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THE VISION

In 1998, Florida voters amended their state Constitution to redefine the way education is governed. With the passage of Amendment 8, Floridians received a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to design a system of education governance for a new century: one seamless system of coordinated choices that links high expectations with performance, producing a continuum of opportunities for excellence from kindergarten through graduate and professional educational programs.

For the first time, Florida’s highest elected official will be held accountable for the education of the state’s citizenry.

For the first time, Florida’s public K-20 education systems will work collaboratively to ensure every student’s educational needs are met. The public school system, community college system and the state university system will unite under one common goal to serve the needs of students by providing high quality educational programs.

For the first time, Florida’s education system will be perceived as dynamic and well coordinated.

The delivery systems will be collaborative, progressive and proactive in seeking to provide new and expanded programs to meet the needs of students, businesses and communities. They can and should become partners in a move to expand opportunities for a quality education for students young and old.

For the first time, our state education system will be seen as serving the public, providing current and useful information on education choices for families, both in the public and independent sectors. The system will be focused on encouraging more choices within and outside the public education system.

For the first time, Florida will lead the nation in K-20 education governance reform. While other states are planning and collaborating on how to complete systemic K-20 education governance reform, Florida is fulfilling the vision through reforming its education governance and accountability structure.

For the first time, K-20 education in Florida will be student-centered.

The Transition Task Force has, in its charge of recommending to the Legislature the steps needed to move toward a new governance structure, stayed true to the Guiding Principles established in the legislation now a part of Florida law. The Guiding Principles mandate that the new governance structure:

- be a coordinated, seamless system for kindergarten through graduate school education;
- be student-centered in every facet;
- maximize education access and academic success for all Floridians;
- safeguard equity and refuse to compromise academic excellence; and
- emphasize local control of institutions.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force was charged by the Florida Legislature to recommend a plan for a smooth and timely transition of Florida’s current education governance system to the new seamless kindergarten through graduate school system envisioned in the Education Reorganization Act of 2000. After thoroughly reviewing alternatives and conducting extensive debate on the fundamental needs of the new system, the task force recommends the following implementation plan. The plan includes 10 major recommendations that must be addressed by the 2001 Florida Legislature.

The Transition Task Force is pleased to present this report to the Governor and Legislature as a compilation of the extensive review and consideration given to education governance in Florida. This is an opportunity to establish the framework for an educational delivery system for a new century. – Phil Handy, chairman

1. The Florida Legislature should articulate a clear vision for the relationship of the state to local education entities.

The state should develop standards for performance, provide resources in an equitable manner, provide information and assistance to institutions, provide parents and citizens with options for quality education and hold education providers accountable for results. Local school districts and education institutions should have broad latitude in developing local policies and programs to meet the needs of their students, employers and the communities they serve.

The new relationship between the state and education entities must permeate legislation, state board rules and policy. This relationship, if clearly articulated and codified, shall serve as the basis for decisions regarding the design and implementation of the state’s new K-20 education governance structure. It should apply to the legislative and executive branches. Refer to the table below for additional information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>State Level Education Entity Responsibilities</th>
<th>Local Level Education Entity Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Sets goals, performance measures and standards and holds education institutions accountable for performance.</td>
<td>Has the operation authority to find the best possible ways to meet performance expectations and should comply with state law and rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Expectations</td>
<td>Provides information to the citizens on the performance of the K-20 system, the delivery systems and the individual institutions.</td>
<td>Provides information on the performance at the institutional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Establishes standards of operation that set limits of authority and responsibility within broad state policy parameters.</td>
<td>Exercises freedom in adopting policies that are student centered; that further student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Resources</td>
<td>Provides resources through equitable polices and requires institutions to exercise their fiduciary responsibilities as caretakers of public funds.</td>
<td>Exercises freedom to establish partnerships and seek innovative approaching to teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal setting
Sets expectations in the areas of student learning, efficient and quality services, contributions to workforce quality and economic development.
Develops strategies and programs to meet state expectations.

Articulation
Requires adherence to policies that produce seamless articulation for students, whether they are being educated in government institutions or through independent delivery systems.
Seeks new and improved ways of helping students articulate through a seamless system while maintaining standards of excellence.

Academic Programs
Establishes criteria for creation or termination of academic programs, campuses or universities; approves post-master’s program creation/termination.
Authorizes academic program creation/termination for associate, bachelor or master’s degrees. Provides input to Chancellor and Florida Board of Education regarding criteria for advanced degree, newcampus or new university creation/termination.

Technology
Develops a K-20 master plan, and retains performance and budget authority for plan. Consults with appropriate state agencies.
Exercises freedom to implement and expand opportunities via technology. Provides input into developing and updating master plan.

Government in the Sunshine
Deliberations of their boards should be open and should provide access to all who are affected by, or interested in, the policy and operational issues they address.
Should maintain accessible input from members of the education community and the general public. Deliberations will be open.

Best Practices
Provides technical assistance, evaluates high-performing areas to identify basis of success, and shares best practices.
Participates in sharing best practices shown to improve quality of services.

**Policy Based Leadership**

The authority the state exercises over educational institutions should be policy based. The enforcement of policies and the provision of opportunities should be equitable and open to all. The “personality” of leadership should be expressed as world class direction through vision and communication. State officials should: push creativity and innovation, and encourage risk taking; provide the highest quality assistance where needed and when needed; provide data and performance reports; translate data into areas of need for improvement and be willing to share exemplary practices when they appear; should vigorously evaluate successful practices for application across jurisdictions; should consider the public to be consumers; actively communicate with students and families, by providing information on all available education services, whether public or private; and should first and foremost exercise its responsibility to the public and then to institutions.

**Specifically the legislation should include** the articulation of this relationship as intent language introducing the various duties of state and local entities. The designation of duties should reflect this relationship.

