedures for maintaining teacher quality and content integrity of courses, similar to the guidelines in the Council of President's Statement of Standards. Such procedures should include a plan for recruiting, selecting and evaluating faculty and monitoring dual enrollment course instruction taught on the high school and college campus.

f. **Institutional responsibilities for the cost of dual enrollment courses and programs.**

A strong agreement employs cost-sharing and cost-saving measures and considers the effectiveness of combining resources to cover costs associated with the program. An important point to remember is that school districts receive FTE funding for student participation in dual enrollment courses, even when students attend courses taught on the college campus.

Cost-sharing, although not required, is strongly encouraged, particularly for the cost of instruction. Though there are several variations of this model, a key cost-saver allows each entity to contribute half of each instructor's salary. The dollar figure, for example, can be calculated on a college adjunct's pay or the cost of a teacher overload. Whatever the rate decided, each entity is responsible for half that amount for each dual enrollment instructor. If the school district pays the instructor's salary, the community college would pay the school district half the agreed upon cost of an instructor. Conversely, if the community college pays the instructor's salary, the school district would pay to the community college half the agreed upon cost of an instructor. The opportunity for this financial balance provides incentive for both entities to actively recruit instructors qualified to teach dual enrollment. Another cost-saving incentive could include tuition free college coursework and professional development opportunities for district teachers to advance their teaching qualifications and credentials needed to teach dual enrollment courses on the high school campus.

While school districts are responsible for the purchase of students' textbooks, the two entities can come to an agreement on a reasonable length of time for the use of "class sets" of dual enrollment textbooks. If, for example, there can be a guaranteed use of a set of textbooks for 3 years from the time of purchase, the costs associated with textbooks can be greatly diminished. Many districts have cost-saving procedures that require students to return used dual enrollment textbooks to the college bookstore at the end of the term, whereby the district receives textbook reimbursement for the resale of used books. With the exception of those areas with rapidly changing technology (which can be specified in the agreement), most academic texts can be used effectively for much longer than they typically are used. Though this may involve compromise on the part of the instructors, it should not compromise the quality or integrity of the course.

New instructional costs that colleges and districts should consider are the costs of licensing fees for electronic media access. Today, many students are required to pay a fee for electronic media access. Textbooks may continue to be re-used, but in contrast, the student may need to obtain an updated CD-ROM or license fee for each course, that is generally not re-usable. Electronic access is often password protected and does not become the property of the district or college. If the e-access fee is a required component of the textbook purchase, the district and college must address and delineate who will assume responsibility for these costs.

As required by law, students with disabilities must receive appropriate accommodations. Issues related to this topic must be negotiated and delineated. Which entity covers the cost of accommodations? Whose criteria determine the need for accommodations (K-12 or CC)? Providing these details in the agreement helps avoid difficult situations that, while rare, occasionally do arise.

g. Responsibility for providing student transportation.

This section should clearly outline who is responsible for the cost of transportation for courses taught at locations other than the high school campus. If it is the student's responsibility to provide his/her own transportation, this should be stated in the agreement. A number of districts have outstanding promising practices in terms of providing bus transportation to sites off campus.

3. Mechanisms and strategies for reducing the incidence of postsecondary remediation in math, reading, and writing for first-time-enrolled recent high school graduates.

Though most districts have partnership activities between the community college and school district that serve to lessen the need for remediation when students enter postsecondary education, few interinstitutional agreements adequately address this topic. This section should specify the process by which the local Articulation Committee will: analyze the unique problems that have been identified in this district and develop corrective actions; measure and communicate outcomes; collaborate, develop and implement strategies that will better prepare students for college course enrollment upon graduation from high school; analyze the costs associated with the implementation of postsecondary remedial education and secondary-level corrective actions; and identify and implement the strategies for reducing such costs.

