

DRAFT

# Higher Education Coordinating Council

---



Florida Department of Education





## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction and Council Recommendations</b>	<b>3</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>7</b>
<b>Section B: Data and Performance Measures</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Section C: Articulation Policies and Programs</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Section D: Workforce Education</b>	<b>38</b>

## INTRODUCTION AND COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2011 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 charged with making recommendations with regard to the following:

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

### **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 recommendation 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 recommendations according to thematic areas, it was the case, then, that recommendations discussed in the narrative of the four report sections were placed in what was determined to be the most appropriate recommendation 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. 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.

- 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.
- Student Financial Aid. This thematic area captures those recommendations relative to various forms of financial aid including but not limited to the Bright Futures program, the Florida Resident Access Grants (FRAG), and the Access to Better Learning and Education (ABLE) grant program.
- 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).
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.

## COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

**(TO BE ENTERED)**

## 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 a governance 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:

- Are all sectors, public and private, and their respective institutions optimally aligned with 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 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?

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. These descriptions could only have been crafted by each of the sectors; they are, therefore, articulations of mission as they stand and are currently understood.

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

- 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.

### **Workforce Education**

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)**

The Independent Higher Education Sector has 29 colleges of various sizes, enrollments and specializations. The ICUF colleges and universities are Florida not-for-profit institutions that are (like Florida's state universities and colleges) accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Florida has a vibrant, vigorous and vital independent higher education sector. Although many independent colleges and universities track back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this 21<sup>st</sup> century success story tracks back to a visionary decision made more than 30 years ago by the Florida Legislature when, in 1979, Florida enacted the Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) that fostered decades of student learning and access for Florida resident students. That visionary policy empowered students to make their own institutional choices. The Legislature chose to provide tuition assistance while demanding performance and accountability from the ICUF institutions. Studies by the Florida Council of 100 and McKinsey and Company have all validated the cost effective return to the state of leveraging dollars for FRAG to assist students in gaining access to higher education.

Following this design, the FRAG was created: 1) to provide Floridians more diverse higher education options; 2) to grow the private college and university sector; and 3) to increase higher education enrollment at a lower cost to the state. Other successful higher education decisions in the same era (the G.I. Bill, Pell Grants and Student Loan Programs) followed the same visionary design: student choice coupled with performance accountability on the part of both students and institutions.

Today, ICUF has large universities similar to the State University System as well as medium-size colleges and universities in urban, suburban and rural settings. It has smaller, specialized institutions as well as more than 200 fully online degree distance learning programs for off-campus students that are among the nation's largest and best.

Today, the Independent Higher Education Sector has 29 colleges of various sizes, enrollments and specializations. Institutional highlights include:

- 8 research universities, 14 master's universities, 7 baccalaureate colleges, 1 arts college, 1 health services college and 3 business colleges.
- 2 medical schools, 5 law schools, 2 hospitals, 12 nursing programs.
- More than 132,000 students at 128 sites, including 25 state college locations.
- ICUF students graduate in an average of 4.2 years.
- 45% of FRAG recipients are minority students.
- Almost half of all FRAG recipients are "First Generation in College" according to an analysis by the state's Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA).
- ICUF students received over \$185 million in grants during 2009-10.
- The nearly 18,000 bachelor's degrees awarded in 2009-10 were 26% of Florida's total.
- ICUF institutions award 41% of all graduate degrees in Florida.
- ICUF institutions award 30% of all Florida bachelor's, master's, doctoral and first professional degrees.
- ICUF institutions award 43% of the computer science degrees in Florida, 36% of the education degrees, and over one third of Florida's health degrees.
- ICUF institutions have annual institutional payrolls of nearly \$2 billion for 32,000 employees.
- The 29 ICUF institutions spend nearly \$4.5 billion in Florida each year.
- ICUF institutions bring to Florida nearly 60,000 out-of-state students and their dollars.
- The 47,624 Florida undergraduate students at ICUF institutions would cost the State of Florida an additional \$482 million were they to attend state universities.
- The diversity of the ICUF institutions assists the state in providing a shared core mission of teaching, research and service.

The 29 institutions of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida appreciate the student financial support provided by the State of Florida during the past 32 years that has assisted hundreds of thousands of Florida students to earn their bachelor degree. For the upcoming 30 years, the Legislature needs visionary policy decisions for all of Florida's higher education sectors that are as solid, sound and stable as the FRAG decision made 30 years ago. Implicit in any consideration of the need for expanded access should be the inclusion of FRAG as an expanded option to be used as a tool for creating access for Florida resident students.

### **The State University System**

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.

New Florida goals of the State University System include:

- Increasing graduation and retention rates.
- Increasing annual baccalaureate degree production.
- Increasing STEM graduates at all academic levels.
- Increasing the System's annual number of patents and licenses awarded.
- Increasing the System's number of medical breakthroughs that improve the longevity and quality of life.
- Increasing the System's number of annual new business start-ups.

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**

The Commission for Independent Education licenses over 900 nonpublic institutions of higher education in Florida. These institutions offer additional choices for students as they seek an opportunity for postsecondary education among the various sectors of higher education. Educational offerings include a wide range of programs provided by a very diverse community of educational institutions. Institutions are located all over the state, with physical sites concentrated in the larger metro areas of Florida, serving as a resource to the local employers and bringing the relevant training and further education programs to the residents. Institutions licensed by the Commission offer a number of distance education programs as well, thus providing an opportunity to serve communities where there are fewer opportunities for postsecondary education. Credential levels range from non-degree certificate and diplomas to doctoral and first professional degrees. The Commission works closely with the accrediting commissions, recognized by the United States Department of Education, that oversee institutions licensed in Florida.