The Florida Board of Education should play the most prominent role in charting Florida’s current and future direction in providing high quality education opportunities for all Floridians.

For example, academic program creation is an issue of considerable importance to individual institutions, as well as to the overall vision of the state’s K-20 system. In addressing this issue, the Florida Board serves a distinct and separate function from the institutional Boards of Trustees. The institutional Boards of Trustees
will approve new and terminate existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs, up to and including the master’s degree level, based on criteria established by the Florida Board of Education. These criteria must include an assessment of need, indicators of quality, and projections of resources need to create and maintain a new campus or program.

2. The Florida Legislature should establish in law the major components of the new K-20 system, and initiate the transition effective July 1, 2001.

The Constitutional amendment mandates that the new education governance structure officially takes effect on January 7, 2003. Extending until 2003 the implementation of the new governance model creates unintended consequences of uncertainty and instability. A prolonged period of uncertainty could produce a system devoid of leadership, vision, innovation and energy – all of which are needed to make strides in performance toward greater excellence. Time and time again, leaders of Florida’s current education delivery systems have requested that the implementation proceed rather than waiting until 2003.

A second reason to expedite the implementation of the new governance structure is the sheer volume of work that is needed to truly produce a fully operational system. The greatest challenge will be in devolving current authority from the state to the individual universities. Devolving the myriad of centralized operations to the institutional level, or to a consortia of institutions will take time, thought, legal work and training.

Given the complexity of some of the issues regarding the devolution of authority, a phased-in approach is needed to achieve the desired outcome of improving efficiency and effectiveness without jeopardizing the services provided by the universities. Those knowledgeable of and involved in the decision-making should be active participants in the transition process. These include, but are not limited to, superintendents, institution presidents, administrators, faculty representatives and student body leaders. Public and independent education providers must be involved.

There is much to be done in developing a K-20 accountability system. With a reorganized Department of Education, the major delivery systems can work together, with broad input, to develop a strong, clear and fair system. This new working relationship will move Florida forward on a number of fronts. It is this coordinated working relationship that will produce better, more student-centered policies. There is little potential of laying the groundwork for a new system while operating within the current fragmented systems. Seamlessness must be achieved under a new structure.

Specifically, the legislation should include the following provisions:

1. Effective July 1, 2001 the Governor shall appoint the members of the interim Florida Board of Education.

2. Effective July 1, 2001 the Governor shall appoint the members of the Boards of Trustees for each of Florida’s 10 state universities.

3. Effective July 1, 2001, or upon full appointment and operation, each Board of Trustees will be a body corporate for its state university.
4. The university Boards of Trustees will participate in executive training and develop an implementation plan to address issues related to the transfer of authority.

5. Effective July 1, 2001, transfer state-level powers and duties from the Florida Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges to the Florida Board of Education, and the devolved powers and duties to the respective boards of trustees for each state university and community college. As such, the following shall cease to exist: Florida Board of Regents; Division of Universities of the Department of Education; State Board of Community Colleges; Division of Community Colleges of the Department of Education; State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities; and State Board of Non-Public Career Education

6. Effective July 1, 2001, the current (elected) Commissioner of Education shall serve as the Education Commissioner for the K-20 system, until January 7, 2003. The Education Commissioner shall serve as the CEO of education in Florida, overseeing the reorganization of the Department of Education. The Commissioner shall appoint interim Chancellors for Public Education; Community Colleges; Universities; and an interim Executive Director for Independent Education.

7. The Commissioner of Education shall continue to sit as a member of the State Board of Education (Florida Cabinet) and shall determine the agenda for the interim Florida Board of Education (IFBE). All actions of the interim Florida Board of Education are subject to review by the State Board of Education (SBE).

8. Effective July 1, 2001, the Commissioner of Education shall initiate an organizational plan for the Department of Education that is consistent with and reflects the March 1, 2001 recommendations of the Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force. This reorganization shall be subject to approval of the Interim Florida Board of Education.

9. The interim Florida Board of Education will recommend to the Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force, the Governor, the Commissioner of Education and the Florida Legislature, no later than January 1, 2002, a new “school code,” comprised of the revisions to Chapters 228-246, for K-20 education in Florida.

3. **An interim Florida Board of Education should be given statutory authority to begin the implementation of Florida’s new K-20 education governance structure, effective July 1, 2001.**

The interim Florida Board of Education should be established as the cornerstone of the new education governance structure, and be given the statutory authority and responsibilities of that which the constitutional board will receive on January 7, 2003. The Florida Legislature should authorize the Governor to appoint an Interim Florida Board of Education beginning July 1, 2001. This board should have statutory authority over K-20, including public K-12, community colleges, workforce development, and universities. When the constitutional Florida Board of Education takes office in 2003, it should focus on the mission of improving education services to Floridians, not reconstructing the system. This will initiate the process of establishing the Florida Board as the policy-setting entity for all of education.

The interim Florida Board of Education should be given statutory authority to establish policies and rules for all
of education. The current State Board of Education, consisting of the Governor and Cabinet, should retain its constitutional authority to have the final say on rules and policies, as it deems necessary. The Commissioner of Education, currently elected statewide, should assume the position of Chief Education Officer for the state of Florida and should control the agenda of the interim Florida Board. During the interim period, the Education Commissioner would not answer to the interim Florida Board, but should guide it in this developmental period. The Commissioner should be empowered to take issues acted on by the interim Florida Board of Education to the State Board of Education for approval as appropriate.

The interim Florida Board of Education should have the authority to begin reviewing performance standards to meet goals established by the Florida Legislature. This process will take time, working with educators within each delivery system.

The Interim Florida Board of Education will have the benefit of a combined state education agency staff that will produce the staff work necessary to adopt state policies that comply with the guiding principles.