The results of the Articulation Committee's analysis/assessment should be annually reported to the district school board and community college board of trustees. It is worthwhile to describe a realistic action plan in this section of the agreement. Examples of activities and strategies described in this section include: federal, state, or local grant programs focused on remediation, CPT testing agreements, co-sponsored after-school or summer tutoring/remediation programs, and collaborative teacher-faculty initiatives.

4. Mechanisms and strategies for promoting "tech prep" programs of study.

Many districts have a separate "tech prep" articulation agreement in place that thoroughly addresses a plan to make students aware of the program, promotes enrollment, and articulates a sequential program of study leading to a postsecondary career and/or technical education degree or certificate. If such an agreement exists, reference in this section and provide a copy as an appendix to this agreement. Districts that do not have a separate "tech prep" agreement must address the components discussed in the previous paragraph at this point in the interinstitutional agreement.

5. A plan that outlines the mechanisms and strategies for improving the preparation of elementary, middle, and high school teachers.

Another opportunity to enhance articulation outcomes and document promising practices is to outline the strategies and activities that address ongoing professional development of district teachers. The plan should address both pre-service and in-service activities developed with the intent of improving teacher preparation at all levels and addressing local critical teacher shortages. Pursuant to s. 1007.235(3), F.S., professional development programs should include curriculum content and the utilization of new technologies that respond to local, state and national priorities.

The final section of this agreement is the execution, which includes the appropriate signatures of school district and community college representatives.

Reminders:

- ✓ The district school superintendent is responsible for incorporating, either directly or by reference, all dual enrollment courses contained within the district interinstitutional articulation agreement within the district school board's student progression plan.

- ✓ This is the opportunity to provide assistance to districts; suggesting additional dual enrollment courses that districts should propose for department approval as courses that will count toward “Major Areas of Interest” offered at the high schools. Dual enrollment courses can advance the program of study for MAIs, enhance students’ Bright Futures scholarship eligibility, and increase acceleration options.
- ✓ Districts and Community Colleges are encouraged to include representatives from local universities to participate in the development of articulation agreements.
- ✓ Districts are responsible for annually submitting updated copies of Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements to the Florida Department of Education, Office of Articulation by the start date of the fall term.
- ✓ All agreements are reviewed in accordance with the provisions of the law. Evidence of promising practice will be recognized. Compliance reports will be publicly reported and areas of confirmed non-compliance will be addressed.

For additional information or assistance in completing your interinstitutional articulation agreement, contact Dr. Pamela Kerouac at Pamela.kerouac@fldoe.org or 850-245-9558.

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS

DUAL ENROLLMENT/EARLY COLLEGE PROGRAMS
IN THE FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS
February 23, 2007

Endorsed by the Articulation Coordinating Committee on February 28, 2007

Introduction	As required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), each of our community colleges “ must ensure appropriate levels of student achievement and equivalent quality of programs regardless of method of instruction or location of program. ” To that end, the following Standards provide a statement of community college commitment to ensuring that Early College/Dual Enrollment programs demonstrate the level of academic rigor expected of all college courses and programs.
Definition	Section 1007.271, F.S., defines Dual Enrollment as the enrollment of an eligible secondary student or home education student in a postsecondary course creditable toward high school completion and a career certificate or an associate or baccalaureate degree. Dual Enrollment does not include remedial or physical education courses. In addition to the common placement examination, student qualifications for enrollment in college credit dual enrollment courses must include a 3.0 unweighted grade point average, and student qualifications for enrollment in career certificate dual enrollment courses must include a 2.0 unweighted grade point average. Early College/Dual Enrollment students are exempt from the payment of registration, tuition, and laboratory fees.
Rigor	<i>In contrast to other accelerated programs available in Florida, Early College/Dual Enrollment allows students who meet program admission eligibility criteria to take and earn credit in actual postsecondary courses offered by a regionally accredited postsecondary institution and taught by faculty credentialed per SACS Commission on Colleges guidelines. Therefore, satisfactory completion of the course fulfills the requirement for earning postsecondary credit. This postsecondary credit is transferable to any public postsecondary institution in Florida via the Statewide Course Numbering System as provided in Section 1007.24, F.S.</i>
Role of the Community Colleges	The Florida Community College System works with local school districts, private secondary schools and home school families to provide Dual Enrollment or “Early College” postsecondary options to over 30,000 eligible students annually. The term Early College is synonymous with “Dual Enrollment” in the Florida Community College System.
Purpose of the Standards	The Standards are measurable criteria of Early College/Dual Enrollment elements that are the basis of quality programs. Community Colleges are required to submit evidence of implementation of these Standards through periodic program reviews conducted by the Division of Community Colleges, Florida Department of Education.
Categories of Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students ▪ Faculty ▪ Curriculum