There are approximately 8,500 licensed programs in Commission institutions which offer career preparation programs that are in demand by employers, including health occupations, business and technology. There are 150 licensed institutions participating in Workforce Development programs. Occupational training is a large part of these licensed programs and prepares the graduates for new careers which include many people seeking to change occupations due to changes in the economy. Career advancement and enhancement is a goal for many graduates as well, as there are programs designed to prepare for professional certifications, licenses, and advanced degrees. The institutions licensed by the Commission have graduated over 100,000 students in 2010-2011, making 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 innovation and content to address labor market needs and challenges as they strive to serve established, as well as new and emerging industries. These institutions are individual entities, and so, are flexible to



adjust to local educational and market needs, operating within the Standards for Licensure and Fair Consumer Practices. A program will be successful if students graduate and benefit from the education received, through job placement or advancement. The institutions themselves receive no state or federal funds; students may qualify for some financial aid, and so, are encouraged to carefully evaluate all the factors they find important prior to choosing an institution to attend. Students will not be attracted to an institution and its programs unless the performance outcomes in job placement and career advancement are satisfactory and easily understood. Without the positive outcomes, the independent postsecondary institution ceases to exist. The Commission for Independent Education is accountable to the citizens of Florida through its oversight of the 900 institutions. The departmental teams within the Commission: Information Systems, Licensure, Consumer Services, and General Counsel report to the Executive Director. The Commission operates with budgetary authority as part of the Office of the Department of Education Commissioner. Budget is driven totally from revenue generated from the fees paid by licensed institutions. The Commission receives no General Revenue.

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 the Standards for Licensure and Fair Consumer Practices are met. The institutions licensed by the Commission have their specific missions that are unique to each of them, but they are all focused on positive student outcomes. These 900 entities are part of Florida's economic system that helps to attract employers and jobs to our state. Florida's private postsecondary institutions are a valuable part of the solution to concerns about capacity and access for students to higher education, as they provide consumer choice and value to the Florida taxpayer.

### **The Florida College System**

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 relaxes 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

---

<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.

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 to include 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 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. To reach its economic potential and to attract good jobs for its diverse and growing population, Florida must expand access to 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 baccalaureate programs designed to provide access to 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.

### **FCS Mission Summary**

The Florida College System is dedicated to increasing, maintaining, and providing access to a comprehensive range of postsecondary educational opportunities for all Floridians by:

- Maintaining an open-admission policy (non-selective) for entry into lower division programs/courses.
- Being affordable; keeping tuition rates lower than the state's public and private universities.
- Providing geographic accessibility to postsecondary education for place-bound students with a college located within commuting distance of every citizen in the state.
- Providing remediation; offering development education in reading, writing and math to students lacking college-ready skills, but seeking higher education.
- Responding to local community needs; fostering close ties with business and industry in developing high need, job-related career and technical degree programs in both lower and upper divisions.
- Promoting economic development via Enterprise Florida-related programs, technology transfer centers, economic development centers (incubators), and workforce literacy programs.
- Providing dual enrollment instruction.
- Delivering adult education services per local articulation agreements with public school districts.
- Offering community, recreational, and leisure services that are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement.

## 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.

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 colleges and universities, admissions criteria ensure that overall levels of preparation for entering students are very high. In fact, many institutions have no way to measure preparation.

The best measure of preparedness comes from the K-12 sector. High school students should graduate ready for college. The Department has defined college readiness and identified cut-scores for several standardized tests to reflect college readiness. Thus, we recommend the following measure of preparedness:

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Definition/Explanation</b>
<i>Preparedness</i>		
Measure 1	<b>College 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 prove to be critical barriers. In addition, there are the simply 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.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Access</i>		
Measure 2	<p><b>Current System Enrollment</b></p> <p>Number and percentage of students who</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply</li> <li>• Are Admitted</li> <li>• Enroll</li> </ul>	<p>Simple counts of applications, admissions, and enrollments provide contextual information about the size of each sector and the types of students accessing them.</p> <p>For open enrollment institutions, applications and admissions will be available or applicable.</p>
Measure 3	<p><b>Disparity analysis</b></p> <p>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 age 18-24</p>	<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.</p>
Measure 4	<p><b>Financial Accessibility</b></p> <p>Net Cost of Attendance</p>	<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.</p>

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

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.

	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Definition/Explanation</b>
<i>Completion</i>		
Measure 9	<b>Completions</b> Total degrees and credentials	This measure will provide valuable information about the state's total production of postsecondary credentials



	awarded	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.

	Measure	Definition/Explanation
<i>Placement into the Workforce</i>		
Measure 13	<b>Pass Rates</b>	This is available only for fields that

	Licensure pass rates, where available	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.

Not all sectors can report fully on retention. CIE requires statutory authority to require licensed institutions to participate in FETPIP.

## **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. 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.

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 and universities 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.

Florida College System Dual Enrollment				
	Total Exempted \$	Dual Enrolled FTE	Total FTE	% of FTE
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 yet 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 it 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 SACS 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.*

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

---

<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)

**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.*

**Issue (c): Examination of the need for non-college credit certificate programs.**

**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

---

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

(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 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 three 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 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

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

<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.

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 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 completer 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

---

<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.

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 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.

---

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

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

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

<b>Unique College Student Database Elements</b>	<b>Description</b>
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**

<b>Unique District Data Elements</b>	<b>Description</b>
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.

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.