

# HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COUNCIL

A Report to the Florida Legislature  
The Office of the Governor  
The State Board of Education  
And the Florida Board of Governors

December 2011

---



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction, Council Members, and Council Recommendations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Work of the Council</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Organization: Report Recommendations and Thematic Areas</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Report Sections</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Recommendation Thematic Areas</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Council Recommendations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Section A: The Core Mission of Public and Nonpublic Postsecondary Education Institutions in the Context of State Access Demands and Economic Development Goals</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Mission Statements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>K 12 Public Schools</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Workforce Education</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Independent Colleges and Universities</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>State University System</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Commission for Independent Education</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Florida College System</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Section B: Data and Performance Measures</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Preparedness</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Access</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Retention</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Transfer</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Completion</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Placement into the Workforce</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Section C: Articulation Policies and Programs</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Transfer Student Admissions</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Lower-Level Requirements as Preparation for the Upper Division</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Career and Technical Education</b>	<b>45</b>

Articulation Monitoring Systems	47
Section D: Workforce Education	50
<u>Issue (a):</u> The alignment of school district and Florida College System workforce development education programs to ensure cost efficiency and mission delineations	50
<u>Issue (b):</u> Examine the need for college credit certificate programs	52
<u>Issue (c):</u> Examination of the need for non-college certificate programs	53
<u>Issue (d):</u> Evaluation of the merit of retaining the Associate in Applied Science degree	55
<u>Issue (e):</u> Consolidation of adult general education programs within school districts	56
<u>Issue (f):</u> The consistency of workforce education data collected and reported by Florida College System institutions and school districts, including the establishment of common elements and definitions for any data that is used for state and federal funding and program accountability	57
Appendix A: Recommendations to the Articulation Coordinating Committee	68
Appendix B: Higher Education Coordinating Council Statutory Language	70

## INTRODUCTION, COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Florida Legislature created the Higher Education Coordinating Council for the purposes of identifying unmet needs and facilitating solutions to disputes regarding the creation of new degree programs and the establishment of new institutes, campuses, or centers. The Council is to serve as an advisory board to the Legislature, the State Board of Education, and the Board of Governors.

The Council is comprised of the following members:

- Mr. Marshall Criser, III, (Co-Chair) Business representative appointed by House Speaker
- Mr. Jon Moyle, (Co-Chair) Business representative appointed by Senate President
- Mr. Gerard Robinson, Commissioner, Florida Department of Education
- Mr. Samuel Ferguson, Executive Director, Commission for Independent Education
- Dr. Ed Moore, President, Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida
- Mr. Randy Hanna, Chancellor, Florida College System
- Mr. Frank T. Brogan, Chancellor, State University System of Florida

The Council is charged with making recommendations with regard to the following:

- A. The primary core mission of public and nonpublic postsecondary education institutions in the context of state access demands and economic development goals.
- B. Performance outputs and outcomes designed to meet annual and long-term state goals, including, but not limited to, increased student access, preparedness, retention, transfer, and completion. Performance measures must be consistent across sectors and allow for a comparison of the state's performance to that of other states.
- C. The state's articulation policies and practices to ensure that cost benefits to the state are maximized without jeopardizing quality. Recommendations shall consider return on investment for both the state and students and propose systems to facilitate and ensure institutional compliance with state articulation policies.
- D. A plan for workforce development education that addresses:
  - the alignment of school district and Florida College System workforce development education programs to ensure cost efficiency and mission delineation, including an examination of the need for both college credit and noncollege credit certificate programs, an evaluation of the merit of retaining the associate of applied science degree, and the consolidation of adult general education programs within school districts; and
  - the consistency of workforce education data collected and reported by Florida College System institutions and school districts, including the

establishment of common elements and definitions for any data that is used for state and federal funding and program accountability.

The Council is required to submit a report outlining its recommendations to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Board of Governors, and the State Board of Education by December 31, 2011, which specifically includes recommendations for consideration by the Legislature for implementation in the 2012-13 fiscal year.

### **The Work of the Council**

As a body comprised of the heads of Florida's key postsecondary education delivery sectors, and co-chaired by prominent business leaders, the Higher Education Coordinating Council is a unique, first-of-its-kind creation with the potential to have an effect on educational policy, by redefining the landscape of and interaction between higher education sectors in Florida. The Council has focused its efforts on exploring ways to achieve a more seamless Pre-K-20 educational system, to promote consistent education policy and articulation processes across all educational systems, to maximize access to a high quality education to all Floridians, and to improve accountability measures across all delivery systems.

The Council has conducted more than a dozen meetings, all webcast and open to the public. Representatives from business and industry were invited to attend and participate in discussions, and presenters have included the Council of 100, The Associated Industries of Florida and The Florida Chamber. In addition, the Council developed a web site that features recordings of past meetings, a meeting schedule, meeting notices and information regarding the ongoing work of the Council.

In July 2011, the Council sought input relative to higher education issues by launching a survey to seek input from education stakeholders including local school districts, education associations, postsecondary schools, Florida colleges, state universities, and independent colleges and universities. The Council was gratified to receive a great deal of valuable feedback that assisted in forming the recommendations contained within this report.

The Council created workgroups to further delve into some of the issues referenced above. These included workgroups on articulation policies, on identifying the talent needs for existing, evolving and emerging industries as a means to assist in forging a talent supply chain, and in the creation of a statewide degree inventory of all available educational offerings.

It was inevitable and appropriate that the Council spend a portion of its initial meetings in a "discovery" mode: reviewing information relative to the educational sectors and offices that comprise the Council, as well as gaining insights into a substantial number

of key issues associated with postsecondary education. The Council's interests captured issues ranging from student financial aid to those associated with Pre-Kindergarten Education, the latter of which resulted in a resolution to support current Florida Department of Education efforts in that critical area. But perhaps the two most substantive dynamics that the Council focused its attention on have been the tremendous access needs for postsecondary education facing Florida as well as simultaneously becoming informed of and exposed to the profusion of programmatic experiences from certificates through Ph.D.s and professional schools that are offered in Florida.

The broad educational opportunities that exist are a great strength for Florida in the face of its access challenges. However, that a single, accessible inventory of these postsecondary offerings was conspicuously absent in Florida, led the Council to the belief that such a statewide inventory needed to be created so that students, parents, employers, and others would be able to access this information through a single portal.

The Council has made good progress on this project, and work is currently being done to move this product to fruition. *Florida TalentNet* is a product of the Council, making possible a cross-sector inventory of all programs and locations throughout the state. This electronic inventory will be useful for state and local level education planning, for industry and business seeking education providers, for economic development and industry recruitment, and for students seeking programs of study. The Council has worked closely with Workforce Florida and the Talent Supply Chain work group to determine the talents needed for existing, evolving, and emerging industries. Ultimately, *Florida TalentNet* will become a strong, central link of the Talent Supply Chain.

While this report contains a number of what it believes are good and actionable recommendations, the Council is under no illusion that its work has concluded. There are still a number of important issues for which the Council believes it can provide a useful forum. For this report, the Council has worked to address those issues specified in statutory direction. However, the Council will continue its work and provide updates on its progress in keeping open this important dialogue among the educational sectors.

## **Organization: Report Sections and Recommendation Thematic Areas**

### Report Sections

The narrative of the Higher Education Coordinating Council's report is organized according to the four primary areas that it was directed to address by the Legislature:

- Section A: The Core Mission of Public and Nonpublic Postsecondary Education Institutions in the Context of State Access Demands and Economic Goals
- Section B: Data and Performance Measures
- Section C: Articulation Policies and Programs
- Section D: Workforce Education

### Recommendation Thematic Areas

As the Council began its initial review of recommendations that were being proposed by educational sectors and offices within the Department of Education, it concluded that it would be helpful to both review and, ultimately, to present its recommendations in thematic areas rather than strictly organized according to the four sections of the report. The impetus for this decision was due to the number and breadth of report recommendations (85 in Draft One). Recommendations were deemed to be too diverse in topic to be presented according to the four report sections. Creating thematic areas presented the Council’s best opportunity for reviewing, accepting, combining, deleting, and presenting recommendations emanating from all four sections of the report in the most facilitative and cogent manner.

By organizing according to thematic areas, recommendations discussed in the narrative of the four report sections were placed in what was determined to be the most appropriate thematic area irrespective of from which section of the report the recommendation emanated. For example, while a discrete recommendation thematic area for Workforce Education was created, some recommendations relative to that topic were determined to be more appropriately placed under the recommendation thematic area of “Data, Performance Measures, and Accountability.”

While certain of the recommendation thematic areas were bound to overlap to some degree, the Council agreed to the following recommendation thematic areas:

- Strategic Degree Program Coordination
- Capital Expansion Issues
- Student Financial Aid
- Funding/Performance Funding
- Articulation Policies and Programs
- Data, Performance Measures, and Accountability
- Workforce Education

These thematic areas are further described at the beginning of each of their sections in the context of the Council Recommendations List.

## COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

**Note:** Recommendations are numbered sequentially. Letters following the numbers refer to the Report Sections from which the recommendations came forward:

- **A** (**The Core Mission** of Postsecondary Education Institutions in the Context of State Access Demands and Economic Development Goals),
- **B** (**Data and Performance** Measures),
- **C** (**Articulation Policies and Programs**, and
- **D** (**Workforce Education**). Cells containing recommendation numbers that are shaded identify recommendations made directly to or relative to the Florida Legislature. All other recommendations are directed to the State Board of Education and/or to its postsecondary educational sectors and/or to the Florida Board of Governors.

**Strategic Degree Program Coordination.** This thematic area captures recommendations for actions that might be taken to improve strategic program planning, reducing potential program duplication, maximizing geographical distribution of degree programs, improving programmatic alignment relative to unique institutional missions, and sector or institutional governance issues. This thematic area also captures recommendations associated with Florida’s increasing need for access to postsecondary education irrespective of delivery sector, as well as the last link of a Talent Supply Chain: improving channels of communication and initiating actions so that educational sectors have a better understanding of the types of degree programs business, industry, and other organizations need; and the specific knowledge and skill sets that should be incorporated into such new or existing programs.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
1 A	Determine specific degree and institutional capacity demands by projecting and tracking traditional and non-traditional student demand both statewide and regionally. This should include certificate and degree demand, enrollment driven capacity demand, and cross-reference business and industry employment needs in order to promote more targeted degrees and keep more talent in Florida. HECC should direct completion of work developing an inventory of all certificates, associate, bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral and first professional degrees offered at all of Florida’s higher education institutions.
2 A	The State Board of Education and the Board of Governors should jointly review the current process for the development and delivery of public baccalaureate education and recommend potential revisions, if any, that will provide Floridians with expanded access to quality baccalaureate degree programs in the most efficient and cost-effective way. In proposing new programs, the Florida Colleges, the State Universities, and ICUF should undertake an analysis of whether a new proposal will impact existing FCS, SUS or ICUF programs and the most cost effective means of increasing access, prior to expanding or implementing new baccalaureate degrees.



3 A	In order to work toward greater economic development and a New Florida, knowledge-based economy, and for the state’s careful investment with limited resources, the institutions of the State University System need to identify with greater specificity their primary areas of research expertise. Similarly, the State University system must continue to align both its undergraduate and graduate programmatic offerings based on the unique strengths and missions of its individual institutions. This will entail more systemic planning within the State University System.
4 A	The HECC should request and receive a rolling annual list of prospective certificate and degree programs that are being planned by postsecondary education sectors to increase coordination among the sectors. The State should require that the development of new baccalaureate programs in all public and private postsecondary systems receiving state appropriations be guided by comparative cost analyses as well as a demonstration of unmet need and demand linked to employment. Academic leaders from institutions within all higher education sectors, SUS, FCS, ICUF, school districts, and CIE, should meet annually by workforce region to share and discuss common issues related to enrollments, transfers, economic/business and industry needs, as well as planned program additions and deletions. Each regional group should provide a meeting summary report to the Higher Education Coordinating Council that includes any recommendations for improved processes and efficiencies, no later than September 1st of each year.
5 A	Each of the various educational sectors should be charged by the Higher Education Coordinating Council with setting goals for increased degree completion, with a particular emphasis on STEM degree production. The inventory of all undergraduate degree programs should be made readily available to all employers statewide, as well as a directory of career placements offices at all colleges/universities. Likewise, employers should have the ability to easily and regularly electronically post/link their specific job needs for interns, fellows, and degree graduates via the program inventory website.
6 A	The Legislature should create authority for state colleges and universities to establish and have oversight of their own charter schools preK through 12.

Capital Expansion Issues. This thematic area captures those few recommendations made relative to the issue of dwindling Public Education Capital Outlay dollars and the need to explore ways of ensuring maintenance of existing and creation of new facilities necessary to accommodate the growing need for access to postsecondary education.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
7 A	All appropriate educational delivery sectors, working with the Florida Legislature, need to explore new methodologies for the provision of funding maintenance and construction of facilities. This should include exploring alternative funding solutions for the construction of University Educational Partnership Centers on state college campuses or use the state’s Higher Education Facilities Finance Authority rather than using PECO funding, to finance new buildings and seek community matching funds.

Student Financial Aid. This thematic area captures those recommendations relative to all financial aid including the Bright Futures program, the Florida Resident Access Grants (FRAG), and the Access to Better Learning and Education (ABLE) grant program.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
8 A	The Legislature should align financial aid and grant programs to encourage and accelerate access, graduation, and time-to-degree. FRAG, Bright Futures, Need Based and other grants should be stabilized at an appropriate value and offered for a

	specified number of credit hours and if, by using IB, AP, or dual enrollments, students can graduate earlier, the state should allow them to apply those grants for “hours remaining within the 120” at the graduate level for Florida based programs. Allow students to use the grants for summer sessions. All financial assistance programs should be available to SUS, ICUF and FCS non-traditional students taking nine or more credit hours.
9 A	The Florida Legislature should provide STEM incentives in early college pathway programs and in the form of Florida College System transfer grants that can be used in either public or private upper division programs. As an option, the Legislature should provide “match” for private contributions geared toward STEM grants-in-aid/scholarships.
10 A	The Florida Legislature should consider a state tax credit or other incentive to promote business/industry/education system collaboration, to include student internships, and leverage private support for research.

Funding/Performance Funding. This thematic area captures some general funding recommendations, and more specifically focuses on the desire of postsecondary institutions to explore funding mechanisms based less on inputs (i.e., enrollments) and more on outputs (i.e., program completers).