**Specifically the legislation should include provisions that authorize the Interim Florida Board of Education to:**

1. Prepare and submit a unified K-20 education budget to the Governor and Legislature.
2. Establish a work plan and timeline for the orderly implementation of the 2001 legislation.
3. Establish accountability standards to implement legislative performance goals and measures. Order the development of mechanisms to implement new measures contained in the legislation.
4. Supervise the coordination of institutions and delivery systems by establishing policies that limit operating authority and guide policy development of boards and education institutions.
5. Establish policies for university and community college boards to follow in selecting and nominating presidents.
6. Enact rules, approve plans and reports, and take other actions pertaining to the supervision of education in Florida upon the recommendation. All actions of the Interim Florida Board of Education are subject to review of the State Board of Education.
7. Enter into agreements that will ensure the timely implementation of the K-20 system.
8. Establish boards, commissions, and advisory boards to provide the support needed to address policy issues that will span the entire system. These would include, but not be limited to, advisory bodies on issues such as public education facilities planning, student issues, distance learning and technology, and academic quality and freedom.
9. Develop and review recommendations and comment on issues of statewide importance that will be in effect during and after the transition (i.e. technology systems, facilities, construction, etc.).
10. Adopt criteria and implementation program(s) for future growth including but not limited to new colleges and universities, campus mergers, and cooperative non-traditional agreements between existing, and within, systems.
11. Approve the issuance of bonds.

4. **The interim Florida Board of Education should have the full support needed to address issues that span K-20 education.**

One question often asked of the task force is, “Can the new K-20 state board adequately comprehend and address the diversity of issues that it must address across the entire education spectrum?” The answer to this question is threefold:
The Florida Board of Education will devote considerably more time to education policy issues than the current State Board of Education, which constitutes one of many functions of the Florida Cabinet.

The Florida Board of Education will adopt broad state policies that will guide institutions in making these decisions locally and will not devote time to the many operational issues addressed by the Board of Regents.

The interim Florida Board of Education should have the authority to establish boards, commissions, and advisory bodies to provide the support needed to address policy issues affecting the entire system. The interim board may find it necessary to establish groups to study complex issues and to make recommendations on issues of statewide importance such as the distribution of facilities construction dollars, student affairs, program approval criteria, growth plans, mission, technology and access improvement. The interim board would have the full support of the entire Department of Education and the reorganized divisions, as well the constitutional board.

To the extent that the legislature would propose a new post-master’s academic program or new university or campus that is not recommended by the Florida Board of Education, a two-thirds majority should be required. Any position recommendations by the Florida Board of Education to establish campuses or advanced programs may be rejected by the legislature by either a simple majority or by not taking action.

5. The Florida Legislature should authorize the interim Florida Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education to reorganize the Department of Education to reflect the seamless system, effective July 1, 2001.

The Department of Education (DOE) currently focuses much of its resources on delivering services and support to K-12 public education, separate from the divisions of Community Colleges and State Universities.

The DOE should be reorganized this year to reflect the new seamless system and its mission, and recognize the period of July 1-December 31, 2001 as an interim period of reorganization to evaluate, consolidate, reassign or eliminate all functions related to education delivery. The commissioner should begin the process of reorganization, in response to customer needs captured by customer satisfaction surveys, and to the needs of the Interim Florida Board of Education. The reorganization should be expedited, striving to retain the institutional knowledge and high performing staff to lead the new system. The commissioner should be provided with resources to acquire professional assistance in managing the reorganizations for the employees in the agency.

The Department of Education will become a state agency of the Governor, as direct support to the Florida Board of Education under the direction of an appointed Commissioner of Education. In its new role of K-20 education governance, the state should not supervise or oversee the operation of local education institutions, but should provide direction, resources, assistance, policy-based checks and balances and hold delivery systems and institutions accountable for results. A reorganized Department of Education must support the statewide education mission. The Department of Education will focus services and products on meeting the guiding principles stated in Ch. 229.002 F.S.

The recommended organizational structure should also focus more on communication and consumer information/services to ensure that Floridians’ needs are being heard and met regarding education. This new structure will include a Citizen Information Center, an Education K-20 Policy and Research Commission and a greater emphasis on an integrated approach to data management and technology.
Specifically the legislation should include provisions that:

1. Authorize the commissioner to eliminate duplication across divisions, achieve greater efficiency and effective use of financial and human resources.

2. Effective July 1, 2001, authorize the Commissioner of Education to initiate an organizational plan for the Department of Education that is consistent with and reflects the March 1, 2001 recommendations of the Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force. This reorganization shall be subject to approval of the Interim Florida Board of Education and shall achieve economies in education services; identify which, if any current education staff functions and resources should be eliminated, transferred, or realigned within the proposed new K-20 educational governance structure; and other organizational changes as enacted by the 2001 Florida Legislature.

During this interim period, the Interim Florida Board of Education should, with the leadership of the Commissioner and in conjunction and cooperation with divisional staff, institutional administrators and faculty, identify those education delivery functions currently conducted by existing boards or commissions that should “evolve” to the Interim Florida Board and those which should “devolve” to institutional boards.