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environment ▪ Assessment ▪ Strategic Planning
--	---

Students: Standards for Early College Eligibility

S1-Grade Point Average (GPA)	In order to participate in Early College/Dual Enrollment, students must meet the GPA requirements, as specified in Florida Statute, (1007.271 F.S.) for the degree/certificate program selected. Any exceptions to the GPA requirements must be noted in the Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement.
S2-Assessment for Placement Purposes	In order to participate in Early College/Dual Enrollment, students must complete the required assessment tests (CPT, SAT/ACT, or TABE). Students seeking to enroll in college credit coursework must meet the same placement test score requirements as all postsecondary students.
S3-Joint AP/Early College-Dual Enrollment	For joint Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses, as authorized in Section 1007.272, F.S., students must comply with the add/drop policies and deadlines of the postsecondary institution. Under no circumstances will an Advanced Placement student who does not take or pass the AP examination be permitted to earn postsecondary credit for that course through Dual Enrollment. (Credit earned will be posted to the student transcript as either college credit with a grade, or AP credit, but not both.)

Faculty: Standards for Early College Faculty

F1-Faculty Credentials	All full-time or adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment must meet SACS requirements/guidelines for postsecondary instructors in the course/discipline. Criteria are the same for all faculty teaching postsecondary courses regardless of the location of the class (i.e., college campus, high school campus, or satellite site). The college is responsible for ensuring that all Dual Enrollment/Early College courses are taught by qualified faculty.
F2-Faculty Transcripts	For SACS accreditation purposes, postsecondary transcripts of all full-time or adjunct faculty teaching Dual Enrollment/Early College courses must be on file with the community college, regardless of who (school district/college or both) actually employs or pays their salary.
F3-Faculty Handbook	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Dual Enrollment/Early College classes shall be provided with a copy of the current faculty and/or adjunct faculty handbook, and are expected to adhere to the professional guidelines, rules, and expectations therein. Exceptions must be noted in the Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement.
F4-Student Handbook	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall be provided with a current student handbook detailing add/drop and withdrawal policies, student code of conduct, grading policies, critical dates, etc., and are expected to adhere to the guidelines, rules, and expectations therein. Exceptions must be noted in the Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement.
F5-Faculty Liaison/Ment or	All adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall be provided with a full-time faculty contact or liaison in the same discipline.
F6-Observation/ Evaluation	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall be observed by a community college faculty member or administrator for evaluation purposes using the same criteria as for all

<i>of Instruction</i>	other full-time and/or adjunct faculty.
-----------------------	---