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
11 A	All public and private postsecondary sectors should expand the use of instructional technology to help solve access and availability challenges. Colleges and universities should use already developed resources within Florida to offer expanded access through on-line programs and promote consortium programs that enable public and private institutions in a region to allow students to easily take courses at other institutions in the partnership. The Florida Legislature should provide a reliable and predictable funding model for technology-based infrastructure such as the Distance Learning Consortium, the Orange Grove repository for digitized learning resources, and FACTS.org, that help deliver high quality instruction and student services with maximum cost efficiencies.
12 A	If the Florida Legislature continues to provide administrative funding for partnerships with state colleges, it should include State University System institutions, and ICUF schools in the appropriation. The 2+2 language is included in the 2011 General Appropriations Act. The specific Proviso language can be found Section 101A of Chapter 2011-69, Laws of Florida.
13 A	The Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, working with the Florida Legislature, need to examine a new State University System and Florida College System funding formula based in part on greater emphasis on performance-based accountability to enhance areas such as graduation and retention rates, STEM degree production and commercialization of research that leads to job creation. The Florida Legislature should reaffirm its commitment to seamless 2 + 2 transfer articulation pathways by incentivizing state universities, state colleges and private colleges/universities to increase the number and proportion of Associate-degree holding students enrolled in upper division programs.
14 C	The Florida Legislature should modify acceleration incentives to school districts based on the number of college credits earned by high school students in all acceleration programs (AP, IB, AICE, Dual Enrollment).
15 C	The Florida Legislature should modify existing systems to provide Dual Enrollment funding to the institution providing the instruction.
16 D	State appropriated funds allocated to support Workforce Education programs should have a higher percent of the total appropriation based on program performance for

	school district Workforce Education programs. The Florida Legislature should increase the percentage of workforce education funds that are based on performance. The workforce education fund is used to support school district workforce education programs. In fiscal year 2011-12, 1.33% (\$5 million) of the workforce education budget was based on performance.
--	--

Articulation Policies and Programs. This thematic area captures a variety of recommendations for improving Florida’s 2+2 system of transferability, as well as recommendations relative to subcomponents relative to the 2+2 system, including the State Course Numbering System and the work of the Articulation Coordinating Committee. The great majority of these recommendations came from Section C of the Council’s report, which bears the same name as the name of this recommendation thematic area.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
17 A,C	The Higher Education Coordinating Council should convene a postsecondary enrollment estimating conference involving all postsecondary sectors to determine existing and projected institution and program capacity at the upper division.
18 C	The Board of Governors and State Board of Education should require each public postsecondary institution to establish policies and procedures for ensuring graduates attain the General Education Competencies prior to graduation.
19 C	The Florida Legislature should amend s. 1007.28, F.S., <i>Computer-assisted student advising systems</i> , requiring FACTS.org to collect the Transfer Program of Interest and Transfer Institution of Interest for the purposes of upper-level capacity analysis and recruitment.
20 C	The Florida Legislature should amend s. 1007.25, F.S., <i>General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements</i> , to require the State Board of Education to establish rules for Associate in Arts degree seekers to indicate a program and institution of interest by the time 36 semester hours is accumulated and to require that institutions track student Transfer Program of Interest. To facilitate access to upper division, the SBE should encourage the establishment of new articulation agreements modeled after “Direct Connect.”
21 C	The Florida Legislature should revise s. 1007.25, F.S., <i>General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements</i> , to require Associate in Arts graduates to complete a foreign language course sequence prior to graduation, if the requirement was not met in High School.
22 C	The Florida Legislature should repeal s. 1007.262, F.S. <i>Foreign language competence; equivalence determination</i> as unnecessary in determining the completion of foreign language course requirements.
23 C	The Department of Education should create mandatory advising mechanisms through the ACC and FACTS.org to assist students in selecting acceleration credit that will count towards general education and common prerequisites.
24 C	The Department of Education should develop a clear curricular definition of Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees that differentiates between AAS and Associate in Science (AS) degree mechanisms for articulation to the baccalaureate degree.
25 C	The Department of Education, working with all the higher education sectors, should create a postsecondary feedback data system to report the progress of students into and through the baccalaureate degree. To ensure a consistent and equitable review of the issues, all postsecondary sectors should adopt and use a common set of data elements, particularly in regard to the definitions of FTIC, AA transfer, and other transfer students.

26 C	The Higher Education Coordinating Council should direct the Articulation Coordinating Committee to evaluate cross sector compliance with the State’s articulation policies and programs. These findings should be reported to the HECC on an as needed basis.
---------	---

Data, Performance Measures, and Accountability. This thematic area responds directly to the legislative directive for the Council to make recommendations with regard to performance outputs and outcomes consistent across delivery sectors designed to meet annual and long-term state goals, including, but not limited to, increased student access, preparedness, retention, transfer, and completion.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
27 A	Similar to the cooperative efforts underway relative to library automation and distance learning, the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors, and ICUF should create a joint taskforce to identify the potential for other joint contracts for shared services, where feasible, in order to maximize the use of state resources. The taskforce should make a report annually to the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors, the Higher Education Coordinating Council, and the Florida Legislature regarding its efforts.
28 B	Beginning December 2013, the HECC shall produce an annual report on the performance of Florida’s system of higher education that includes each of the common measures identified and described in the Data and Performance narrative section, as well as unique performance measures that are specific to each individual sector.
29 B	To enable the HECC to report results for all sectors, the Florida Legislature should provide specific authority for the Commission for Independent Education (CIE) to collect the data necessary for reporting the measures identified in the Data and Performance Section of the Council Report
30 D	The Department of Education should strengthen and enhance the accountability system for Florida’s Workforce Education programs by providing recommendations to the Legislature that include incentives for meeting specific outcomes (completion, placement, earnings) and consequences for failure to meet the required outcomes.

Workforce Education. This thematic area captures recommendations, some of which were legislatively mandated, associated with Workforce Education programs. Virtually all of the recommendations found under this thematic area are touched upon in the Council’s report Section D, which bears the same name as the thematic area.

Recommendation Number	Recommendation
31 D	The Florida Legislature should directly link adult education to employment by changing the definition of adult education by revising s. 1004.93, F.S., to further emphasize that the goal of adult education is employment.
32 D	The Florida Legislature should amend the current statutory [1004.02(26), F.S.] definition of “Workforce Education” to ensure that business and industry personnel needs are met. The current definition is “Workforce Education means adult general education or career education and may consist of a continuing workforce education course or a program of study leading to an occupational completion point, a career certificate, an applied technology diploma, or a career degree.” The definition should be amended as follows “Workforce Education consists of secondary and postsecondary courses and programs that lead to an occupational completion point, industry certification, certificates and two year degrees that are directly linked to employment and Florida’s industry and businesses needs and demands.”

<p>33 D</p>	<p>The Florida Legislature should continue to support the current workforce education delivery system that allows local institutions to determine program offerings to meet local business and industry personnel needs. Programs and courses should be market-driven, meet industry needs, cost-effective and result in employment for students. Which system provides the programs and courses should not be the issue that determines program offerings. The determinant should be whether the programs that are offered are market-driven and successfully prepare individuals for employment.</p>
<p>34 D</p>	<p>The Florida Legislature should not consolidate adult general education programs within school districts. Currently, school districts, Florida colleges, and community-based organizations provide adult education programs to meet the needs of their local communities. This local decision-making should be maintained.</p>
<p>35 D</p>	<p>The Department of Education, school districts and the Florida College System institutions should ensure that, beginning in the 2013-14 school year, workforce education data collected and reported include common data and definitions for state and federal accountability programs</p>
<p>36 D</p>	<p>The Department of Education should maintain the college credit certificate, the non-college credit certificate, and the Associate in Applied Science degree as valid credentials as needed in Florida because these certificates and programs are directly linked to workforce need and demand.</p>

## SECTION A: THE CORE MISSION OF PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF STATE ACCESS DEMANDS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS

*“The mission of the state system of postsecondary education is to develop human resources, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to extend knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campuses, and to develop in students heightened intellectual, cultural, and humane sensitivities; scientific, professional, and technological expertise; and a sense of purpose. Inherent in this broad mission are methods of instruction, research, extended training, and public service designed to educate people and improve the human condition.”*

**(1004.01(2) Florida Statutes)**

The 2011 legislature mandated that the Higher Education Coordinating Council make recommendations regarding the core mission of public and non public postsecondary education institutions. The recommendations have multiple audiences: not only executive and legislative bodies, but also the State Board of Education and the Florida Board of Governors. The Council sees this as an opportunity to more clearly and consistently define the mission of post secondary education in relation to access and economic development and to identify the roles and responsibilities of each sector and how each sector can contribute to Florida’s vital access and economic development needs.

The above-quoted statute regarding postsecondary education reflects the traditional context that creation of knowledge in and of itself creates value for Florida’s communities and its citizens. Additionally, though, 21st century economic realities and the need for Florida to compete in attracting high-tech, high-wage jobs suggests that the state should leverage its resources to ensure that Florida’s talent is developed and provided the tools to achieve lifetime learning and success. The traditional charge of “What is best for the student?” must now be expanded to include what is best for the taxpayer, the economy, and the state as a whole. This is also an opportunity to ensure the skills and knowledge imparted to students are consistent with the traditional values and ideals of public morality which are essential to the general welfare of the state and its citizens.

Resolving this question must also be set in the context of the existing provision of post secondary education, including public and private, K-12 institutions, colleges, and universities with respective governance structures; institutional aspiration; and by statute, policies, and procedures that may need to be revisited or created.

As they should, all sectors strive to be great, to be efficient and effective, and to respond to their local constituents. And all Florida postsecondary sectors are populated with exemplary institutions and programmatic offerings that are a source of pride. But does the state need a greater voice, or at least a greater foreknowledge, as to which

institutions will and do offer what programs, serving which students, in what academic areas, and at what cost? Perhaps exploring this question represents the ongoing critical work of the Council itself; it is without doubt on the minds of many Council members.

The question is not asked in a vacuum, but, rather, in an environment of limited funding when the demands for access and an educated workforce have never been greater, and when Florida's promise for a knowledge- and innovation-based future is critically dependent on the missions of all sectors.

Several sectors combine to deliver Florida's postsecondary education: public school systems; public community/state colleges; public universities; and the private/independent institutions, both non-profit and for-profit. For decades it has been a goal to create a seamless educational path of access, transferability, quality, and affordability that efficiently meets the state's essential access and economic development needs. Despite the positive efforts of all sectors, it is an ideal that has yet to be *fully* realized, especially given the evolving missions of institutions in the context of governance structures and processes that have shifted, in some cases radically, over time. Probably the four most compelling examples are the increasing role of advanced placement and dual enrollment programs, the creation of a baccalaureate-conferring Florida College System, the authorization of baccalaureates and master's-level degrees by the boards of trustees of individual State University System institutions, and the rapid growth of postsecondary schools within the for-profit sector.

Historically, Florida has been a national leader in establishing articulation policies and pathways between and among both public and private institutions that have been the envy of other states. And yet, at this juncture in the evolution of systems and institutions, it is important to at least ask whether such a statewide, cross-sector system should develop an accountability model that establishes performance and accountability metrics that can be uniformly applied across and among all sectors. Similarly, policy makers should consider whether performance and accountability objectives are best achieved by funding outputs and outcomes versus the traditional approach of funding inputs, e.g. enrollment.

If indeed it is Florida's goal to better organize its cross-sector delivery and to make the best systemic decisions, certainly some of the most fundamental questions relative to mission are these:

- Do all sectors, public and private, and their respective institutions optimally reflect Florida's state system of postsecondary education as articulated in (1004.01(2) Florida Statutes? If Florida is currently not optimally organized to meet its growing access and economic development demands, what steps need to be taken and in what order so that greater cohesion, planning, access, and, ultimately, outcomes can be achieved?

- Given the growth and evolution of some sectors and their institutions (more institutions, more branch campuses more programmatic offerings, more baccalaureate granting institutions, more graduate/professional schools) are the missions of all sectors optimally aligned with one another relative to efficiency, effectiveness, and student-centeredness? How can state policy ensure that this alignment happens?
- Does the state provide sufficient oversight for the changing missions of all sectors and their institutions by virtue of existing statute, policies, and procedures now in effect?
- Are there elements relative to institutional mission that have unintentionally weakened Florida's commitment to the two-plus-two system of postsecondary articulation? Is the two-plus-two system of articulation fundamentally at risk more than it was ten years ago? If so, how can Florida move forward to protect this great asset?
- Are there geographic/programmatic gaps between all sectors, public and private, through which students are falling? Are there unnecessary overlays of duplication that reduce cost-effectiveness? Is there a methodology for state-level enrollment and programmatic delivery planning across sectors?
- With regard to voluntary pre-kindergarten and K-12 education, how can the missions of all sectors, public and private, be maximized to produce effective professionals who are equipped to respond to the enormous challenges of providing Florida's youngest generation with the tools to be successful in their formative elementary school years?
- How can Florida's postsecondary sectors help to better address issues of postsecondary readiness, reducing the need for remediation?
- How can the State Board of Education and the Florida Board of Governors most optimally articulate between themselves for systemic postsecondary planning?
- For more efficient systemic planning, what new collaborative partnerships might be created for the development of new academic offerings among Workforce Education, the State University System, the Florida College System, the institutions licensed by the Commission for Independent Education, and the institutions that constitute the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida; and how might these collaborative partnerships be funded?



### **Mission Statements**

What follows are brief treatments of each of the missions of the delivery sectors, public and private, associated with a statewide system of postsecondary education crafted by each of the sectors: Workforce Education, Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, The State University System, the Commission for Independent Education, and the Florida College System. Each sector provided its own perspective of its mission, and the inclusion of these in this report does not reflect the endorsement of the language by the Council. These mission statements are not the end conclusions of the Council, only a beginning point for discussion.

There were a few key areas that stood out as important across sectors relative to mission:

- All sectors must work more collaboratively and inclusively to understand and take advantage of institutional capacity across sectors relative to the whole of Florida's student access demands and, with as much specificity as possible, the needs of business and industry.
- All sectors must work collaboratively to systematically plan for the delivery of graduates to fill high-skill, high wage, workforce present and future needs. There must be a concerted and coordinated effort among all sectors to produce more graduates of STEM programs.
- The Florida Legislature should provide funding to enhance Florida's technology-based infrastructure for services available across all sectors, as a method for responding to student access and instructional support needs. This includes e-learning, e-advising (FACTS.org), linked library systems, and the Orange Grove digital repository. This technology investment will assist sectors and institutions in realizing their missions.
- The Florida Legislature should ensure that the postsecondary education accountability system, including performance measures [s. 1008, F.S.], as well as the mission [s. 1004.01(02), F.S.] reflect the criticality of the issues regarding state access demands and economic development goals.

### **K 12 Public Schools Mission Statement**

Florida's K-12 public education system serves more than 2.7 million K-12 public school students within 3,800 schools statewide and 44 school district technical centers. The State Board of Education's guiding vision is, "To change the culture of our schools from PreK to postsecondary by raising the ceiling and raising the floor to better enable

students for success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century". Florida engages in strategic planning annually based upon reform implementation results and the state's educational priorities. Florida's 2009-10 Next Generation PreK-20 Strategic Plan identifies the state's student achievement goals and is structured around guiding principles, priorities, objectives, and projects that support Florida's education mission.

The State Board of Education operates utilizing the mission of Florida's K-20 education system established pursuant to s. 1008.31(2)(a), Florida Statutes. Therefore, the K-12 public school system's mission statement, as prescribed by law is:

*Florida's K-20 education system shall be to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless, efficient system, by allowing them the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents, and communities.*

To ensure the mission statement is honored the State Board of Education adopted the next Generation Strategic Plan (December, 2010) that included the following goals:

- Strengthen foundation skills
- Improve Quality of Teaching and Leadership in the education system
- Improve college and career readiness
- Expand opportunities for postsecondary degrees and certificates

Florida's K-12 education system is the foundation and stepping stone for the majority of college and university students in the state. The State Board of Education has specifically adopted objectives tied to their goals that directly impact the success of our students and their progression to postsecondary education. Examples of these objectives are:

- Increase postsecondary enrollment rate;
- Increase diversity and number of high school graduates who enroll in postsecondary education;
- Increase diversity and number and percentage of high school graduates who earn a certificate or a degree at a Florida college or career center;
- Increase diversity and number and percentage of Florida college system or state university system students who enroll in and complete upper division program of study;
- Increase number and percentage of students scoring "college ready" in math and language arts on approved postsecondary readiness assessment;
- Increase student participation and performance in accelerated options of AP, IB, DE, and AICE; and
- Define College and Career Readiness.