The Legislature should expedite to July 1, 2001 the relocation to the Interim Florida Board of Education the powers and duties of those entities currently responsible for aspects of education in the K-20 spectrum, in order to accomplish the reorganization of the Department of Education to support the mission and deliver services of a K-20 education governance structure. These include:

- Board of Regents
- State Board of Community Colleges
- State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities (merge)
- State Board of Nonpublic Career Education (merge)
- Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
- Articulation Coordinating Committee
- Education Standards Commission

The Legislature should authorize the Commissioner of Education to reorganize the following divisions:

- Division of Workforce Development of the Department of Education
- Division of Human Resource Development
- Division of Support Services of the Department of Education
- Division of Administration of the Department of Education
- Division of Financial Services of the Department of Education
- Division of Technology of the Department of Education
- Office of Student Financial Assistance of the Department of Education
- Division of Universities of the Department of Education
- Division of Community Colleges of the Department of Education

The reorganized Department of Education should include the following areas of leadership:

Office of the Commissioner - Office of the Commissioner will include those areas of education delivery considered “enterprise” areas: general areas of operation common to all delivery systems. These will be elevated to the Commissioner’s Office in the K-20 Department of Education to increase efficiency and improve service delivery. In addition to administrative areas such as communication, legal services, financial aid, government and public relations, the Commissioner’s office should also provide the administrative function to support the Florida Board of Education. These include:

Office of Technology and Information Services - The reorganized DOE should reflect the importance of a strong commitment to technology in the broadest sense. The Legislature should authorize the establishment of a Technology Office under the Commissioner that will highlight the need to utilize new and creative technologies in the transition and ongoing operation of the K-20 system at the state and local levels. The Technology/IT Office shall be responsible for developing a state and system master plan, making budget recommendations to the Commissioner, budget management, program and data collection and management for the system, and coordinating services with other state, local and private agencies.

Office of Workforce and Economic Development - All sectors of education - K-12 vocational and technical centers, community college workforce training programs and state universities - have important roles to play in Florida’s workforce and economic development. The future workforce must possess a comprehensive education as well as specific work skills. The variety of careers make it incumbent on all institutions to understand and fulfill their roles in educating future and current workers. As such, leadership for this function should come from the Commissioner’s Office.

K-20 Leadership Team - The heads of each of these divisions/offices should begin reporting to the Commissioner effective July 1, 2001. The Chancellor of Public Schools, Chancellor of Community Colleges, Chancellor of Universities and the Executive Director of Independent Education; a representative for the Technology and Information, and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development should serve to operate and direct, with the Commissioner, as the joint leaders of the seamless system and be responsible for communicating horizontally between delivery systems (as well as vertical communication within the delivery system). As members of the Commissioner’s staff, the Chancellors of each delivery system are responsible for and contributing to the overall success of a K-20 system, as opposed to serving solely as an advocate for a single delivery system.

Citizens Information Center – Public information will be a hallmark of a K-20 education delivery system. Housed within the Office of the Commissioner, this section will serve as a central contact point for student and institutional performance data, reports, fiscal and academic accountability, and general information regarding education of importance to Floridians.

Chancellors - Chancellors serve as the head of each division and are responsible for each system, providing leadership, administering programs, resolving disputes, allocating resources, making recommendations to the Board and serving as a critical member of the state level education leadership team. In this role, their responsibilities will include but not be limited to directing the division’s activities to coordinate with other divisions to provide Floridians with a seamless education system; in cooperation with other chancellors, directing the development of a priority Public Education Capital Outlay list; directing the development of the delivery system’s accountability system and recommend changes to the Florida Board of Education; evaluating the performance of each education institution under the division and report performance results to the public, legislature, Florida Board of Education and to the institution and its governing board; and directing institutional governing boards to take corrective action to improve unsatisfactory performance pursuant to the policies and directives of the Florida Board of Education.

Division of Public Schools (K-12) - This Division will include all public elementary, middle and high schools, as well as charter schools and district magnet programs.
**Division of Community Colleges** - This Division will include the state’s 28 public community colleges.

**Division of State and Independent Universities** - This division will include the state’s 10 universities. In addition, this division will include the ICUF four-year institutions (Independent Colleges and Universities) to enable more effective articulation between public and private postsecondary institutions.

**Division of Independent Education** - The reorganized DOE should include the creation of a new Division of Independent Education. The Legislature should authorize the transfer of powers and duties of the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities and the State Board of Non-Public Career Education to this division. The Governor should appoint a new consolidated commission to oversee licensing of private postsecondary institutions, consumer protection and program improvement. In addition, this division shall be defined in law as serving as the advocate for and liaison to independent education providers, including home school providers, private K-12 institutions, religious institutions, private postsecondary career preparation and vocational training institutions and others. The head of this Division should be an executive director who should establish a mechanism for regular interaction and input from independent education providers in the development of policies that provide seamless articulation for all students. The Division should be charged with the responsibility of working within the confines of the K-20 system, but constantly “thinking outside the box.” The primary purpose of this Division is to afford students and parents educational options not currently available in the public K-20 system. The head of this division should establish a mechanism for regular interaction and input from independent education providers in the development of policies that provide seamless articulation for all students. The functions of the executive director shall include but are not limited to the following:

- Learn the interests and concerns of the recipients and providers of independent education at all levels in order to strongly represent them in the Florida Department of Education.
- Participate on an equal footing with the other division heads in the key decision making process in Florida education.
- Monitor and participate in the rule making and other DOE activities that either foster or frustrate the interests of the independent sector.
- Ensure that independent sector families and schools receive the services and funds to which they are currently entitled. Foster the legitimate expansion of such services and funding.
- Establish a clearinghouse of information for private education providers and recipients.
- Foster a collaborative spirit and working relationship between the institutions of the private and public sectors.
- Identify and convey the best practices of the independent sector for the benefit of the public sector and vice versa.
- Facilitate the administration of those State services currently provided to the independent sector, such as those relating to teacher certification and background checks.
- Encourage student-centered funding and the expansion of family choice in education.
- Develop and propose courses of action to the representatives of the independent sector

**Education K-20 Policy and Research Commission/Office of Education K-20 Policy Research** - Effective July 1, 2001, the Education K-20 Policy and Research Commission should be appointed by the Governor to direct and approve the work of an independent Office of K-20 Education Policy Research, which will explore emerging issues, locate successful and innovative programs and make recommendations to improve Florida’s seamless K-20 education delivery system. The duties of the commission should be outlined in statute.

In addition, the commission would coordinate the efforts of the research centers and institutes supported with state funds to maximize the return on the state’s investment in education research. The nine members of the Education K-20 Policy and Research Commission will be appointed by the Governor. The Executive Director
6. The Florida Legislature should authorize the appointment of university boards of trustees and establish their duties and authority.