Curriculum: Standards for Content/Syllabi/Exams/Grades

C1-Course Content	All courses taught as a part of Early College/Dual Enrollment must meet the postsecondary course content requirements as specified in the Statewide Course Numbering System.
C2-Course Plan and Objectives	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall be provided with a copy of course plans/objectives for the college course they are teaching. In addition, they will be provided with additional requirements for Gordon Rule courses, if applicable. All course objectives must be included in the instructional plan and “covered” per the syllabus during the term.
C3-Syllabus Requirement	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall file a copy of their current course syllabus with the discipline/department chair prior to the start of each term. Content of the syllabus must meet the same criteria as required for all college courses.
C4-Final Exam	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes shall file a copy of their course final exam with the college discipline/department chair each term. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will assign the responsibility for reviewing the exams for comprehensiveness in assessing expected learning outcomes. Feedback will be provided as appropriate to the instructor and the high school principal.
C5-Textbooks and Instructional Materials	Textbooks/instructional materials used in Early College/Dual Enrollment classes must be the same as or comparable to those used other postsecondary courses at the college with the same course prefix and number. The college will advise the school district of instructional material requirements as soon as that information becomes available, but no later than one term prior to a course being offered.
C6-Tests and Assignments	Course requirements in terms of tests, papers, or other assignments for Early College/Dual Enrollment students shall be at the same level, rigor or depth as those for all non-Early College/Dual Enrollment postsecondary students.
C7-Grades	All full-time and adjunct faculty teaching Early College/Dual Enrollment classes must observe college procedures/deadlines for submission of grades in appropriate format. All faculty will be advised of college-wide grading expectations/guidelines prior to teaching an EC/DE course.

Environment: Early College Class/Course Expectations

E1-Classroom Atmosphere	Early College/Dual Enrollment courses taught on a high school campus are expected to maintain a college-like atmosphere with minimal interruptions of instructional time. Student behavior which is disruptive to the learning environment may result in that student’s loss of EC/DE eligibility.
E2-Early College Course Expectations	Students and parents/guardians of students enrolled in Dual Enrollment/Early College courses will be advised of college course-level expectations, including, but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expectation of 2-3 hours of homework for each hour spent in class. ▪ Firm assignment deadlines. ▪ Any letter grade below a “C” will not count as credit toward satisfaction of the Gordon Rule requirement; however, all grades are calculated in a student’s GPA and will appear on their college

	<p>transcript.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All grades, including “W” for withdrawal, become a part of the student’s permanent college transcript and may affect subsequent postsecondary admission. ▪ While appropriate for college-level study, course materials/class discussions may reflect topics not typically included in secondary courses which some parents may object to for “minors.” Courses are not “brought down” to high school level to accommodate variations in student age and/or maturity. ▪ Students/parents should consult a community college counselor and/or advisor regarding the selection of courses to meet degree requirements or for transfer to a specific course of study at another institution.
E3-Educational Planning	All Early College/Dual Enrollment students are encouraged to work with a community college advisor to develop a postsecondary Educational Plan rather than enrolling in a random selection of college courses.

Assessment/Accountability

A1-Grade Analysis of Subsequent Course Success	Colleges shall conduct follow-up analysis on grades of Early College/Dual Enrollment students in subsequent college courses taken at their institution to ensure that level of preparation and future success is comparable with non-EC/DE postsecondary students. Reports shall be shared/reviewed with the principal and local school district and the Division of Community Colleges.
A2-Course/ Instructor Evaluation	Institutions shall conduct course/instructor evaluations for Early College/Dual Enrollment classes on the high school campus, consistent with those used in all other community college classes.
A3-Consistency in Standard Assessments	Any course-, discipline-, college-, or system-wide assessments that a postsecondary institution requires in non-Early College/Dual Enrollment sections of a course shall also be used in all EC/DE sections of the course.
A4-Grade Comparison of Early College and “Regular” Student Grades	Institutions shall conduct follow-up on Early College/Dual Enrollment course offerings to ensure that grading standards and outcomes are comparable to non-EC/DE sections. Results will be shared with the principal, local school district and the Division.
A5-Periodic Program Review	<p>Every three years the Division of Community Colleges will conduct a thorough program review of all Early College/Dual Enrollment programs that will include evidence of institutional implementation of the aforementioned Standards, including the areas of assessment. This program review will provide, but not be limited to, system-wide information on the performance of Early College/Dual Enrollment students in subsequent courses in both the Florida Community College System and the State University System. Measures will include: participation and success rates of all students (also disaggregated by ethnicity and gender), as well as subsequent postsecondary enrollment and/or employment. The results of the program review will be shared with the local school districts, the Commissioner and the State Board of Education.</p> <p>Minimum Performance Measure Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual Participation Rate