Florida's Race to the Top student achievement goals lead to College and Career Readiness. Florida's Race to the Top investments will assure the realization of increased student achievement in an expedited time frame. Florida's Race to the Top plan builds toward the goal of preparing our students to graduate high school and succeed in college and career. Florida's key Race to the Top goals for student achievement are the following:

1. Double the percentage of incoming high school freshmen who ultimately graduate from high school, go on to college, and achieve at least a year's worth of college credit;
2. Cut the achievement gap in half in 2015; and
3. Increase the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on NAEP by 2015, to or beyond the performance levels of the highest-performing states.

Recent reform efforts have been implemented by the Legislature to help ensure Florida's students are college and career ready. For example, high schools are required to evaluate their students before the beginning of grade 12 on the college readiness of each student who scores at Level 2 or Level 3 on the reading portion of the grade 10 FCAT or Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 on the mathematics assessments. The high school will use the results of the test to advise the students of any identified deficiencies and provide 12th grade students, and require them to complete, appropriate postsecondary preparatory instruction prior to high school graduation. Students who demonstrate readiness by achieving the minimum test scores established by the state board and enroll in a Florida College System institution within 2 years of achieving such scores shall not be required to retest or enroll in remediation when admitted to any Florida College System institution. Additionally, new requirements include both mathematics and science courses and end of course assessments. The new course requirements are phased in over a four-year period with new requirements beginning with each 9<sup>th</sup> grade class. End of course assessments are also phased in with the first year when the end of course exam is 30% of a course grade and the second year and following years the end of course exam must be passed to earn the required credit. Specifically students entering the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2010 were required to take Algebra and Geometry, in 2011 entering 9<sup>th</sup> graders were required to also take Biology and the Algebra End of Course Exam, in 2012 entering 9<sup>th</sup> graders are required to take a Biology and Geometry End of Course Exams and Algebra II and students entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2013 are required to take Chemistry or Physics and an equally rigorous science course.

Florida's unparalleled history of reform has created the foundation for strong student achievement. The following list of historical reforms has set the foundation for continued student improvement in Florida:

- Adopting internationally-benchmarked student standards aligned to college and career readiness;

- Setting high standards for student achievement (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, grades 3-10) several years before the passage of No Child left Behind (NCLB);
- Instituting a strong school accountability system (grading public schools “A” through “F” on performance, learning gains, learning gains of lowest 25% of students, high school graduation rate, college readiness);
- Building a longitudinal database and reporting system and PK-20 data warehouse;
- Emphasizing student learning in educator evaluations and reward systems, and in teacher preparation;
- Chosen as one of six states for a flexibility waiver to implement a differentiated accountability system for struggling schools;
- Providing state support and assistance, rewards and sanctions (School Recognition Program);
- Emphasizing reading (state-funded LEA comprehensive reading plans and thousands of teachers, principals, and reading coaches trained in research-based reading instruction);
- Creating a vibrant charter school system and scholarship programs to enable school choice;
- Establishing the Florida Virtual School, recognized as the #1 virtual school in the nation for the past two years; and
- Initiating a statewide voluntary prekindergarten program that serves 63% of all four-year-olds in the state.

Consequently, Florida’s initiatives have shown impressive results. Florida has dramatically improved student achievement over the past decade as measured by National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) student achievement growth.

### **Workforce Education Mission Statement**

The Workforce Education system is a dual delivery system with programs offered in 59 school districts including 46 technical centers and 28 state and community colleges. The system served almost 800,000 students in technical certificate, associate in science degree, apprenticeship, literacy/ diploma, and continuing workforce education programs in 2009-10.

Workforce Education in Florida is making a difference in our students’ lives:

- Average annual earnings provide a sustainable income for career programs completers.
  - District certificate completers averaged annual earnings of \$32,733.
  - College certificate completers averaged \$37,355.
  - College A.S. degree completers averaged \$47,707.

- Career certificate completers have a 76% placement rate in employment or continuing education with college credit certificate completers demonstrating an 86% placement rate.
- In the adult general education programs, students document progress through learning gains and transition to higher levels.
  - 74% of post-tested adult education students made learning gains.
  - 63% of students completing adult basic education transitioned to adult secondary education or earned a diploma by the following year.
  - 59% of adult ESOL students making a documented learning gain continued their education.

The mission of Florida's Workforce Education System is to help ensure that Florida has the skilled workforce needed to grow and diversify its economy. The primary customer of workforce education is Florida's businesses and industries and, therefore, workforce education programs in Florida are designed and tailored to meet their needs. As indicated in "*Closing the Talent Gap – A Business Perspective: What Florida needs from its Talent Supply Chain*", Florida's Workforce Education System is committed to solidifying and enhancing the Talent Supply Chain to focus on creating a pool of talent that will help both our existing and future businesses thrive in the global innovation economy.

For students in Workforce Education programs the goal is employment in demand occupations. Workforce Education programs are designed to ensure that students have access to programs that are linked to employment opportunities that result in self-sufficiency. Florida's workforce education programs provide training designed to meet local and state workforce needs and help Florida compete in the global economy by building a broadly based, highly skilled, and productive workforce. Postsecondary Workforce Education programs include both career education and adult education programs.

Short-term and long-term forecasts of employment demand for jobs by occupation and industry are the foundation on which workforce education programs are developed. Florida's workforce education delivery system is aligned to the occupations with employment opportunities. Florida's Workforce System utilizes several tools to determine the employment demand for jobs by occupation and industry and consequentially what programs are needed. The Workforce Estimating Conference [s. 216.136(7), F.S.] provides information on the personnel needs of current, new, and emerging industries. This information, in addition to other market driven tools, is used to determine what workforce education programs are needed. These tools include: the statewide targeted occupation list; Enterprise Florida's Targeted Sectors information; information from industry state associations (i.e., manufacturers associations); needs identified at the local level by local business and industry, school districts and community colleges; employment openings advertised on the internet; and direct employer input. Department of Education staff work collaboratively with business and

industry representatives to design programs and program standards to meet Florida's needs.

Program performance is assessed using the statutorily mandated outcome measures that include: retention rates, completion rates, placement rates and earnings [s. 1008.42, F.S. and 1008.43, F.S.]. Since 2005-06, the legislature has provided a separate performance-based incentive funding allocation to district workforce education providers based on outcomes such as program completers, special populations served, employment placement, and continuing education. In fiscal year 2011-12, 1.33% (\$5 million) of the workforce education budget is performance-based. This allocation is calculated annually based on the most recent available data. Utilization of performance-based funding and a comprehensive use of market driven tools are key elements that contribute to the responsiveness of Florida's workforce education system.

### **Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) Mission Statement**

Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the mission of the Independent College and Universities of Florida has included expanding access to higher education and enhancing Florida's economy. And since 1979, ICUF has closely coordinated these efforts with the State of Florida. This ongoing collaboration and the resulting student financial assistance programs (like the Florida Resident Access Grants (FRAG), Bright Futures Scholarships and the Private Student Assistance Grants) boost both student access and Florida's economy.

Total enrollment at ICUF's institutions has grown by 41% in the past decade and the FRAG undergraduate enrollment in the past decade has grown by 47%. ICUF has grown to 128 educational sites with 25 instructional sites on state college campuses and others at schools, hospitals and businesses. The collaborative partnership sites deliver degree programs that are among the lowest cost options in Florida for both students and the State. These non-profit SACS-accredited institutions provide more than 135,000 students access to 29 diverse colleges and universities that award more than 31% of Florida's bachelor's and advanced degrees. ICUF has large institutions similar to the state universities and colleges, as well as medium-size and small institutions in urban, suburban and rural settings where students complete their degrees in 4.2 years on the average. Eleven ICUF institutions deliver on-line courses, 200 fully on-line bachelor's degree programs, professional development on-line and on-line graduate degree programs, providing students access to otherwise unavailable programs throughout Florida. Working with the Florida Department of Education, ICUF has created an on-line eLibrary and contributes to FACTS.org to advise students.

The 29 ICUF institutions boost Florida's economy in several ways. This past year, they awarded nearly 34,000 bachelor's and advanced degrees. That total was 25% of all bachelor's degrees, 38% of all master's degrees, 35% of all doctoral degrees and 55% of

all first professional degrees awarded in Florida. Eight ICUF institutions focus on biotech, aeronautics, aerospace, technology, health care, business, oceanography and marine science research. Fifteen award math degrees. Eleven award chemistry degrees. Nineteen award biology degrees. Two award physics degrees. Twenty award nursing and/or allied health degrees. Nineteen award technology and/or engineering degrees. Twenty-six award business degrees. These STEM and business programs and other institutional minors in these fields could be expanded to meet any unmet student or employer demand. In addition, other graduates in Arts & Science fields fuel Florida's economy of for-profit, non-profit and public enterprises. The ICUF institutions are also private, non-profit corporations which employ nearly 32,000 Floridians, have payrolls of more than \$2 billion, expend nearly \$4.5 billion a year and are privately financing more than \$1 billion of construction. They attract nearly 60,000 out-of-state students who expend money in Florida and often after graduation, join and further support Florida's economy.

ICUF institutions have succeeded in these two missions by staying attuned to student, parent, community and employer demands, aligning resources to meet those demands, accelerating degree awards of students, attaching graduates to the economy and being accountable for delivering high-quality affordable education.

### **The State University System Mission Statement**

All universities share the core tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service. The further articulated mission of the eleven institutions comprising the State University System of Florida is to provide student access to a coordinated system of public institutions of higher learning, each with its distinctive mission and collectively dedicated to serving the needs of Florida and the Nation. The State University System provides education to over 321,000 degree-seeking students at the undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and professional levels.

The System's mission reflects the strategic priorities of a New Florida knowledge economy through academic excellence, scholarship, research and innovation, and community engagement. The State University System supports students' development of knowledge, skills, and aptitudes needed for success in the global society and marketplace. It works to transform and revitalize Florida's economy and society through scholarship, research, creativity, discovery, and innovation. It delivers knowledge and advances the health, welfare, cultural enrichment, and economy through community engagement and service. And it mobilizes its resources to address significant challenges and opportunities facing Florida's citizens, communities, regions, the State, and beyond. A prime example of this is when all universities came together to work on the Gulf Deepwater Horizon blowout and spill, forming a consortium comprised of both public and private institutions.

The Board of Governors' 2025 Goals for the State University System express the Board's priorities for the 2012-2025 strategic planning period and are framed by the Board's three critical points of emphasis: *Excellence, Productivity, and Strategic Priorities for a Knowledge Economy*.

Excellence translates to:

- Improving the quality and relevance of all academic programs, and growing the number of institutions and academic programs with state, national, and/or international preeminence.
- Improving the quality and impact of scholarship, research, and commercialization activities, and growing the number of faculty/departments/centers and institutions recognized for their scholarship, research, and commercialization endeavors.
- Improving the quality and relevance of public service activities, and growing the number of institutions recognized for their commitment to community and business engagement.

Productivity translates to:

- Increasing access and degree completion for students, including students from traditionally underrepresented groups, returning adult students, and distance learning students.
- Increasing research and commercialization activities to help foster entrepreneurial campus cultures.
- Increasing undergraduate participation in research to strengthen the pipeline of researchers pursuing graduate degrees.
- Increasing faculty and student involvement in community and business engagement activities.

Strategic Priorities for a Knowledge Economy translates to:

- Increasing student access and success in degree programs in the STEM fields and other areas of strategic emphasis that respond to existing, evolving, and emerging critical needs and opportunities.
- Attracting more research funding from external (includes federal and private) sources.
- Promoting more collaboration with private industry on research projects.
- Increasing the percentage of graduates who continue their education or are employed in Florida.



That all universities share a tripartite mission cannot mean that all institutions of the State University System should interpret their tripartite missions exactly the same, especially given the goals referenced above. For a university system to work, a more carefully articulated understanding and alignment is necessary with regard to the proportions of teaching, research, and service appropriate to each institution, affording access to an array of different educational opportunities unique to the mission of each institution. This differentiation must also encompass more strategic areas such as how many students at each institution can be expected to be first-time-in-college admits, the appropriate ratios of undergraduates to graduate students relative to each institution, and proportions of first-time-in-college to 2+2 transfers according to the capacity and the unique mission of each institution.

Similarly, the State University System is continuing to develop regulations, processes, and procedures for exploring how branch campuses will or will not grow, their future roles in programmatic delivery, and their optimal use in articulating across sectors. The System also faces questions as to whether and where new stand-alone institutions might be created, and similar strategic questions that ultimately reflect on the missions of both new and existing institutions, both within the System and across sectors.

In sum, the tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service must be differentiated by institution, must reflect the creation of tools to increase student access, and must aggressively point toward meeting the workforce goals of the state and building world-class academic programs and research capacity, all aspects of which must focus on student success, on increased outputs, and on unquestionable degrees of relevance to Florida's future. In other words, the State University System must become better organized and its institutions more clearly differentiated to meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in order to maximize the state's investment on its future.

### **Commission for Independent Education Mission Statement**

The Commission for Independent Education currently licenses over 900 nonpublic institutions of higher education in Florida with a student enrollment of over 340,000 students. Almost 500 of these institutions are accredited by a national or regional accrediting agency that has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education. These schools and colleges serve a diverse and nontraditional student population - 53% are from an ethnic minority and 62% are over the age of 25. In addition, 85% of these enrollees are Florida residents.

These institutions offer an additional choice from among the various sectors of higher education for students seeking a postsecondary education. A wide range of programs are provided by this very diverse community of educational institutions. Institutions are located throughout the state, with physical sites concentrated in the larger metro areas of Florida. They serve as a resource for local employers by bringing relevant training and education programs to the residents of each area. The institutions licensed

by the Commission also offer a number of distance education programs, thus providing an opportunity to serve those communities where there are fewer opportunities for postsecondary education. Credential levels range from non-degree certificates and diplomas to doctoral and first professional degrees.

There are over 8,500 licensed programs offered by the Commission's 900 plus schools and colleges. Program offerings often encompass those career preparation programs that are in demand by employers, including health careers, business programs and technology occupations. There are also 150 licensed institutions currently training clients for Workforce Development agencies throughout Florida.

Occupational training is a focus of many of these licensed programs and this education often prepares the graduates for new careers. Among these students are people who are seeking to change occupations due to changes in the economy. There are many programs specifically designed to prepare graduates for professional certifications, licenses and advanced degrees since career advancement may also be a goal for many students

The institutions licensed by the Commission graduated over 100,000 students in the 2009-2010 fiscal year, providing a significant positive impact on Florida's skilled workforce. Most of the licensed institutions utilize industry-led program advisory boards to provide input and direction for program innovation and content and to address labor market needs and challenges. Licensed schools and colleges strive to serve established and new and emerging industries. These institutions are willing to adjust to local educational and market needs because they are flexible, individual business entities. A program will be considered successful if students graduate and benefit from the education received, through job placement or career advancement in their field.

The Commission receives its budgetary authority as part of the Office of the Commissioner within the Department of Education. All of the revenue that supports the activities of the Commission comes from the fees that are paid by licensed institutions. The Commission receives no General Revenue from the State of Florida. The institutions themselves receive no state or federal funds; though students may qualify for some state or federal financial aid.