Community colleges have experienced boards of trustees and need little change in their management operations. However, universities need time to have boards appointed, provide professional board development activities, begin establishing institutional policies and procedures and begin setting direction for universities. This needs to begin with the new fiscal year. The new university boards deserve the protection and support of statewide services currently provided to state universities. Universities need time to work through providing some of these functions themselves or joining other institutions and consortia to provide the services.

The Governor will begin the process of identifying potential applicants for 90 institutional board appointments and seven state-level board appointments. This process should be open and include input from university faculty and administrators, and all Floridians. Board members should be appointed to four-year staggered terms with a two-term consecutive limit. Prospective board members will be subjected to background checks and any member who misses three consecutive meetings will be removed. Members will not be compensated for their services but may be compensated for per diem and travel expenses.

The Legislature should authorize and require a period of and resources for training to orient new trustees once appointed.

All boards need to begin the process of understanding their role within the new accountability system and to begin the process of ensuring their institutions are working toward meeting performance expectations. New board members need to develop institutional board policies, examine options for accounting, purchasing, employee benefits and procedures, and the like. This will take time and should begin this year.

Specifically, the legislation should include the following provisions:

1. Effective July 1, 2001, the Governor shall appoint the members of the Boards of Trustees for each of Florida’s 10 state universities. The Student Government Association president at each university should sit as an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees.

2. The Legislature should provide all of the functions, duties and responsibilities to each University Board of Trustees, including but not limited to, corporate status, budget authority, and tuition rates, etc., that are currently exercised by the community college system. The Legislature should provide each board of trustees the authority to set tuition for their institution within a range established each year by the Legislature. However, no tuition increase in a given year should be more than 10 percent of the previous year.

3. The Legislature should direct each Board of Trustees to submit a plan of action, including time lines with dates certain to fully implement the shift to “institutional autonomy.” Such planning should be done in concert with the interim Florida Board of Education directives.
4. The Legislature should direct the interim Florida Board of Education to develop a systemwide policy and procedure manual that each university shall adopt, including provisions for amendments and modifications.

5. The Legislature shall make provisions for each university to phase in and implement certain business and technology systems to assure a smooth transition. In the interim, universities will continue to utilize services the state currently provides.

6. The Legislature shall provide adequate funds for the higher education system to transition various services to meet the directives associated with this mandate without reducing the commitment to academic delivery systems.

7. The Legislature should provide funding and authorization requiring training of the boards of trustees concurrent with their appointments.

8. The Board of Trustees will operate in compliance with Florida’s Government in the Sunshine provisions regarding open meetings.

9. The Legislature should authorize each institutional Board of Trustees to select and appoint its institutional president subject to ratification by the Florida Board of Education. The institution’s Board of Trustees will conduct presidential searches outside the “sunshine” until such time that they are prepared to nominate a candidate to the interim Florida Board of Education. At that time, all files, interviews, meetings, appearances and comments shall be open to the public. Finalist candidates shall meet with faculty, students, staff, alumni, boosters and other support organizations deemed appropriate by the trustees in a public forum. The Board of Trustees would evaluate the President on an annual basis for the purpose of measuring effectiveness related to implementation and application of accountability system that will achieve both institution’s goals and the institution’s role in the larger K-20 education system.

The Board of Trustees would have the authority to remove the president.

10. Authorization should be given to institutional Boards of Trustees to approve new and terminate existing undergraduate and graduate degree programs (See Appendices), up to and including the master’s degree level, based on criteria established by the Florida Board of Education, with prior notification to the Office of the Chancellor. The Boards of Trustees would also provide recommendations to the Commissioner of Education and the Florida Board of Education to make to the Legislature regarding the approval or termination of doctoral and professional degree programs above the master’s level, as well as the establishment of new campuses.

11. Within the guidelines of the Florida Board of Education, the Boards of Trustees will approve faculty tenure, negotiate employee contracts, including collective bargaining. Each Board of Trustees will determine how negotiations will proceed for their institutions (as community college boards currently do). The current state contract in effect for university employees would remain in effect until a new contract is signed.
7. The Legislature should enact a comprehensive K-20 accountability system to assess the effectiveness of Florida’s K-20 education system.

The Legislature should adopt a mission statement and identify goals for Florida’s new K-20 education delivery system. The Task Force recommends the following mission statement: “The mission of Florida’s K-20 Education System is to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless efficient system, by expanding their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents, and communities, and to maintain an accountability system that measures student success toward these goals: Highest Student Achievement, Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, Skilled Workforce and Economic Development and Quality Efficient Services.

The performance accountability system enacted by the Legislature to assess the effectiveness of Florida’s new K-20 education delivery system should answer the following questions in relation to the proposed mission statement and goals:

- What is the public getting for funds it invests in education?
- How is Florida’s K-20 education system performing in terms of educating its students?
- How are the major delivery systems performing, including student achievement?
- How are individual higher education institutions, school districts and schools performing their responsibility to educate their students; - how are students performing and how much are they learning?

Additionally, the performance accountability system enacted should:
- be based primarily on student learning and performance;
- have clear goals;
- include easily understood performance measures;
- contain realistic yet challenging performance standards;
- be based on accurate, valid and reliable data;
- include steps to widely report results to the public in a timely manner;
- link performance to the budget when feasible; and
- provide incentives for good or improved performance and provide consequences for poor performances.

The Task Force recommends that the Legislature identify performance measures in law and statutorily direct the Florida Board of Education to set performance standards in order to provide Floridians with information on what the public is getting for the funds it invests in education.

(Refer to “Changes in Accountability” for the performance measures recommended by the task force to provide Floridians with information on what the public is getting for the funds it invests in education and how our K-20 system is performing).