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Annual Participation Rate by gender/ethnicity 3. Grade Distribution for EC/DE students 4. Comparison of Grade Distribution for “regular” community college students and EC/DE students 5. Postsecondary enrollment rate by prior year high school graduates (both CC and SUS) by EC/DE students and non-EC/DE students; (also disaggregated by ethnicity and gender) 6. Student success rate (grades) in postsecondary courses subsequent to community college Early College/Dual Enrollment. 7. Comparison of student success rate in SUS courses for non-EC/DE students with EC/DE students
--	---

Strategic Planning: Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements

S1-Shared Vision	Per statute, school districts and community colleges must annually develop/ revise and submit the Interinstitutional Articulation Agreement (IAA) aligned with the district Student Progression Plan. Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements should involve collaborative strategic planning and promote effective management of resources. The agreements must delineate institutional responsibilities to inform students and parents about articulated acceleration program options, eligibility criteria to ensure college readiness, the process for monitoring student performance, and the criteria by which the quality of Early College/Dual Enrollment programs are to be judged. (Section 1007.235, F.S.)
S2-Articulation and Partnership Implementation	Public schools and postsecondary institutions are encouraged to share resources, form partnerships with private industries, and implement innovative strategies, student and faculty workshops, and parental involvement activities that serve the local needs of the educational community. Strategic partnerships promote integrated and inclusive involvement that focus on a shared return on the investment.
S3-Continuous Improvement	The IAA should outline strategies for collaborative professional development to improve instructional efficacy, encouraging teacher utilization of instructional technologies, addressing critical needs, and supporting in-service initiatives.

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 10

Subject: Status Report: Residency update

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: No Handouts

Facilitator/presenter: Dr. Sara Hamon & Ms Lori Clark

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 11

Subject: Summary Report of Disabilities Survey

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required

Supporting Documentation: Handout included in packet.

Facilitator/presenter: Ms. Lynda Page & Ms. Amy Albee

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 12

Subject: Status Report: Institution submission of policies to identify courses that meet the Gordon Rule requirement

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required

Supporting Documentation: None

Facilitator/presenter: Mr. Matt Bouck

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 13

Subject: Status Report: Standing Committee on Statewide Course Numbering

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required

Supporting Documentation: Agenda in packet.

Facilitator/presenter: Dr. R.E. LeMon

**ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
STANDING COMMITTEE ON COURSE NUMBERING**

**May 23, 2007
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
1505 Turlington Building**

Agenda

- Special Accreditation and Course Transfer
- Equated Courses Across Degrees
- OPPAGA Study on Nonpublic Institution Course Transfer
- Course Equivalencies by Course Competencies
- Non-participating Institution Use of SCNS Numbers

FYI Items

- Gordon Rule Policies/Courses
- General Education Courses

Articulation Coordinating Committee

May 23, 2007

Item 14

Subject: Status Report: Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Information and discussion; No action required.

Supporting Documentation: Agenda in packet

Facilitator/Presenters: Dr. Massey & Mr. Ron Blocker

Articulation Coordinating Committee
Standing Committee on Postsecondary Transition

May 23, 2007

Turlington Conference Room 1721/25

Tallahassee, Florida

9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Chairmen Ed Massey & Ron Blocker - Opening comments & introductions
2. Bruce Janasiewicz- Report on FSU course mapping
3. Alan Ramos- Report on 2007 Legislative Updates for Secondary Education
4. Walt Christy- Brevard School District's strategic initiatives to reduce the need for postsecondary remediation
5. Chris Cothran- Dual Enrollment Eligibility and Assessment for CTE
6. Kay Noble- Polk School District's Electronic Portal to Polk Community College
7. Pam Kerouac- Status reports:
 - IAA updates and regional workshops
 - IAA red flags
 - IAA template, <http://fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/interinstitutional-articulation-agreements.pdf>