The mission of the Commission for Independent Education is to serve as a consumer protection agency for the individual student and to promote accountability at the independent postsecondary level. The Commission protects the integrity of the licensed institutions by assuring that the Standards for Licensure and Fair Consumer Practices are met. Though each institution that is licensed by the Commission has a unique mission, they are all focused on positive student outcomes. These schools and colleges perform a vital service for Florida's economic system by producing a supply of graduates that meet the demands of Florida's employers. Florida's private postsecondary institutions provide consumers a choice in higher education while addressing concerns about student access and institutional capacity in Florida's system of higher education.

## **The Florida College System Mission Statement**

The Florida College System (FCS) which serves almost one million students annually, represents 28 comprehensive public community colleges, colleges and state colleges, statutorily charged with responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education. Central to that charge is a mandate for providing educational opportunities leading to social equity and meaningful employment, by combining high standards of excellence with an open-door policy for lower-division programs for all who can benefit without regard to age, race, gender, creed, or ethnic or economic background. The FCS is further charged with promoting economic development for the state through the provision of special programs including, but not limited to Enterprise Florida related partnership technology transfer centers, economic development centers and workforce literacy programs.

By design and via their mission, Florida College System institutions have the experience, history, flexibility, nimbleness, and strong community ties with local businesses and industries, to develop and deliver programs to meet the ever-changing needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century workforce. Policies such as common course numbering and guaranteed transfer into the State University System, as well as articulation agreements with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, have made our state a national leader in model educational pathways. The fact that over 60% of Florida high school graduates who attend college start out in the Florida College System and that almost 50% of the students who enter Florida's public universities come through the gateway of the Florida College System, is a testament to the viability of these processes. Unless the achievement gap is significantly closed over the next ten years, and/or the University System and ICUF relax SAT admission requirements, it is realistic to expect that an even higher proportion of students will choose Florida College System institutions as their primary entry point to higher education. Currently almost 80% of minority students enrolled in postsecondary, lower-division programs in Florida are enrolled in the FCS with a similar percentage of lower division students receiving Pell Grants also in the FCS. Fueled by the "Great Recession," an unprecedented 30% enrollment growth rate over the past three years has tested the ability of the colleges to keep their open-doors "open," and raised serious concerns about the capacity of the state's public and private universities to handle the coming crush of potential transfer students.

Economic and technological changes have accelerated pressures put upon the traditional mission of the Florida College System, *aka* the community college system. Across the globe, business and industry is looking toward higher education to prepare the knowledge workers of the future for jobs which may not yet exist. Concern that the United States is falling behind other developed countries in baccalaureate degree production is prompting a renewed and more critical focus on higher education accountability and productivity. According to statistics cited by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, "the U.S. adults ages 55-64 are tied for first in the industrialized

world in college degree attainment; a younger generation of Americans (ages 25-35) is tied for 10<sup>th</sup>.”<sup>1</sup>

Further clarifying the country’s higher education challenges, the Beginning Postsecondary Longitudinal Study demonstrated that nationally “...most college students today are non-traditional. Most attend non-selective institutions, and just 14 percent of students live on-campus. One third of students enrolled in postsecondary education work full-time, and another 44 percent work part-time. And 60 percent of students who earn degrees earn them from different institutions than the ones in which they started.”<sup>2</sup> Clearly, the stereotypical model of a college student as being a single, recent high school graduate, supported by his/her parents has morphed into something quite different, and as such, the traditional parameters that define system and institutional missions must also change. This change is taking place within the Florida College System. Most notably, it is being seen in a system commitment to a philosophy and a delivery system appropriate to non-traditional populations and local employment needs, whereby a “community” college can maintain its identity/primary mission while offering both associate degrees and a limited, select array of baccalaureate degrees as part of its comprehensive programming.

The detailed, comprehensive need/demand analysis required for Florida College System baccalaureates in Florida, combined with academics which meet all state and Southern Association for Colleges and Schools criteria for granting baccalaureate degrees, represents not “mission creep” nor “mission leap,” but instead a careful evolution of the characteristics which define our system: open-door admissions, affordability, remedial education, responsiveness to local community needs, flexible scheduling, and a commitment to teaching and learning. In a day when we are all being challenged to think globally and act locally, it is time to acknowledge that these recognized hallmarks of the Florida College System can be extended by expanding lower-division to upper-division educational opportunities of the highest quality, without adversely impacting the historical mission of our colleges and without competing for enrollments with other educational sectors in the state. Baccalaureate-authorized colleges within the FCS are today demonstrating that they can embrace the full concept of meeting community needs in a manner that is consistent with, rather than detrimental to their identity, while contributing responsibly to the economic development needs of the state.

Although Florida’s “2 + 2” articulation system has long been considered one of the strongest and most comprehensive models in the nation, Florida’s institutions of higher education have been unable to meet the workforce demands for increased baccalaureate

---

<sup>1</sup>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. “Education at a Glance: 2010.” Paris, France, August 9, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Atwell P. and Laven D. (2008). The other 75%: College Education Beyond the Elite. Weinberg Seminar Remarks, April 15, 2008. Data from the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study.

production. For a state which will soon rank 3<sup>rd</sup> nationally in population to also rank in the bottom quartile in baccalaureate production has become increasingly unacceptable to state legislators, policy-makers, employers and educators , --thus the forward-thinking move to explore new degree production/completion options. To reach its economic potential and to attract good jobs for its diverse and growing population, Florida must expand access to associate and baccalaureate degrees targeted toward the state's critical-need and technical workforce sectors, while being carefully non-duplicative, and demonstrably cost-efficient. The Florida College System, with the support of the Legislature, has heard these urgent calls for action and responded with the introduction of innovative, yet substantive workforce-oriented certificates, associate degrees and baccalaureate programs designed to provide access to and completion of degree programs with a data-supported unmet need for employees.

The mission of the Florida College System is based soundly on the premise that our state and nation cannot afford to waste a large segment of its human potential, i.e., older students, place-bound students, the "working poor," recently unemployed students, etc.), and still remain globally competitive. Emerging technologies demand fresh and forward-thinking – but no less rigorous views of what truly constitutes a meaningful postsecondary education. Foundational to our System's commitment to its mission is a statewide, statutorily authorized policy framework that guarantees consistent academic oversight, minimizes barriers (including financial, geographic and transfer) within the educational pipeline, and maintains strong ties to the business and industry needs of our communities.

## SECTION B: DATA AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Council's task is to make recommendations regarding "performance outputs and outcomes designed to meet annual and long-term state goals, including, but not limited to, increased student access, preparedness, retention, transfer, and completion. Performance measures must be consistent across sectors and allow for a comparison of the state's performance to that of other states."

Performance measurement is critical to effective management and systemic improvement. This is especially true as the Council takes on the task of developing statewide plans and goals for all of higher education in Florida. The Council requires comprehensive and comparable information regarding the productivity and success of each postsecondary sector.

The Council recognizes the criticality of understanding issues relative to the funding of postsecondary education, the extent to which funding can impact productivity, and the implications of better knowing at what cost and to whom the costs of higher education are borne. The Council is committed to working with the various education sectors toward more outcomes-based funding for postsecondary education while also examining the relationships between funding and productivity.

Achieving effective performance measurement across multiple organizations requires striking a balance between the precision of each measure and its comparability. The directive to the Council mandates identification of performance measures that are, to the greatest extent feasible, comparable across sectors and states. This requires a trade-off in precision. Some measures that most accurately measure the performance of a given sector cannot be compared to other sectors.

### **Preparedness**

The level of preparation for students entering our postsecondary institutions varies dramatically. For many universities, admissions criteria ensure that overall levels of preparation for entering students are very high, while open-access institutions in the Florida College System use state adopted placement assessments to gauge levels of college-readiness. Other institutions have no way to measure preparation.

Despite these differences, it is widely agreed that high school students should graduate with college-ready and entry-level career-ready skills. The State Board of Education adopted the following definition of college and career readiness in February 2011:

**Definition:**

Students are considered college and career ready when they have the knowledge, skills, and academic preparation needed to enroll and succeed in introductory college credit-bearing courses within an associate or baccalaureate degree program without the need for remediation. These same attributes and levels of achievement are needed for entry into and success in postsecondary workforce education or directly into a job that offers gainful employment and career advancement.

The State Board of Education has identified cut-scores for several standardized tests to reflect college readiness.

### Remedial Cut Scores

CPT	
Elementary Algebra	72
Reading	83
Sentence Skills	83
SAT-I	
Verbal	440
Math	440
ACT	
Reading	18
English	17
Math	19

**Postsecondary Education Readiness Test: P.E.R.T. (Launched Oct. 2010):** The scaled scores on the P.E.R.T. Placement range from 50-150. The goal for setting the interim cut scores was to match the current distribution of placements based on CPT results. To do this, the Division of Florida Colleges used data from 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09, to determine the percentage of students placed into various developmental and introductory courses based on their CPT results. These distributions were then matched to the expected distributions of the P.E.R.T. to create interim cut scores that mirror the current placement rates. Interim cut scores will be replaced with permanent scores once student performance data based upon an adequate number of administrations and placements has been analyzed.

The current course placement score ranges for the P.E.R.T. are:

Mathematics	
Lower Level Developmental Education	Scores of 50 – 95
Higher Level of Development Education	Scores of 96 – 112
<b>Intermediate Algebra (MAT 1033)</b>	<b>Scores of 113* - 122</b>
College Algebra or Higher (MAC1105)	Scores of 123 - 150

*\*113 is the college-ready cut score for mathematics*

Reading	
Lower Level Developmental Education	Scores of 50 – 83

Higher Level of Development Education	Scores of 84 – 103
<b>Freshmen Composition Skills I (ENC 1101)</b>	<b>Scores of 104* - 150</b>

*\*104 is the college-ready cut score for reading*

Writing	
Lower Level Developmental Education	Scores of 50 – 89
Higher Level of Development Education	Scores of 90 – 98
<b>Freshmen Composition Skills I (ENC 1101)</b>	<b>Scores of 99* - 150</b>

*\*99 is the college-ready cut score for reading*

Thus, we recommend the following measures of preparedness:

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Preparedness</i>		
Measure 1	<b>College and Career Readiness</b> The percentage of Florida high school graduates who are college ready.	The number of high school graduates who have been identified as college ready divided by the number of school graduates.

### Access

Access can be defined in a number of ways. Geographic access is critical, as students need colleges and schools near where they live. Financial access is also critical, as costs can be critical barriers. In addition, there are the simple logistics of having space available at a given institution.

For the purposes here, access is measured as total system enrollment, the difference between the percentage of minority students enrolling in postsecondary and percentage in the overall population, and the net cost of tuition. Increasingly, Florida’s institutions are serving a multi-racial, multi-cultural population, and this can pose new challenges for meeting access obligations.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Access</i>		
Measure 2	<b>Current System Enrollment</b> Number and percentage of students who <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply</li> <li>• Are Admitted</li> <li>• Enroll</li> </ul>	Simple counts of applications, admissions, and enrollments provide contextual information about the size of each sector and the types of students accessing them. For open enrollment institutions, applications and admissions will be



		available or applicable.
Measure 3	<p><b>Disparity analysis</b> The racial and gender make up of students who</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply</li> <li>• Are Admitted</li> <li>• Enroll</li> </ul> <p>Compared to the racial and gender demographics of the state's population</p>	Comparing the percentages admitted and enrolled allows analyses of potential disparities among races or genders. This can be done in relation to overall admissions and enrollments as well as in comparison to the demographics of the state. The analysis can help identify access points and blockages for minority and underrepresented students.
Measure 4	<p><b>Financial Accessibility</b> Net Cost of Attendance</p>	The net cost of attendance is reported in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). It is average of cost of attendance once financial aid, including grants, is taken into account. It effectively represents the actual cost, not the sticker price, of education.

Not all sectors can report fully on each of the access measures.

- CIE requires statutory authority to collect race and gender information.
- CIE can report net cost of attendance only for schools that submit data to IPEDS.
- The Division of Career and Adult Education does not have a net cost since some programs do not have a traditional tuition model. A proxy measure would have to be developed.

### Retention

Retention is the percentage of students who do not earn a credential and return the same institution the following year. Institutions regularly track this for internal program improvement. At the state level, this can help identify instances in which underrepresented students are leaving higher education before completing a credential. It should be noted that efficient and effective articulation policies for transfer students could increase retention by removing barriers to changing institutions.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Retention</i>		
Measure 5	<p><b>Retention rates</b> The percentage of students who enroll and the subsequently re-enroll in the <u>following</u> year. Reported by race, gender, and age where possible.</p>	This is the percentage of students who did not earn a credential and return the following year.

Not all sectors can report fully on retention. Because of statutory limitations, CIE does not track individual students and so cannot track the percentage returning. It can report a proxy measure based on aggregated counts of students enrolled, graduating and withdrawing.

**Transfer**

The ability of students to transfer among postsecondary institutions with minimal loss of credits is critical to increasing the production of degrees and certificates. The measures identified below provide contextual information regarding the scope of transfer activity and an outcome measure designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the state’s overall transfer framework.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Transfer</i>		
Measure 6	<b>Transfer Activity</b> The number of students who transfer to another postsecondary institution	The number of students transferring to another institution within the state provides reflects the overall volume of transfer activity.
Measure 7	<b>Transfer Rates</b> Percentage of <u>graduates</u> who transfer to another postsecondary institution	Transfer rates provide an indication of the percentage of students who graduate and continue their education at another institution.
Measure 8	<b>Transfer Effectiveness</b> The graduation rate, average time to completion, and credits earned for transfer students as compared to non-transfer students	This is measured within each sector by comparing students who transfer into an institution with non-transfers or native students. This will reflect the overall effectiveness of transfer policies in ensuring seamless movement between institutions.

Not all sectors can report fully on retention. The CIE requires statutory authority to require licensed institutions to participate in FETPIP and to collect student level data necessary to report on transfers.

**Completion**

Research has consistently shown strong links between the level of education and the productivity and success of its workforce. For Florida to compete national and internationally, it must increase the number and percentage of its population with wage-sustaining degrees and credentials. The performance measures recommended here focus on the number of completions, completions in critical STEM fields, graduation rates and the overall percentage of the population with college degrees.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<b>Completion</b>		
Measure 9	<b>Completions</b> Total degrees and credentials awarded	This measure will provide valuable information about the state's total production of postsecondary credentials and degrees.
Measure 10	<b>STEM Completions</b> Total STEM degrees and credentials awarded	This measure is subset of total completions but focused exclusively on STEM related fields.
Measure 11	<b>Graduation rates</b> Percentage of students graduating within 150% of time for degree (i.e. 3 for initial AA, 6 years for initial baccalaureate)	This is among the most common measures used in higher education accountability systems. This measure focuses on first-time, full-time students and is available using IPEDS data.
Measure 12	<b>Educational Attainment</b> Percentage of Florida's working age population (25-64) with an Associate degree or higher Can also be reported for Bachelor degrees and graduate degrees.	The percentage of a state's working age population that has a college degree or credential is strongly linked to the state's economic success. Based on census data that is reported annually, this outcome measure reflects the ultimate goal of increased completions – a more educated workforce.

### Placement into the Workforce

By leveraging the Florida Education Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) the Higher Education Coordinating Council can track the state's postsecondary graduates into the workforce and to measure their economic success. FETPIP currently tracks program completers into the workforce as well as other postsecondary systems. In addition, FETPIP reports on the use of public assistance. As the state improves its postsecondary production the number of residents earning family-sustaining wages will increase and the number receiving public assistance will decrease.