The Legislature should statutorily direct the Florida Board of Education to identify performance measures and standards to determine how each of the delivery systems, the higher education institutions, school districts and individual schools are performing by focusing primarily on student achievement and how much students are learning. The Florida Board of Education should be directed to obtain input from the K-20 education community and the public in its deliberations to identify the performance measures and standards that will be integrated into the comprehensive K-20 accountability system to assess the effectiveness of the delivery systems and education institutions.
Integrating Performance Accountability into the Proposed Governance Structure

Superintendents, institution presidents, local board members, chancellors, the Executive Director of Independent Education, the Commissioner of Education, Florida Board of Education members, the Governor, the Legislature and all Floridians have critical roles in assessing the effectiveness of Florida’s K-20 public education system. Please refer to the Appendices for specific roles that each of the previously mentioned stakeholders will have in the task force’s proposed accountability system.

The task force’s proposed K-20 governance model establishes that school boards will be held accountable for the performance of students in their district and community college boards of trustees and university boards of trustees will be held accountable for the performance of the students and their institution. The superintendents, community college presidents and university presidents will act as chief executive officers that are responsible for the leadership and management of the institutions, school districts and/or schools. The Florida Board of Education will focus its efforts on developing and implementing K-20 education policy and overseeing and reporting on the results of the K-20 performance accountability system.

Specifically,

1. The Legislature should provide accountability and incentive funds to institutions and systems that achieve or exceed expectations from separate and enhanced funding sources.

2. The Legislature shall direct the Commissioner of Education to expedite the implementation of the K-20 data warehouse. The K-20 data warehouse currently under development will be the cornerstone of the new K-20 performance accountability system.

8. The transition process must be managed to ensure the system achieves the vision by January 2003.

The role of the Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force should adapt to reflect the expedited schedule. Now that a plan for implementation has been developed, the task force should interact with those in charge of implementation, assessing the steps and progress toward full implementation.

The task force fully understands the vision, has gained much knowledge about the changes needed and, as such, is in a unique position to monitor and guide implementation and report progress to the Legislature.

By monitoring and guiding implementation the task force will be an asset to the Interim Florida Board of Education and can free the board to begin the work of developing policies and mechanisms to make the new system work to its full potential. The task force will be a conduit for public input into the transition. In this capacity, the task force will adapt its statutory expectations and reporting requirements as established in Ch. 229 F.S. to reflect this new role.
9. **The Legislature should reinforce the need for strong coordination but should not place the Florida Partnership for School Readiness in the Florida Department of Education for purposes of administration.**

Preparation of children for kindergarten is a critical concern of the state of Florida. It is important that parents, as their children’s first teachers, and early childhood programs help children make the most of the early development years. Research has shown that opportunities missed during the early years may never be fully regained. There must be close coordination between programs for young children and the formal K-12 education providers.

Furthermore, it is the intent of the Legislature that the school readiness program not be construed as part of the system of free public schools, but rather as a program for children under the age of kindergarten eligibility, funded separately from the system of free public schools, utilizing a mandatory sliding fee scale, and providing an integrated and seamless system of school readiness services for the state’s birth-to-kindergarten population. As the Partnership makes the transition to administering more than $650 million in state and federal funds, placement in the Executive Office of the Governor is no longer feasible.

The task force recommends the Florida Partnership for School Readiness not be included in Florida’s K-20 education governance structure. The Partnership is responsible for coordinating the many services that at-risk children ages 0-5 are eligible to receive. It is imperative to be cognizant of the fact that the organizational placement of the Partnership at the state level is strictly for administrative purposes only. Program evaluation and improvement must rely heavily on early childhood services to prepare children for success in the K-12 environment. The Florida Partnership for School Readiness has recommended that the Partnership be placed as an autonomous entity within the Agency for Workforce for administrative purposes. Additionally, the Agency for Workforce Innovation has requested that the Partnership be placed in its agency because this program provides support to working families and is intended to help break the poverty cycle.

10. **The Florida Legislature should revise the Florida On-Line High School mission statement, establish a new funding methodology and house the school within the division of public schools.**

The task force makes the following recommendations concerning the Florida On-Line High School:

1. The Legislature should adopt the following mission statement for the Florida On-Line High School: “The mission of the Florida On-Line High School is to provide students with high quality technology-based educational opportunities to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the 21st century.”

2. The Florida On-Line High School is not to be an open-ended alternative for all students. Public schools offering the same course options should be the first choice of public school students. The On-Line High School should serve as an option for students who need expanded access to courses in order to meet their educational goals.
3. The task force recommends that the Department of Education’s Division of Public School administratively support the Florida-On Line High School. Additionally, the task force recommends that the Department of Education monitor the performance of the school and ensure the school’s performance is reported to the Florida Board of Education, Commissioner of Education and the Chancellor of Public Schools.

4. The task force recommends that the accountability system implemented to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the On-Line High School should contain: three goals (Highest Student Achievement, Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, and Quality Efficient Services); performance measures and performance standards to assess whether the school is meeting its intended mission; performance measures that reflect the school’s admission priorities, such as students in inner city and rural high schools who do not have access to higher-level courses and to selected higher-level courses to home education students; and a focus on the performance of students who enter or complete an online course.

5. The task force recommends that the Legislature should direct the board to become primarily self-sufficient by fiscal year 2003-04. The state should continue to fund students that are categorized as admission priorities and the school should begin collecting FTE for home-schooled students beginning in fiscal year 2001-02. The task force recommends that the board aggressively seek avenues to generate revenue to support its future endeavors. The issue of double funding for students taking courses through the On-Line High School should be resolved with an appropriate cost sharing policy for public schools supporting students who enroll in online courses. Thus, the task force is recommending that the Legislature create a policy to fairly resolve the issue of double funding students taking courses online.
THINKING BIG:
K-20 EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN FLORIDA

At the first meeting of the Transition Task Force, Governor Jeb Bush issued the following challenge to task force members:

“Think big . . . be bold and visionary and look over the horizon.”

The following sections of the Final Report capture the philosophy and approach the Transition Task Force applied in its deliberations and as the basis for its recommendations. It is imperative that those considering these recommendations are provided the perspective of the task force.

- DEFINING SEAMLESSNESS
- THE POSSIBLE VERSUS THE PRESENT
- WE CAN GET THERE FROM HERE
- THE TRANSFORMATION
- THE TASK FORCE EFFORT
- THE CHANGE IN STRUCTURE
- THE CHANGE IN ACCOUNTABILITY
DEFINING SEAMLESSNESS:
the Path to Excellence in Education

The Transition Task Force’s discussions regarding a new governance structure introduced new terminology into Florida’s education vocabulary. **Seamless** is one of the most commonly used new words being used to define what is different and better about the proposed governance structure. In defining “seamlessness,” it is important to ask one question: Outside of a constitutional mandate, why should Florida change its current education governance structure? The reason is simple: consistency in public policy leads to greater student performance. Seamlessness provides this consistency.

As the Legislature examines the recommendations made by the task force, lawmakers should ask themselves what a seamless K-20 system in Florida will look like as opposed to the bureaucratic silos and fiefdoms that govern public education today. The Task Force’s recommendations embody the essential elements of a seamless K-20 education governance structure for Florida. If the task force’s recommendations are adopted by the Legislature, Florida will be the first state in the country to have shared vision, mission, planning, core values, and accountability for all of its students.

We must implement a governance structure that supports and encourages consistent public policy by aligning acts of improvement; to attach the reality of resources to accountability; and to maintain consistency of purpose for Florida’s entire education system. “Student centered,” the heart of the new K-20 education governance structure, is reflected in the Task Force’s recommended accountability system.

THE POSSIBLE VERSUS THE PRESENT

Imagine a student portfolio that enables students to traverse between all levels of public and private schools. The portfolio becomes the student’s passport to achieve education goals and dreams. Students are the decision makers and the educational choices are avenues that they can take without encountering barriers to continue education.

Unfortunately, today’s decisions are often driven by the delivery systems, reflecting the priorities and needs of a bureaucracy rather than those of the students. Issues that are present across several delivery systems such as standards, articulation, workforce programs, distance learning, library automation, accreditation, and technology become system-driven rather than student-centered.

The Present
The following examples of what occurs today in Florida’s education governance system reinforce why Florida education is perceived as system-centered rather than student-centered:
State University System teacher preparation programs often do not respond to school district needs, either in training or producing teachers in shortage areas;

- The frequent need for remediation to access the next level of education;
- A continuing battle between the community college system and the public school system over providing workforce programs;
- Rather than cooperating, each system accuses the other of mission creep as they respond to demands for access to programs;
- The community college system and the state university system battle over lower and upper division course offerings;
- In the past, the public school system, community college system and the state university system have requested funds for the same initiative;
- Each delivery system perceives their problems are the result of the other delivery systems; and
- Public institutions deny services to students at private and independent institutions, placing barriers to public educational services.

The Possible
In the 21st century, Florida’s educational landscape will be one K-20 seamless system:

- Universities, community colleges and K-12 schools will collaborate on the design, funding and utilization of new education facilities. Local university trustee board members, local community college trustee board members and school board members will routinely meet to ascertain how they can meet the educational needs of the students they serve.
- Various delivery system entrance and exit standards will be consistent.
- Student performance as measured by learning gains and standards assessment will be the cornerstone of all institutional evaluations.
- Phrases such as, “I’ll lose my FTE” and “we have always provided that service” must be eliminated in order to serve students and realize the vision the Legislature has created.
- Guiding principles adopted by the Legislature set a new vision for Florida’s K-20 education governance structure.

Universities of Excellence
This vision reflects a university system that works in cooperation with community colleges, public schools and independent colleges and universities to provide an array of quality education programs; one that more aggressively forms partnerships with other research entities and with national and international businesses to create new knowledge and new products to improve the economic development of Florida and improve the quality of life worldwide. This vision reflects a means for universities to communicate high student expectations to all educational levels to enable them to help students attain these standards.

Responsive Community Colleges
This vision reflects a community college and workforce education system that is nimble and responsive to the growth of high tech industry; a community college system that provides easily accessible and affordable education and training opportunities to improve the standard of living of many Floridians; a system that provides a trained workforce for economic development. The vision sees local colleges getting out of the box and forming partnerships with other public and private education providers to better serve our students. With the students being the focus of new alliances, the old barriers that separated delivery systems could disappear for the benefit of students.
Public Schools that Prepare
The vision reflects public schools that work more closely with colleges of education and in-service programs to improve and expand the preparation of teachers for the vital and sometimes difficult jobs they perform. This vision reflects high expectations for public schools that will clearly incorporate into the K-12 curriculum and assessment system the standards needed for success in college and vocational training, and, more importantly, success at the next level of learning to which they strive.

Choice and Options as Partnerships
This vision reflects private schools, independent education programs and home school providers as partners in our state’s overall mission to provide quality education experiences for all students. These educational programs would be viewed as not only options, but sources of innovation and checks on public education, not as threats to the public system. Best practices could be shared to benefit students whether they choose a public or private path of educational opportunities – or, as is the reality for many – a combination of both — to reach their educational goals. State policies would reflect the need to improve opportunities for all students, not just those in one sector.

WE CAN GET THERE FROM HERE
A system that first considers the student must be seamless, must remove arbitrary barriers that protect turf, must be open to the needs of citizens over institutions, must promote better and more consistent interaction with those the system serves. It must reduce the number of boards and commissions, and therefore minimize the gaps between educational levels. The goal is a single education delivery system versus a segmented series of uncommunicative silos that value one part of the system at the expense of another. Such a single system must promote a rational and efficient use of resources in the most effective way possible.