With this increased emphasis on placement of completers in the workforce, Florida should also begin tracking dislocated and unemployed workers. This data is necessary to determine if new placements stay employed. This data on such workers disconnected from the workforce may also indicate areas of over-supply, increasing the challenge of placing future graduates. In addition, many dislocated workers may be easier to upgrade and place in high-demand areas than initiating new degree candidates. This will get high-demand fields filled more quickly while getting the unemployed back to work. This approach may be an essential strategy to meet

immediate STEM degree demand while other future STEM graduates are beginning their studies.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Placement into the Workforce</i>		
Measure 13	<b>Pass Rates</b> Licensure pass rates, where available	This is available only for fields that require licensure exams.
Measure 14	<b>Placement Rate</b> The percentage of students found employed or continuing their education after completing a degree or credential.	This measure tracks graduates into the workforce and continuing education. FETPIP cannot determine if a graduate is placed within their field.
Measure 15	<b>Income</b> The average income for recent graduates, by type of credential	This measure looks at the average across all recent graduates by type of degree or credential. This could also be broken by fields, such as health or STEM.
Measure 16	<b>High Skill/High Wage</b> The percentage of graduates whose income exceed the high skill/high wage threshold.	This measure reports on the percentage of recent graduates who meet or exceed the high skill/high wage threshold. This could also be broken by fields, such as health or STEM.
Measure 17	<b>Family Sustainability</b> The percentage of program completers receiving public assistance compared to the rate for students without postsecondary education.	This measure tracks the percentage of recent graduates who receive some form of public assistance.

The Council recognizes certain caveats and limitations associated with data reporting. For example, not all sectors can report fully on retention. CIE requires statutory authority to require licensed institutions to participate in FETPIP. The federal IPEDS data system category “race/ethnicity unknown” presents a data collection problem for retention tracking. This category is used when the student does not select a racial/ethnic designation and the institution is unable to place the student in one of the racial/ethnic categories. The federal IPEDS data system may also provide an imprecise picture of institutional performance in retention, completion and placement. These data collection problems should likewise be addressed and at minimum coordinated to

standardize the data collection and performance measurement reporting that HECC provides.

## SECTION C: ARTICULATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Articulation in Florida is a set of dynamic and constantly evolving, student-focused policies and practices which facilitate transition between and among education sectors. Section 1007.01, Florida Statutes, describes the Legislative intent:

It is the intent of the Legislature to facilitate articulation and seamless integration of the K-20 education system by building, sustaining, and strengthening relationships among K-20 public organizations, between public and private organizations, and between the education system as a whole and Florida's communities. The purpose of building, sustaining, and strengthening these relationships is to provide for the efficient and effective progression and transfer of students within the education system and to allow students to proceed toward their educational objectives as rapidly as their circumstances permit. The Legislature further intends that articulation policies and budget actions be implemented consistently in the practices of the Department of Education and postsecondary educational institutions and expressed in the collaborative policy efforts of the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors.

Florida's strong system of articulation includes guarantees for associate in arts graduates for admittance to the upper division, general education block transfers, common program prerequisites, a common course numbering system, access to college credit while still in high school, and access to associate and baccalaureate degree programs for students who complete career and technical certificates, degrees, and industry certifications.

### **Transfer Student Admissions**

Florida continues to be widely viewed as a national leader in articulation, the coordination of programs and services that facilitate the movement of students through the state education system. Students enjoy a number of articulation options on the path to a baccalaureate degree. The State 2 + 2 articulation agreement, enacted in 1971, has enabled distinctive education sectors to function as an interdependent system. The Agreement has continued to evolve through the years through the enactment of administrative rules and regulations by each education sector and institutional policies that support the matriculation process. Students may enter a university baccalaureate program without leaving the Florida College campus through one of the almost 400 concurrent or joint use partnerships. In addition, students who begin at an institution of the Florida College System may transfer to one of the institutions of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida under a statewide 2+2 agreement. Other private

institutions have similar agreements with the Florida College System. Finally, regional 2+2 agreements offer a more specific path in the transfer of credit between specific institutions of the Florida College System and state universities.

As evidenced by the enduring state articulation agreement, there is consensus that every student who achieves an associate in arts degree at a community or state college should be provided access to the upper division at a state college and/or a state university. To ensure adequate access for Floridians to the state's public baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, an appropriate number and balance of available, funded slots at the lower and upper division need to be determined and agreed upon by the postsecondary sectors.

There are certain academic degree programs, both at the associate and baccalaureate level, that have restricted admission requirements. These programs either require students to have a certain level of pre-requisite skills or are limited in available resources (space; equipment or other instructional facilities; clinical facilities, adequate faculty; fiscal, etc.), often due to the high demand for the program. "Limited access" is primarily a State University System term and Board of Governors Regulation 8.013 provides definition and a process for the designation of a limited access programs at state universities. Additionally, there are currently some associate degree programs in the Florida College System that have enrollment limits for similar reasons of preparation and resource adequacy.

Limited access programs are referenced in the state articulation agreement (section 1007.23,2(a), F.S.) as exceptions to the admission guarantee for both the state colleges and the state universities. Limited access programs are also referenced in State Board of Education Rule 6A-10.024(9), which calls for community college and state university transfer students to have "the same opportunity to enroll in baccalaureate limited access programs as native students."

As the FCS and SUS are offering an increasing array of baccalaureate programs, transfer opportunities are increasing for students moving between and among the two systems. The increasing demand for access to the upper division, however, is now straining the admission and enrollment policies of limited access baccalaureate programs.

### **Lower-Level Requirements as Preparation for the Upper Division**

In order to earn an associate in arts degree from a Florida public institution students must meet a number of lower-division requirements. These include : completion of 36 hours of general education coursework in the areas of communication, humanities, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences; complete 60 credit hours; earn a 2.0 cumulative grade point average; and complete the English, writing, and mathematics

requirements of the “Gordon Rule.” It is recommended that students also complete the specific common program prerequisites and display two-year proficiency in foreign language; these are requirements for entrance to or completion of the baccalaureate degree.

### **General Education**

Due to budgetary concerns, Senate Bill 1676 (effective July 1, 2009) repealed section (s.) 1008.29, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and eliminated the College-Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) as an examination. However, the CLAST alternatives previously in Rule were embedded in section 1007.25, F.S. In 2010, the CLAST alternatives were removed from s. 1007.25, F.S. While statute no longer requires students to demonstrate mastery of college-level academic skills, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges’ *Principles of Accreditation* Standard 3.5.1 requires that each institution identify *college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.*

In 2010 the Articulation Coordinating Committee charged faculty committees in English and mathematics to determine lower-level competencies for all students. As a part of the long-term strategy to assess student learning, these competencies would be embedded in the lower-level curricula statewide. Currently, these competencies have been recommended by the faculty committees, with wider faculty input received.

### **2.0 Cumulative Grade Point Average**

State Board of Education Rule 6A-10.024, Articulation Between and Among Universities, Community Colleges, and School Districts, requires “*achievement of a grade point average of at least 2.0 in all courses attempted, and in all courses taken at the institution awarding the degree, provided that only the final grade received in courses repeated by the student shall be used in computing the average.*” This rule is no longer applicable to the State University System; however, the Board of Governors passed a temporary resolution adopting the rule.

### **The “Gordon Rule”: Six Semester Hours of English Plus Six Semester Hours of College-Level Writing Skills and Six Semester Hours of Mathematics at the Level of College Algebra or Higher**

State Board of Education Rule 6A-10.030, F.A.C., (the “Gordon Rule”) was first established in 1982 with amendments in 1988 and 2005. This rule requires six semester hours of English coursework and six semester hours of college-level writing in other courses; also six semester hours of mathematics at the level of College Algebra or above. This requirement for meeting specified semester hour thresholds in English and mathematics extends the general education requirements set forth by SACS and sets College Algebra as the minimum competency level in mathematics.



The accreditation process requires institutional commitment to student learning and achievement as well as to the concept of quality enhancement through continuous assessment and improvement. All Florida public colleges, universities, and ICUF institutions are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges. Specifically, Principle 3.5.1 of the SACS *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* (2010 Edition) states that institutions are responsible for identifying “college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.” There is an additional expectation that once institutions have identified these outcomes and achievement, each institution will provide evidence of improvement based on an analysis of data.

### **Common Prerequisites**

Section 1007.25(5), F.S., requires the Department to identify common prerequisite courses and course substitutions for degree programs across all institutions. The Department maintains the common prerequisite courses for all baccalaureate programs offered by public postsecondary institutions in Florida within the Common Prerequisite Counseling Manual located at FACTS.org. The Manual is maintained by faculty committees, representatives in the Department and Board of Governors office, and the Articulation Coordinating Committee.

Proper advising is vital for students to complete the proper common program prerequisites. In a 2008 report, OPPAGA recommended that institutions adopt “pre-majors” in order to properly transition students into the upper level. The “transfer program of interest” and “institution of interest” will serve to advise students of requirements and establish a relationship between the student and receiving upper division institution and program.

In 2009, s. 1009.286, F.S., was created to encourage each undergraduate student who enrolls in a state university to complete the student’s respective baccalaureate degree program in the most efficient way possible while providing for access to additional college coursework and established an excess hour surcharge. Students who do not complete appropriate coursework at the lower level must complete this credit during their upper-division career, increasing the risk of excess hours.

### **Foreign Language**

Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students, states that undergraduate transfer students are expected to have earned two high school credits in one foreign language or eight or more semester credit hours in one foreign language. Alternative methods include presentation of qualifying scores in an examination program or a university-based assessment. A limited number of transfer students may be admitted without this requirement, but these students must complete the foreign language requirement before award of the baccalaureate degree.

According to State University System admissions officers, students may complete their foreign language requirement via the following course sequences:

1. Completion of the second course in a secondary foreign language sequence, or completion of any foreign language course offered through Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), or Advanced International Certificate of Education (AICE).
2. Completion of the second course in a postsecondary foreign language sequence, provided the course is offered for four (4) credits.
3. Completion of the third course in a postsecondary foreign language sequence, regardless of credits.

S. 1007.262, F.S., requires the Department to identify the competencies demonstrated by students upon the successful completion of 2 credits of sequential high school foreign language instruction and establish rules for Florida College System institutions to correlate those competencies to postsecondary course offerings.

### **Acceleration**

The purpose of articulated acceleration mechanisms is described in s. 1007.27, Florida Statutes:

It is intended that articulated acceleration serve to shorten the time necessary for a student to complete the requirements associated with the conference of a high school diploma and a postsecondary degree, broaden the scope of curricular options available to students, or increase the depth of study available for a particular subject. Articulated acceleration mechanisms shall include, but not be limited to, dual enrollment as provided for in s. 1007.271, early admission, advanced placement, credit by examination, the International Baccalaureate Program, and the Advanced International Certificate of Education Program.

### **Acceleration Funding**

Acceleration programs are funded to the school districts through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). Districts are given the basic student funding for all mechanisms, including dual enrollment. In addition, districts also receive incentive funding for students who pass AP, IB, and AICE exams. From the additional FTE incentives, teachers may earn a \$50 bonus for each student who successfully completes an AP, IB, or AICE examination, not to exceed \$2,000 per year.

For 2011-12, the average full-time equivalent state funding for each full-year high school course is \$591. In addition, the state provides incentive funds to school districts based on student performance on AP, IB and AICE exams. For 2011-12, the state is paying an average of \$560 in incentive funding for each AP exam passed, \$557 for each IB exam passed and \$554 for each AICE exam passed. In addition, the state paid \$1,045 for each IB diploma earned and \$1,035 for each AICE diploma earned.

OPPAGA report 09-12 *Modifying Advanced Placement Program Incentive Funding Could Produce Significant Cost Savings* showed that in 2008-2009, projected AP incentive funding was almost twice the cost per credit hour (\$164) as the similar course at a university (\$85).

Florida Colleges and state universities may include dual enrollment students in their FTE count, but because dual enrollment students are exempt from the payment of tuition and fees, the postsecondary institution receives no tuition for these students.

A primary goal of acceleration programs is to allow students to earn college credit while in high school and thus produce savings for both students and the state. However, the state does not receive a return on its investment in acceleration programs if students do not subsequently receive college credit after successfully completing these programs.

Acceleration Mechanisms 2009-2010	Program Enrollments	Eligible for College Credit
Advanced Placement	165,262	44%
International Baccalaureate	10,477	79%
Advanced International Certificate of Education	3,866	59%
Dual Enrollment	33,553	92%

Source: OPPAGA presentation January 25, 2011 [http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/monitordocs/reports/pdf/012511\\_Acceleration\\_Mechanisms.pdf](http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/monitordocs/reports/pdf/012511_Acceleration_Mechanisms.pdf)

The Florida College System has seen marked increases in dual enrollment in both numbers of students and in the total percentage of FTE. The following table lists these increases, with corresponding exempted revenue, that is, the amount of tuition money not collected for dual enrollment students.

FloridaCollegeSystemDualEnrollment				
	TotalExempted\$	DualEnrolledFTE	TotalFTE	%ofFTE
2000-01	\$13,153,322.32	8589	244558	3.51 %
2001-02	\$15,444,871.00	9,892	267,486	3.70 %

2002-03	\$17,085,537.00	10,628	285,128	3.73%
2003-04	\$19,797,403.00	11,347	298,390	3.80%
2004-05	\$21,599,246.00	11,276	295,740	3.81%
2005-06	\$23,181,658.00	11,191	288,983	3.87%
2006-07	\$24,897,326.18	11,161	288,422	3.87%
2007-08	\$28,755,162.45	11,990	307,824	3.90%
2008-09	\$35,679,480.45	13,140	332,573	3.95%
2009-10	\$48,179,997.52	15,759	365,277	4.31%
2010-11	Not available	17,474	375,292	4.66%

Source: Florida College System Office of Financial Policy

Pursuant to s. 1007.271(14), Florida Statutes, instructional materials for use in dual enrollment courses are provided to students free of charge. This same provision does not apply to students from private secondary schools. Materials provided by the district become the property of that district.

The provision of dual enrollment instructional materials is a key issue for school districts. Many districts have reported spending several hundred thousand dollars annually to provide these materials to dual enrollment students. Electronic access fees are also a current issue. These one-time electronic access fees pose even greater costs for the school districts as these, unlike a textbook, may not be re-used once purchased by the school district.

### **Acceleration Student Preparation for Advanced College Coursework**

OPPAGA report 09-30 *University Students Benefit from Acceleration Courses, But Often Retake Math and Science Courses*

(<http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/MonitorDocs/Reports/pdf/0930rpt.pdf>), surveyed university students to determine their usage of acceleration credits. University students who responded to the survey reported that participating in high school acceleration programs helped prepare them for the demands of college level coursework and made them more competitive during university admissions processes.

Recent Florida College System reports found that dual enrollment courses were comparable in rigor to state university courses, and these students earn higher grades than students who did not participate in dual enrollment once at a university; indicating sound preparation in introductory college coursework. In addition, students who participated in acceleration mechanisms had higher GPAs in university coursework than those students with no acceleration credit.

Section 1007.27(2) directs the Department of Education to annually identify and publish the minimum scores, maximum credit, and course or courses for which credit is to be awarded for each College Level Examination Program (CLEP) subject examination, College Board Advanced Placement Program examination, Advanced International

Certificate of Education examination, and International Baccalaureate examination. The Articulation Coordinating Committee establishes these examination and course equivalencies in its ACC Credit by Exam Equivalencies (<http://www.fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/ACC-CBE.pdf>).

Chapter 2011-177, Laws of Florida directs the Department of Education to use student performance data in subsequent postsecondary courses to determine the appropriate examination scores and courses for which credit is to be granted. Minimum scores may vary by subject area based on available performance data. The Department is currently designing the research study to determine success of students in subsequent postsecondary coursework depending on exam and exam score.

### **Acceleration Mechanisms Impact on Time to Degree**

OPPAGA report 09-30 *University Students Benefit from Acceleration Courses, But Often Retake Math and Science Courses* (<http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/MonitorDocs/Reports/pdf/0930rpt.pdf>) found that acceleration credits generally could be applied toward graduation requirements. Most (82%) of the accelerated credit hours earned by the students in the cohort could be applied towards degree requirements.

Participation in acceleration programs is successful in reducing the number of courses required by university graduates. The typical university graduate who had earned accelerated credits had earned 14 credit hours in the programs. These students when graduating from Florida public universities in 2002-03 earned a median of 129 credit hours (not including the 14 acceleration program credits). In contrast, the students who had not received acceleration program credit hours earned a median of 143 credit hours while at college. Thus, students who had participated in acceleration programs took approximately five fewer college courses, thereby freeing classroom space for other students.

## **Career and Technical Education**

### **Secondary to Postsecondary Transition**

For students who enter high school July 1, 2007 or later Board of Governors (BOG) Regulation BOG 6.002 requires that an FTIC applicant must have completed specific secondary academic unit requirements (4 credits – English/Language Arts, 4 credits – Mathematics, 3 credits – Natural Science, 3 credits – Social Science, 2 credits – Foreign Language) including 2 additional academic credits among specific Level III courses or ROTC/military training from the Course Code Directory.

This Regulation outlines minimum eligibility requirements for first-time-in-college students seeking admission to an undergraduate degree program in the State University

System (SUS), but does not include Level III career and technical education courses identified in the Department of Education Course Code Directory as part of the secondary academic unit requirements.

As part of program design investment, in 2010, the Division of Career and Adult Education (in consultation with the Division of Public Schools' Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction) developed a course rubric with standardized criteria to evaluate all CTE courses to determine appropriate levels and to validate that courses designated as Level III in the Course Code Directory provide rigorous instructional content. CTE Level III courses exemplify the following characteristics:

- Require a higher level of cognition and quality of work than a standard course.
- Enable students to become actively involved in classroom and work-based learning experiences
- Involve students in exploratory, experiential, and open-ended learning experiences

Currently, there are 152 Level III career and technical education courses.

### **Articulation Agreements**

The Florida Legislature has placed an emphasis on career education and the articulation of programs between all sectors of education in order to maximize students' ability to progress from high school career education programs to postsecondary adult programs to associate and bachelor's degrees. The 2005 Career Education Study Task Force lead by Lt. Governor Toni Jennings strongly recommended strengthening statewide articulation at all levels.

Since that time, faculty groups have convened to evaluate proposals for articulation of coursework from certificate to degree programs. These agreements may be viewed at [http://www.fldoe.org/workforce/dwdframe/artic\\_frame.asp](http://www.fldoe.org/workforce/dwdframe/artic_frame.asp). These articulation agreements include:

Statewide postsecondary adult vocational (PSAV) to AAS/AS articulation agreements, which grant college credit for completion of a PSAV certificate program; there are now 44 such agreements.

Industry Certification to AAS/AS statewide articulation agreements. 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 that the student has met a specified level of competency as validated by a third party (i.e. industry certification). As new "Gold Standard" industry certifications are identified, new agreements will continue to be established and approved.

Agreements allowing for the articulation of non-college-credit Applied Technology Diploma hours to college credit degree programs. These agreements should be updated and expanded, as necessary.

Finally, certificate courses that are a part of a postsecondary adult vocational program are listed by their postsecondary course number in the Statewide Course Numbering System and Course Code Directory. This guarantees the transfer of credit not only at the program completion level, but also at the specific occupational completion points within the program.

### **Associate in Applied Science/Associate in Science degrees**

The range of career and technical education programs, including the AAS and AS, is dynamic, rather than static. As programs become obsolete, the economic climate changes, and/or student interest wanes, programs are subject to updating or termination. Likewise, new programs are added as appropriate, based upon economic development needs, and emerging technology. The Statewide Demand Occupation List is an important resource used by colleges when developing new programs. In cooperation with the Agency for Workforce Innovation, FLDOE identifies the education training codes or levels associated with the targeted occupations each year, including those identified to be high-skill and high-wage.

The AS and AAS degrees have the same technical curriculum, but the AS curriculum is specifically designed to prepare an individual for entry to the workforce and transfer to a related baccalaureate program. The AAS degree is primarily intended to prepare students for entry into the workforce. When the AAS was developed in Florida, it was intended to be a terminal-to-work degree while the AS would be dual purpose – career and transfer. Since SACCS requires at least 15 college credits of general education to be included in any associate degree, the resulting difference between the AAS and the AS in Florida is hardly distinguishable. According to s. 1004.02, F.S., for licensure purposes, the term "associate in science degree" is interchangeable with "associate in applied science degree."

Certain AAS/AS degree programs should transition to stand-alone AS degrees that are fully transferable to the baccalaureate degree level. Certain AAS/AS degree programs should transition to stand-alone AAS degrees that would be terminal degrees and not transferable to the baccalaureate degree level.

## **Articulation Monitoring Systems**

### **Advising Systems**

It is clear that accurate and well-coordinated academic advising at both the secondary and postsecondary level is critical to increasing the prospects for student matriculation

and persistence to graduation. Additionally, effective advising is an important variable in maintaining a cost effective system that enables students to progress through their degree program in an efficient manner.

Academic advising programs and services have a particularly critical impact on transfer students. Transfer students are a heterogeneous group who face numerous challenges in their pursuit of a degree and often have unique academic and support needs. Advising for these students must be proactive and clear to assist them to make an efficient transition from a lower level institution to an upper division baccalaureate degree program.

### **Postsecondary Data Systems**

Each year, Florida attempts to answer the question of how well high school graduates are prepared for postsecondary education. The Office of Articulation, in conjunction with the K-20 Education Data Warehouse, has produced the *High School Feedback Report*. This document conveys a more comprehensive and current profile of college readiness, including pre-graduate and post-graduate indicators based on school, district and state data. In addition to a focused snapshot of graduates' participation in a rigorous and well-planned curriculum, combined state university system, Florida College System, and Bright Futures data provides a more complete history of students' best test scores. For the High School Feedback Report, see: <http://data.fldoe.org/readiness>.

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.

### **Monitoring Systems**

The Articulation Coordinating Committee (ACC), established by [s. 1007.01\(3\), F.S.](#), is a K-20 advisory body appointed by the Commissioner of Education and Chancellor of the State University System. It is comprised of representatives from all levels of public and private education: the State University System, the Florida College System, independent postsecondary institutions, public schools, nonpublic schools, and career and technical education. There is also an additional member representing students.

The ACC was established in the early 1970s as a forum for discussing and coordinating ways to help students move easily from institution to institution and from one level of education to the next. Primary responsibilities include approving common prerequisites across program areas, approving course and credit-by-exam equivalencies, overseeing implementation of statewide articulation agreements, and recommending



articulation policy changes to the Higher Education Coordinating Council, the State Board of Education, and the Board of Governors.

The statutory duties of the Articulation Coordinating Committee directly related to the recommended activities. The relevant duties are:

- (a) Monitor the alignment between the exit requirements of one education system and the admissions requirements of another education system into which students typically transfer and make recommendations for improvement.
- (d) Annually review the statewide articulation agreement pursuant to s. 1007.23 and make recommendations for revisions.
- (g) Examine statewide data regarding articulation to identify issues and make recommendations to improve articulation throughout the K-20 education system.
- (h) Recommend roles and responsibilities of public education entities in interfacing with the single, statewide computer-assisted student advising system established pursuant to s. 1007.28.

## SECTION D: WORKFORCE EDUCATION

### STATUTORILY REQUIRED PROPOSED WORKFORCE EDUCATION ISSUE BACKGROUND AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Issue (a): The alignment of school district and Florida College System workforce development education programs to ensure cost efficiency and mission delineations.**

**Background.** The mission of Florida’s Workforce Education System is to help ensure that Florida has the skilled workforce needed to grow and diversify its economy. The primary customer of workforce education is Florida’s businesses and industries and therefore workforce education programs in Florida are designed and tailored to meet their needs. As indicated in *“Closing the Talent Gap – A Business Perspective: What Florida needs from its Talent Supply Chain”*, Florida’s Workforce Education System is committed to solidifying and enhancing the Talent Supply Chain to focus on creating a pool of talent that will help both our existing and future businesses thrive in the global innovation economy.

For students in workforce education programs, the goal is employment in demand occupations. Workforce education programs are designed to ensure that students have access to programs that are linked to employment opportunities that result in self-sufficiency. Florida’s workforce education programs provide training designed to meet local and state workforce needs and help Florida compete in the global economy by building a broadly-based, highly-skilled, and productive workforce. Workforce education programs include both postsecondary career education and adult education programs.

Any workforce education program may be offered by a Florida College System institution or a school district, except that college credit in an associate in applied science or associate in science may be awarded only by a Florida College System institution [s. 1011.80(2), F.S.]. Workforce education programs have uniform program lengths and program standards that are adhered to by school districts and Florida College System institutions. The primary mission and responsibility of Florida colleges is responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education [s. 1004.65, F.S.]. School boards must provide for the establishment and maintenance of career schools, departments, or classes giving instruction in career education as defined by the State Board of Education [s. 1001.42, F.S.]. Florida has 103 statewide articulation agreements that ensure our workforce education students entering postsecondary institutions are seamlessly provided the opportunity to meet career pathway goals.

There are several statutory provisions [s. 1011.80(4), F.S.] currently in law that requires both school districts and colleges to continually assess the cost efficiency of their workforce education programs. The law requires that all funding for workforce education programs be based on cost categories, performance output measures, and performance outcome measures. Additionally, the Legislature has prescribed and defined workforce education performance output and outcome measures. Staff utilized many of The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability's (OPPAGA) recently published reports regarding workforce education to assist in the development of these recommendations<sup>3</sup>.

The Florida College System and the K-12 Public Education System strive to deliver cost-efficient workforce education programs to ensure tax payers and students are provided a high quality education at the lowest cost possible. The OPPAGA Report 10-62 found that, "there is relatively little duplication in programs within individual counties because districts and colleges typically avoid offering the same postsecondary career education programs within the same counties. Thus, the option to consolidate postsecondary career education programs under colleges is unlikely to result in more flexibility to align program offerings with local area workforce needs and would not likely produce significant long-term savings through an overall reduction in duplicative program offerings."

## **Recommendations**

- *The Legislature should continue to support the current workforce education delivery system that allows local institutions to determine program offerings to meet local business and industry personnel needs. Programs and courses should be market-driven, meet industry needs, cost-effective and result in employment for students. Which system provides the programs and courses should not be the issue that determines program offerings. The determinant should be whether the programs that are offered are market-driven and successfully prepare individuals for employment.*

---

<sup>3</sup> School Districts and Colleges Share Responsibility for Workforce Education; Duplication Is Minimal, Report No. 10-61 (December, 2010); Consolidating Workforce Education Would Bring More Uniformity; Mixed Results on Whether Evidence Supports Other Stakeholder Arguments, Report No. 10-62 (December, 2010); Colleges Perform Slightly Better Than School Districts in Career Education; Neither Clearly Outperforms in Adult Education, Report No. 10-63 (December, 2010); Profile of Florida's Public Workforce Education Program Providers by Service Area, Report No. 10-65 (December, 2010); Summary of OPPAGA Reports Examining Workforce Education Programs and Legislative Options, Report No. 11-07 (February, 2011)

**Issue (b): Examine the need for college credit certificate programs.**

**Background.** College credit certificate programs are a deliberate compilation of related technical courses that prepare students for employment in specific occupations linked to the [targeted occupations list](#). These programs also provide opportunities for incumbent workers who wish to upgrade their technical knowledge and skills for career advancement. In addition to the technical course components, students may have the opportunity to earn a nationally recognized industry certification or state or federal licensure to enhance employment prospects.

Any workforce education program may be conducted by a Florida College System institution or a school district, except that college credit in an associate in applied science or an associate in science degree may be awarded only by a Florida College System institution. However, if an associate in applied science or an associate in science degree program contains within it an occupational completion point that confers a certificate or an applied technology diploma, that portion of the program may be conducted by a school district career center [s. 1011.80(2), F.S.].

Florida College System institutions are authorized to offer the following college credit certification programs pursuant to State Board of Education Rule 6A-14.030, F.A.C., Instruction and Awards in Community Colleges:

***Technical Certificate (College Credit Certificate or CCC):** “A program of instruction of less than sixty (60) credits of college-level courses, which is part of an associate in science degree (A.S.) or an associate in applied science degree (A.A.S.) program offered in the State of Florida and which prepares students for entry into employment.”*

***Applied Technology Diploma (ATD):** “A course of study that is part of an associate in science degree (A.S.) or an associate in applied science degree (A.A.S.), is less than sixty (60) credit hours, and leads to employment in a specific occupation...An applied technology diploma program may consist of either technical credit or college credit.”*

***Advanced Technical Certificate (ATC):** “A program of instruction of nine (9) hours or more but less than forty-five (45) credit hours of college-level courses may be awarded to students who have already received an associate in science degree or an associate in applied science degree and are seeking an advanced specialized planning program of study to supplement their associate degree.”*

Currently, there are 126 CCCs, 14 ATDs and 132 ATCs offered by Florida College System institutions. Enrollment in CCC programs account for approximately 14% (21,612) of the average annual enrollments in CTE programs (156,170) at Florida College System institutions. Similarly, completions (60%) and job placements (80%) have been steady. There are far fewer ATDs with an enrollment of 1,657 reported by school

districts reported in seven ATD programs with 75% employed earning an average of \$33,117 annually. Colleges reported 2,811 students enrolled in 12 ATD programs with an 88% employment rate with annual average earnings \$55,808 during 2009-2010.

The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) examined the performance of *college credit certificate programs* in 2010 and did not recommend changes. *OPPAGA Report No. 10-26* recommended that the Targeted Occupations List (TOL) not be the only factor in program decisions. Instead, local education agencies should also develop programs based on local employer needs that may or may not be captured on the TOL or regional TOL.

After further review of the OPPAGA reports, and Florida Department of Education enrollment and completion data, the CCC programs appear to be meeting their intended outcome in preparing students for specific, entry-level occupations in targeted areas. Annual earnings of CCC completers have hovered around \$38,000 for the past three years. A large increase in CCC enrollments (21,000) occurred in 2009-10, an increase of over 5,000.

### **Recommendations:**

- *The college credit certificate is a valid credential and is needed in Florida because these programs are directly linked to workforce need and demand.*

<b>Issue (c): Examination of the need for non-college credit certificate programs.</b>
--

**Background.** Non-college credit certificate programs are comprised of a sequence of courses that provide coherent and rigorous content aligned with challenging academic standards and relevant technical knowledge and skills needed to prepare for further education and careers. The following non-college credit certificate program is authorized and offered by district career centers and Florida College System institutions:

***Career Certificate (CC):** "A course of study that leads to at least one occupational completion point. The program may also confer credit that may articulate with a diploma or career degree education program, if authorized by rules of the State Board of Education. Any credit instruction designed to articulate to a degree program is subject to guidelines and standards adopted by the Department of Education pursuant to chapter 1007. The term is interchangeable with the term "certificate career education program.""*

State Board of Education Rule 6A-14-030, F.A.C., also defines non-college credit certificate programs as:

***Career and Technical Certificate:** "Each community college and postsecondary technical center may provide programs of instruction consisting of non college-level*

*courses to prepare for entry into employment. The courses shall be classified in the Community College Management Information System as postsecondary adult career and technical courses. Satisfactory completion of courses within the programs shall be recognized by the award of units of measure called technical credit. Upon satisfactory completion of a planned program, including the demonstration of the attainment of predetermined and specified performance requirements, and subject to law and rule, the career and technical certificate shall be awarded."*

Career Certificates may also be referred to as Postsecondary Adult Vocational Certificates (PSAV). Career Certificates do not require students to have high school diplomas to enroll in the program, but students must attain a specified score on a basic skills exam to complete the certificate program or qualify for an exemption in accordance with State Board of Education Rule 6A-10.040, F.A.C. Although career certificates do not require a high school diploma to enroll in the program, some of the regulated occupations (nursing, law enforcement, etc.) for which these programs train require a high school diploma in an addition to other requirements mandated by the regulatory authorities.

Of particular note, is the viability of the career certificate as a pathway for Florida's adult education population--adults who do not have a high school diploma and/or lack basic literacy skills. The 2009-2010 reporting year revealed that Florida registered more than 340,000 individuals into Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Educational Development (GED), Adult High School (AHS), and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs. It is estimated that nearly 2 million Floridians over the age of 18 lack a high school diploma, and that more than 1.7 million adults in Florida have reading skills below the 8th grade level (Source: OPPAGA Report No. 11-04). According to popular reports, current labor market trends and forecasts indicate that a high school diploma is not enough for today's workforce needs since it has been projected that more than 70% of jobs created from 2006-2020 will require more than a high school diploma. The Division of Career and Adult Education has refocused adult education on increasing the number of adult education students who enter postsecondary education and receive a degree certificate or industry certification.

Currently, there are 77 career certificates offered by Florida College System institutions and 193 by school districts. Florida College System enrollment in career certificate programs accounted for approximately 22% (27,626) of the 2008-09 enrollments in college CTE programs (127,849). Among 2008-09 college career certificate enrollees, 36% earned a certificate that academic year and among those completers, 82% were found employed, in the military, or in further postsecondary education. School district career certificate enrollments are approximately 85% (58,866) of the 2008-09 enrollments in district postsecondary CTE programs (69,632). Among 2008-09 district career certificate enrollees, 37% earned a certificate that academic year and among those

completers, 79% were found employed, in the military, or in further postsecondary education<sup>4</sup>.

OPPAGA examined the performance of PSAV programs and did not recommend any changes. *OPPAGA Report No. 10-26* recommended that the Targeted Occupations List (TOL) not be the only factor in program decisions. Instead, local education agencies should also develop programs based on local employer needs that may or may not be captured on the TOL or regional TOL. After further review of the OPPAGA reports, and Florida Department of Education enrollment and completion data, the career certificates appear to be meeting their intended outcome in preparing students for specific, entry-level occupations in targeted areas. Annual earnings of career certificate completers have hovered around \$37,250 for the past three years. Through statewide articulation agreements and local inter-institutional articulation agreements, career certificates are also a viable pathway to the AAS or AS for students meeting college requirements for admission to a degree program.

**Recommendations:**

- *The non-college credit certificate is a valid credential and is needed in Florida because these programs are directly linked to workforce need and demand.*

<b>Issue (d): Evaluation of the merit of retaining the Associate in Applied Science degree.</b>
---

**Background.** Associate in Science (AS) and Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees have the same technical curriculum, but the AS curriculum is specifically designed to prepare an individual for entry to the workforce and in increasing numbers for transfer to a related baccalaureate program. The AAS degree is primarily intended to prepare students for entry into the workforce. When the AAS was developed in Florida, it was intended to be a terminal-to-work degree while the AS would be dual purpose – career preparation and limited transfer to select upper division programs. According to s. 1004.02, F.S., for licensure purposes, the term "associate in science degree" is interchangeable with "associate in applied science degree."

In March 2010, the Florida College System’s Council on Instructional Affairs (CIA) began a review of the existing AAS and AS programs to determine whether the AAS is still a viable option and make determinations whether a program should be designated as AAS or AS. With the assistance of the Occupational Education Standing Committee (OESC), each AAS/AS curriculum framework was analyzed. It was determined that a

---

<sup>4</sup> Sources: Community College Student Database, Workforce Development Information System, Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program

limited number of AAS degrees, intended primarily to lead to entry level employment in a career, are warranted to ensure that the workforce need is met and students have access to degree opportunities while the vast majority of the programs have been recommended as AS programs that will serve the workforce needs and transfer to related baccalaureate degrees.

Since the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) requires at least 15 college credits of general education to be included in any associate degree, the resulting difference between the AAS and the AS in Florida is hardly distinguishable. By separating the AAS and AS programs, unnecessary duplication will be eliminated and programmatic integrity ensured.

**Recommendations:**

- *The Associate in Applied Science degree is a valid credential and is needed in Florida because these programs are directly linked to workforce need and demand.*

<b>Issue (e): Consolidation of adult general education programs within school districts.</b>
--

**Background.** Currently, school districts and Florida College System institutions determine at the local level whether, how, and where they should offer adult education programs. During the 2010-11 school year, 330,000 students participated in an adult education program, with over 80% being served by a school district. The purpose of Florida’s adult general education services is to enable adults to acquire; the basic skills necessary to attain basic and functional literacy; a high school diploma or successfully complete the GED test; and an educational foundation that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and self-sufficient citizens [s. 1004.93., F.S.]. There are many types of adult education programs such as the adult basic education program, adult high school, general educational development (GED) program, citizenship program, applied academics for adult education and the adult English for speakers of other languages program. Students who test below the 9<sup>th</sup> grade skill level enroll in Adult Basic Education and students who test above the 9<sup>th</sup> grade level enroll in the GED program. According to OPPAGA (report # 11-04), in the 2008-09 school year, approximately 66% of students enrolled in adult education programs were adults (over the age of 18) who wanted to improve their employability. Adult education programs are offered in a variety of settings including adult education centers, technical centers, high school and college campuses, churches, hospitals, etc.

OPPAGA also found that most adult education students left programs before achieving documented learning gains, which lessened their ability to find employment and increase their earnings. The Department of Education has recently begun to implement



several high impact reforms in adult education by focusing on further linking adult education to employability. Florida is leading the nation in terms of aligning its adult education programs to career pathways. This effort embodies the slogan, “*learn to earn.*”

Florida’s reform efforts to re-engineer its adult education programs are targeted towards the following goals, to:

- increase the number and percentage of adult education students who enter postsecondary education and earn a degree, certificate, and/or industry credential;
- increase the number of adult general education students who earn an adult high school diploma or GED to successfully transition into postsecondary education; and
- increase the percentage of adult high school diploma and GED recipients earning a postsecondary degree, certificate, or industry certification within three years.

The 2011 Legislature set a precedent by requiring students to pay a fee to enroll in an adult education program offered by a school district or Florida colleges. The adult general education fee is \$45 per half year or \$30 per term and for non-resident students the fee is \$135 per half year or \$90 per term. It is anticipated that the DOE will have preliminary supplemental information on program enrollment for the fall of 2011 in November to determine the impact, if any, on the new tuition policy.

**Recommendations:**

- *The Legislature should not consolidate adult general education programs within school districts. Currently, school districts, Florida colleges, and community-based organizations provide adult education programs to meet the needs of their local communities. This local decision-making should be maintained.*

**Issue (f): The consistency of workforce education data collected and reported by Florida College System institutions and school districts, including the establishment of common elements and definitions for any data that is used for state and federal funding and program accountability.**

**Background.** Florida is a leader in data quality. Florida’s workforce education data resides within a vast and comprehensive K-20 data system. This system is recognized nationally for its quality, and Florida is acknowledged as a leader in the field of education data. According to the national Data Quality Campaign, in 2006 Florida was

the first state to meet all ten essential elements for a statewide longitudinal data system and is still one of only 24 states to do so. Florida is one of only 13 states to have met six or more of the Data Quality Campaign's prescribed state actions. Florida met seven of the ten. No state has met all ten.

***Current Agency Initiatives to Improve Data Consistency.*** The following outcomes planned under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant will help improve data consistency. The outcomes will improve the structure, collection, and management of workforce education data.

***Outcome 1: Upgrade Source Data Systems:*** The initiative "Source System Upgrade (SSU)" involves integrating the three source systems K-12, Florida College System (FCS) and Workforce Development Information System (WDIS) into one system. This will affect the structure and collection of data. The new schema will result in better data structure and controls because data elements common for students and staff across K-12, FCS, and WDIS will be integrated.

Implementation of comprehensive two tier Data Quality process with the Department controlled validation rules will improve the quality of collected data. Applying the same set of validation rules across all sources will improve the consistency of data.

***Outcome 2: Assign a Unique Identifier:*** The initiative "Statewide ID (SID)" will result in assigning a unique identifier to every student and staff at point of entry into the Florida public education system and subsequent submissions. This will affect the collection and management of data. The assigned statewide ID reflected back by the Local Source System (LSS) in their submissions will help link the collected student and staff records with the records in the system. Tracking a student or staff across the three source systems is better managed using Statewide ID.

***Outcome 3: Public Access Reporting Tool:*** The initiative "Public Access Reporting Tool (PART)" will implement a central reporting tool for use by a wide range of consumers with varying levels of access. This will affect management of reports and result in consistency of reported data.

The above outcomes will be progressively planned, designed, and tested through June 2013. During the testing phase, a representative sample of local source systems will be engaged to validate that the modernized system produces results similar to the current system and the data exchange formats are tested.

### **The Key Metrics in Postsecondary Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

The three-legged stool of CTE accountability and funding data comprises enrollment, completion, and post-completion outcomes. Florida college and school district enrollment and completion data are stored in student-level databases; Commission for Independent Education (CIE) institutions report aggregated enrollment and completion

data at the program level. Post-completion outcomes include employment placement (including military enlistment), earnings, and continuation of postsecondary education.

### **College and School District Student Databases**

Current law [s. 1008.41, F.S.] provides the Commissioner of Education the authority and direction to coordinate a workforce education management information system that uses uniform structures and common definitions for the collection and management of Florida college and school district student-level data. According to the law, the system must provide for individual student reporting; compliance with state and federal confidentiality requirements; maximum use of automated technology; and annual reports of student enrollment, completion, and placement by program. All system components shall be comparable between Florida colleges and school districts. The current system provides for reporting data in compliance with federal accountability requirements associated with the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education state grant. The system is also used for compliance with career program reporting requirements specified in s. 1008.43, F.S. In addition, workforce education data are used for state funding models.

The workforce education student data system comprises two distinct databases: the Community College Student Database (CCSDB) for college reporting and the Workforce Development Information System (WDIS) for school district reporting. Because school districts must report both K-12 and workforce education data to the state, WDIS is conjoined with the K-12 Automated Student Information System and the two databases share a number of data elements. The Bureau of Education Information and Accountability Services maintains governing authority over WDIS data elements to ensure consistency among the shared elements. The CCSDB is a stand-alone database. Both systems collect data three times a year during specified submission periods. The Department of Education holds regular meetings with staff from the colleges and school districts to discuss proposed changes and ensure consistency across sectors and among institutions.

### **Commission for Independent Education**

The CIE collects aggregate student data by program for purposes of determining compliance with Rule 6E, Florida Administrative Code, and calculating institutional licensing fees. Rule 6E specifies performance thresholds for institutions licensed by the CIE. Non-accredited institutions holding a Provisional or Annual License with less than a 60% placement rate or 50% retention rate are required to submit an improvement plan to CIE. Institutions accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education must meet the accrediting agency's requirements for placement and retention. Institutions that do not meet the requirements of the accrediting agency are required to submit an improvement plan to CIE. Institutions that continue to fall below the targets may see their license revoked. Rule 6E also specifies that licensing fees for institutions be determined by number of enrollments:

the larger the enrollment, the higher the fee. The CIE is supported by the fees collected from licensed institutions and does not receive general revenue.

Data are submitted from October 1 – November 30 of each year through the CIE website. Program data include total enrollment; Florida resident enrollment; non-resident alien enrollment; enrollment by age group; enrollment by race; total withdrawals; total graduates; and the number of graduates employed in field of training, the military, and continuing postsecondary education. All institutions licensed by the Commission are required to report this data, and submitted data are subject to on-site audits.

The CIE also provides a portal for licensed institutions to submit individual student data to the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). This data submission is voluntary for all institutions licensed by the Commission. However, some institutions that are supported by state or federal funds are required to submit data to FETPIP. For example, institutions that are approved training providers for Regional Workforce Boards are required to submit student-level data. These data are transmitted directly to FETPIP and not used or maintained by CIE. The Commission does not have statutory authority to collect individual student data.

### **FETPIP**

Post-completion outcome data are the result of matching student data with FETPIP. FETPIP is a data collection and consumer reporting system established by s. 1008.39, Florida Statutes, to provide follow-up data on former students and program participants who have graduated, exited, or completed a public education or training program within Florida. The statute requires all elements of Florida's workforce development system to use information provided through FETPIP, for any project requiring automated matching of administrative records for follow-up purposes. FETPIP, in partnership with the Education Data Warehouse (EDW), provides the added capability to continue research from education into the workforce, allowing for the possibility to follow students from kindergarten into employment. These data systems exist within an umbrella unit referred to as Integrated Education Data Systems (IEDS).

### **Analysis: Key Data Elements**

The analysis aligned the reporting of Florida colleges, school districts, and CIE institutions licensed by CIE related to data reported for the three principal metrics of workforce education accountability and funding: enrollment, completion, and post-completion outcomes.

### **Enrollment Data Elements**

Enrollments are reported in two ways: headcounts and hours. Hours can then be converted into fulltime equivalents (FTE). The CIE collects headcounts but not hours. Colleges and districts collect and report both. Colleges convert both credit-hour and

clock-hour enrollments into FTE. Districts offer only clock-hour programs, and they convert hours to FTE by dividing total hours by 900, which is consistent with the colleges.

All three systems use a common ten-digit coding rubric for their programs. The first two digits identify the subject cluster of the program. The next six digits specifies the code for the federal Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) subject category that best fits the program. The final two digits constitute a unique identifier assigned by MIS staff that distinguishes certificate programs from degree programs. In addition to the common ten-digit program code, school districts have a unique seven-character alphanumeric code for each program called Vocational Program Code.

Enrollment data are aggregated and unduplicated differently depending on report requirements. For example, one report may roll up enrollments for a program credential type, e.g. Associate in Science (AS), statewide. At this level, if a student was in an AS program in two different colleges, the student would be counted only once. If the report is by program credential type and college, the student would be included in the enrollment report for both colleges. For colleges, the most common dimensions are institution, program credential type, and program. For districts they are district, school, program credential type, and program. For CIE institutions, they are institution, program credential type, and program. College, district, and CIE institution headcounts can be disaggregated by race and gender.

CIE institution enrollments are based on aggregate data reported to CIE, but college and district enrollments must be extracted from the student databases. District program enrollment data are based on program numbers reported by districts into the WDIS system. College program enrollments require an extra step. Since programs and courses are reported on two separate tables, MIS staff must match program records to the course table to look for a corresponding course record. Students may be enrolled in a program, but not enroll in any courses during the same term. The reason for this difference between the two databases is because among all district programs, courses and programs are inextricably linked. Students in colleges have more credential varieties and program options available to them and are likely to change their program of study multiple times during their college career. In addition, any given course may be applied toward completion of several credential types and programs. Therefore, college program data must be independent from course data. Table 1 below summarizes the findings of the analysis of enrollment data.

**Table 1**  
**Aggregated Headcount Data by Program are Available in All Sectors; Colleges and School Districts Report Student-Level Headcount and FTE**

Sector	Program Codes	Headcount Data	FTE Data
Colleges	CIP	Student-level, unduplicated as necessary	Clock hours reported by course and divided by 900 for FTE
School Districts	Vocational Program Code and CIP	Student-level, unduplicated as necessary	Clock hours reported by course and divided by 900 for FTE
CIE Institutions	CIP	Aggregate headcounts collected by program	Instructional hour data not required

**Completion Data Elements**

Program completions are reported in all three systems. Colleges and school districts report them at the student level, and CIE institutions report aggregate, program-level completions. Program requirements for completion are comparable between colleges and districts because they use the same curriculum frameworks, which specify competencies, benchmarks, basic skills requirements, and required instructional hours. CIE institutions have more flexibility in this regard unless licensure requirements for the occupation are prescriptive. For example, the Board of Cosmetology prescribes required skills and instructional hours required to obtain a cosmetology license, so programs, whether public or private, must meet these requirements to prepare students for the occupation.

According to the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA), only 9% of postsecondary career education programs were offered by both public and private institutions in 2007-08.<sup>5</sup> Among a sample of programs offered in both sectors, OPPAGA found that private institutions were more likely to require a secondary completion credential for admission but were less likely to have a basic skills exit requirement. Public and private institutions offering the sample common programs had similar instructional hour requirements.

College completions are reported in data elements residing in a table of completion information that is separate from both course and program data, each of which has a distinct table. District course, program, and completion data are reported on the same table. For clock-hour programs, the only comparable type of program with districts, which do not offer credit-based programs, students must complete every competency

---

<sup>5</sup> OPPAGA Report No. 10-18 (January 2010)

module (known as Occupational Completion Points or OCPs) specified in a program’s curriculum framework and meet the program’s designated basic skills exit requirement to be reported as a program completer.<sup>6</sup> Students who meet these completion criteria are reported as full program completers. In addition, many career certificate programs have designated “Terminal OCPs” that mark exit points where students may leave a program with a set of skills required for employment in a specific occupation, but these students are not classified as full program completers.<sup>7</sup> Table 2 summarizes the findings of the analysis of completion data.

**Table 2**  
**Aggregate Full Program Completer Data are Available in All Sectors;**  
**Colleges and School Districts Report Student-Level Completers**

Sector	Completion Data
Colleges	Full program completers reported at student level.
School Districts	Full program completers reported at student level.
CIE Institutions	Aggregated full completers reported by program

**Post-Completion Outcome Data Elements**

A critical measure of the effectiveness of career education programs is the extent to which completers are placed in high-wage jobs or continuing their postsecondary education. All three systems collect data related to labor market outcomes and continuing education. Colleges and districts transfer annualized files of student data to FETPIP, which matches completer identifying information to its databases to determine if completers were found employed in the fourth quarter of the year or enrolled in postsecondary education in the fall term after completion.

The CIE provides a portal for licensed institutions to submit individual student data to FETPIP. This data submission is voluntary for all institutions licensed by the

---

<sup>6</sup> Career certificate programs (also known as Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs) require that students meet minimum levels of mathematics, language, and reading skills that align with occupational requirements to successfully complete the program.

<sup>7</sup> Districts have a mechanism through which “derived completion” can be calculated, which constitutes completion of a terminal OCP and meeting the basic skills requirement. Derived completions are used in the district performance-based incentive funding calculation. The college student data system does not include an element that indicates if a student has met a program’s basic skills requirement (see Table 6), so there is no way to make an analogous calculation of derived completion for college career certificate students.

Commission. However, some institutions that are supported by state or federal funds are required to submit data to FETPIP. For example, institutions that are approved training providers for Regional Workforce Boards are required to submit complete data. These data are transmitted directly to FETPIP and not used or maintained by CIE.

All other CIE institutions report aggregate numbers of annual graduates employed in field of training, employed in military, and continuing postsecondary education. These data are collected at the local level. The employed in the military and continuing postsecondary education are comparable to the FETPIP data, but FETPIP cannot determine if employment is related to the field of training. The Unemployment Insurance Database, which forms the backbone of FETPIP’s labor market data, does not include occupational codes. Table 3 summarizes the findings of the analysis of post-completion outcome data.

**Table 3**  
**Comparable Post-Completion Outcome Data are Available from**  
**Colleges, School Districts, and Some CIE Institutions<sup>8</sup>**

Sector	Outcome Data
Colleges	FETPIP match
School Districts	FETPIP match
All CIE Institutions	Aggregate, locally collected data
Some CIE Institutions Required to Report Grant Accountability Data	FETPIP match

**Analysis: Comparison of School District and Florida College Student Data Elements.** The second phase of the analysis was an element-by-element alignment of the CCSDB and the WDIS database to determine if data specifications are comparable. CIE data were not included in the second phase because CIE does not collect, nor is it authorized to collect, student-level data. Data elements in both systems were categorized as unique if they were found in only one system or common if they were found in both. Each unique element was analyzed to determine if the information it contained was applicable to the other system.

If, as was often the case, a college element applied to credit-based programs school districts do not offer, the element was coded as not applicable. Elements were also classified as not applicable if there was no requirement or reasonable need to collect the data. For example, the school district data system does not collect information on high school diploma status among students in technical certificate programs, an issue cited

---

<sup>8</sup> Outcome measures include employment, military enlistment, earnings, incarceration status, public assistance, and enrollment in postsecondary education.



by OPPAGA as an inconsistency.<sup>9</sup> At this time, however, a high school diploma is neither required universally for admission nor used for state/federal funding or accountability. The college system has elements that record high school diploma status, but colleges are allowed to report missing values, and it is not collected for all programs.

Each unique element was also flagged as “critical” if it pertained to enrollment, completion, or placement calculations. All unique elements that are applicable to the other system and flagged as critical are listed in Tables 4 and 5.

**Table 4**  
**Critical College Data Elements Applicable to but not Currently Reported by School Districts**

Unique College Student Database Elements	Description
Total Clock Hours Earned Toward Award	Cumulative count of clock hours earned which apply to current program
Completion Date	Date degree or certificate was awarded to student

**Table 5**  
**Critical School District Data Elements Applicable to but not Currently Reported by Colleges**

Unique District Data Elements	Description
CTE Basic Skills Examination	Indicates if a career and technical education student has demonstrated mastery of required minimum basic skills for the program of enrollment.
Industry Certification Identifier	Specifies the industry certification or technical skill assessment that the student has attempted. College data is collected via supplemental file for a subset of CTE students.
Industry Certification Outcome	Indicates if a student passed the industry certification or technical skill assessment attempted. College data is collected via supplemental file for a subset of CTE students.

---

<sup>9</sup> OPPAGA Report No. 10-18 (January 2010)

Elements common to both systems were evaluated for both technical and substantive consistency. Elements were categorized as technically different if the structure of the data did not match; for example, the elements did not have the same number of possible values. Common elements were flagged as substantively different if the meaning of comparable information contained in the elements was inconsistent. For example, reported gender should be comparable, but one system has an “unknown” value and the other does not. Each common element was flagged as “critical” if it pertained to enrollment, completion, or placement calculations. All common elements that are technically different, substantively different, and flagged as critical are listed in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
**Critical Data Elements Common to School Districts and Colleges**

School District Data Elements	College Student Database Elements	Comments
Adult Educational Functioning Level, Initial	Adult Educational Functioning Level, Initial	Colleges have two values for adult secondary low (grade level 9.0-10.9): high school diploma and no high school diploma. Colleges also have values for workplace readiness course and adult program not requiring a functioning level.
Birth Date Ethnicity Gender Race (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White)	Student Birth Date Ethnicity - Hispanic/Latino Gender Race (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White)	Colleges collect unknown values; districts do not.
First-Time Student Indicator	First-time Student Flag	Colleges include value of not applicable for students enrolled exclusively in adult education, continuing workforce education, lifelong learning, or educator preparation institute.

## **Recommendations:**

- *The Department of Education, school districts and the Florida College System institutions should ensure that, beginning in the 2013-14 school year, workforce education data collected and reported include common data and definitions for state and federal accountability programs.*

The recommended implementation timeline was suggested for the following reasons:

- Changes to data systems must be implemented, tested, and validated before a reporting year begins. Implementing recommended changes for the 2012-13 reporting year would necessitate changes to DOE and local data systems be completed by the spring of 2012. This leaves a relatively small window in which to make changes to all systems in a prudent fashion.
- If implementation were required for the 2012-13 reporting year, mission-critical processes would suffer as DOE staff are redirected to work on database changes, programming modifications, testing, implementation, and working with the local source systems, all while the SLDS source systems upgrade is taking place.
- Implementation by the 2013-14 reporting year will allow districts and colleges to comply and make adjustments to their local data collection and management systems without diverting scarce technical resources from core information management and reporting functions to meet an accelerated timeline.

## APPENDIX A

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

In the course of its deliberations, the Council formulated a number of recommendations made directly to the Articulation Coordinating Committee. This longstanding cross-sector educational body is involved with working toward seamless transition for students from one institution to another, often across sectors. The Articulation Coordinating Committee deals with and makes recommendations relative to areas of transfer student admissions, articulation systems, general education, common prerequisites to majors, acceleration mechanisms, and others.

Recommendations made directly from the Council to the Articulation Coordinating Committee are not included as recommendations in the body of the report since the Committee resides within the purview of the Department of Education. However, the recommendations are included here as an indicator of some of the ongoing work in which the Committee will be engaged. As such, they form at least a part of the Committee's workplan for the coming year, and are provided here for informational purposes.

- 1. General Education.** The Statewide Course Numbering System should identify courses that embed General Education Competencies.
- 2. Transfer Student Admissions.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should appoint a cross-sector Limited Access Task Force to review the number, discipline areas, and capacity of existing limited access programs in the FCS and the SUS and develop a common definition and standards for the designation. Current institution-level transfer policies and practices for limited access programs should be evaluated and recommendations made to ensure equitable and efficient transfer into the programs.
- 3. Articulation Systems.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should appoint a cross-sector Task Force on Student Advisement to review and evaluate state academic advising programs and services in the public and independent postsecondary sectors, particularly policies and programs that are designated for transfer students. The Task Force should identify "Best Practices" for which an increase in the graduation rate of transfer students has been evidenced. Best practices should be shared with all Florida postsecondary institutions.
- 4. General Education.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should recommend to the Board of Governors and State Board of Education common General Education Competencies in English and mathematics.

5. **General Education.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should conduct a study of institutional general education and other lower level course requirements for degree completion then submit recommendations to the Higher Education Coordinating Committee if findings indicate a need.
6. **English/Math Requirement.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should review Rule 6A.10-030, F.A.C. *Other Assessment Procedures for College-Level Communication and Computation Skills*.
7. **Common Prerequisites.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should institute an ongoing review of the Common Prerequisite Counseling Manual to ensure the courses identified as baccalaureate program prerequisites are accurate and appropriate.
8. **Acceleration Mechanisms.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should review district expenditures for dual enrollment instructional materials and best practices in the provision of these materials to students, and make recommendations concerning school district responsibility to provide instructional materials.
9. **Acceleration Mechanisms.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should revise the ACC Credit by Examination Equivalencies List based on the study mandated in ch. 2011-177, Laws of Florida, which requires an investigation of student performance in subsequent coursework in the determination of exam and course equivalencies.
10. **Acceleration Mechanisms.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should conduct an analysis of the acceleration credit (AP, IB, AICE, dual enrollment) of graduates to determine the impact of the acceleration credit on entrance to postsecondary education, time-to-degree, and degree or certificate completion.
11. **Acceleration Mechanisms.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should study the impact of including acceleration credits in the excess hours calculations mandated in s. 1009.286, FS.
12. **Career and Technical Education.** The Articulation Coordinating Committee should study expanding the required secondary academic unit defined in Board of Governors Regulation 6.002 to include Level III courses from the career and technical education section of the course code directory.

## APPENDIX B

### HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COUNCIL STATUTORY LANGUAGE

Title XLVIII K-20 EDUCATION CODE

Chapter 1004: PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

#### **1004.015 HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COUNCIL**

(1) The HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING Council is created for the purposes of identifying unmet needs and facilitating solutions to disputes regarding the creation of new degree programs and the establishment of new institutes, campuses, or centers.

(2) Members of the Council shall include:

(a) The Commissioner of Education.

(b) The Chancellor of the State University System.

(c) The Chancellor of the Florida College System.

(d) The Executive Director of the Commission for Independent Education.

(e) The President of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida.

(f) Two representatives of the business community, one appointed by the President of the Senate and one appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who are committed to developing and enhancing world class workforce infrastructure necessary for Florida's citizens to compete and prosper in the ever-changing economy of the 21st century.

(3) The Council shall serve as an advisory board to the Legislature, the State Board of Education, and the Board of Governors. Recommendations of the Council shall be consistent with the following guiding principles:

(a) To achieve within existing resources a seamless academic Educational system that fosters an integrated continuum of kindergarten through graduate school Education for Florida's students.

(b) To promote consistent education policy across all Educational delivery systems, focusing on students.

(c) To promote substantially improved articulation across all Educational delivery systems.

(d) To promote a system that maximizes Educational access and allows the opportunity for a high-quality Education for all Floridians.

(e) To promote a system of coordinated and consistent transfer of credit and data collection for improved accountability purposes between the Educational delivery systems.

(4) The Board of Governors shall provide administrative support for the Council.

*History.*

*s. 13, ch. 2010-78.*

#### **1004.015 Higher Education Coordinating Council.-**

(4) The council shall make detailed recommendations relating to:

(a) The primary core mission of public and nonpublic postsecondary education institutions in the context of state access demands and economic development goals.

(b) Performance outputs and outcomes designed to meet annual and long-term state goals, including, but not limited to, increased student access, preparedness, retention, transfer, and completion. Performance measures must be consistent across sectors and allow for a comparison of the state's performance to that of other states.

(c) The state's articulation policies and practices to ensure that cost benefits to the state are maximized without jeopardizing quality. The recommendation shall consider return on investment for both the state and students and propose systems to facilitate and ensure institutional compliance with state articulation policies.

(d) A plan for workforce development education that addresses:

1. The alignment of school district and Florida College System workforce development education programs to ensure cost efficiency and mission delineation, including an examination of the need for both college credit and noncollege credit certificate programs, an evaluation of the merit of retaining the associate in applied science degree, and the consolidation of adult general education programs within school districts.

2. The consistency of workforce education data collected and reported by Florida College System institutions and school districts, including the establishment of common elements and definitions for any data that is used for state and federal funding and program accountability.

(5) The council shall submit a report outlining its detailed recommendations to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Board

of Governors, and the State Board of Education by December 31, 2011, which specifically includes recommendations for consideration by the Legislature for implementation in the 2012-2013 fiscal year.