Education Governance Reorganization Act
The attainment of this vision led the 2000 Florida Legislature to enact the Education Governance Reorganization Act to implement the mandate of the people to include education governance in the state constitution. Through this act, the Governor will appoint the state’s Board of Education to oversee a single education delivery system, kindergarten through graduate school. This new Florida Board of Education shall focus solely on education and appoint a Commissioner of Education to manage and carry out the attainment of the state’s education vision, mission and goals.

The Florida Legislature developed this approach not capriciously, but based on the deliberate and in-depth review of education governance by a Blue Ribbon Committee appointed by the sitting Education Commissioner. The Blue Ribbon Committee brought together citizens representing all aspects of education, state leadership and analysis to fully vet the possibilities at stake in redesigning an education governance model for one of the fastest growing and most dynamic states in the nation.

The Legislature also created the Transition Task Force to guide Florida from its current state of a disjointed, segmented collection of separate education systems to a seamless structure that encompasses kindergarten through postsecondary and revolves around a student-centered approach in its delivery of education services for lifelong learning.

Guiding Principles
The Transition Task Force has, in its charge of recommending to the Legislature the steps needed to move toward a new governance structure, stayed true to the Guiding Principles established in the legislation now a
part of Florida law. The *Guiding Principles* mandate that the new governance structure:

- be a coordinated, seamless system for kindergarten through graduate school education;
- be student-centered in every facet;
- maximize education access and academic success for all Floridians;
- safeguard equity and refuse to compromise academic excellence; and
- emphasize local control of institutions.

These principles reflect the rationale of the majority recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission by placing priority on those receiving education, as opposed to those providing education; strengthen the citizen’s ability to hold the Governor accountable for one seamless education system; strengthen local authority by placing decision making for operational issues at the local level and policy issues at the state level; and providing for stronger articulation and communication across all systems.

### The Transformation

The issue of education governance reorganization has been debated in open forum for several years and has been a natural progression in Florida’s emergence as a leader in education reform. We cannot expect Florida’s education delivery system, built in the 19th century, to propel students beyond the world of the 21st century. And so, we find ourselves face to face with a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to build an education delivery system that places student learning at the center, and which acknowledges the fact that students take many different paths to achieve their potential.

This process of building a 21st century education delivery system actually began back in 1997. Below is a chronology of events leading up to the Transition Task Force activities:

1. **1997 — Constitutional Revision Commission.** Recommended amendment to Florida Constitution to reduce the size of the state Cabinet from the Governor and six independently elected officers (who sit as the State Board of Education) to the Governor and three elected officials. It recommended that the elected Commissioner of Education be eliminated and transferred to a position appointed by the Governor. This was viewed as a way of transitioning Florida’s form of government from a “Weak Governor” to a “Strong Governor” by placing more accountability for education on the shoulders of the Governor.

2. **1998 — Cabinet Revision (Amendment 8) approved by voters overwhelmingly.** In effect, they gave up their right to elect the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education, giving this responsibility to the Governor. Prior to this, there was no single source of accountability for education (diffused among Governor, State Board of Education/Cabinet and elected Commissioner).

3. **1999 — Commissioner’s Blue Ribbon Committee** (appointed by then-Education Commissioner Tom Gallagher). Full review and public discussion of new education governance models in light of the constitutional change. Recommendations for a new model were forwarded to the Legislature.

4. **2000 — Florida Legislature approved HB 2263,** which “sunsetted” most state boards and commissions which govern education. This was a way to “wipe the slate clean” and build a
new governance model that is seamless, student-centered, which values excellence, provides greater access and promotes academic success. Also reinforces that accountability for the state’s education system rests with the highest elected leader in the state: the Governor.

**THE TASK FORCE EFFORT**

The *Transition Task Force* was appointed by Governor Bush (five members), then-Speaker of the House John Thrasher (three members) and then-Senate President Toni Jennings (three members) in August 2000. Its first meeting was held in September 2000, with one meeting each month through February 2001 in cities throughout the state. The task force endeavored to review thousands of pages of literature on education governance and accountability and received ideas from hundreds of persons, experts and lay citizens. The task force was true to its promise to provide ample opportunity for full input. A website ([http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/government/learn/egrt_taskforce/index.html](http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/government/learn/egrt_taskforce/index.html)) included all materials presented to and considered by the task force, and was a vehicle for a live web cast of each meeting. The public was encouraged to email questions, ideas and concerns to the staff and task force members, and public testimony during meetings was encouraged and utilized. Their input has benefited the process, resulted in a more thorough evaluation and has provided a solid set of recommendations.

The task force heard from academicians, consultants and lay persons from Florida and throughout the nation — on issues related to governance, accountability, accreditation and higher education. The consensus: there is no one education governance structure that guarantees excellence in education. Consultants agreed that Florida is on the cutting edge of a national movement to unify education across delivery systems and provide a seamless array of options to citizens. Florida must design a governance model that addresses the unique needs of the students in its charge and which is built on a strong system of accountability. Florida is leading the way for other states.

**Pioneers in Governance**

Florida has a tradition, an expectation, of taking on problems that impede its citizens and to finding solutions that become models for states throughout the nation: welfare to work, tourism and economic development, among others. Florida’s innovative approach to education governance is not just cutting edge in its organizational structure, but more importantly in two fundamental acknowledgments:

1. **Student learning cannot be neatly confined to isolated delivery systems.** Students do not follow a simple or straight route to reach their educational destination. Indeed, their educational destination changes each step of the way. In acknowledging these fundamental considerations about student learning, Florida has moved leap years beyond the old model of educational delivery, where stages of education are clustered in silos, separate and apart from one another. They are divided by walls constructed of graduation standards that are inconsistent with entrance requirements, rules that prohibit credits being transferred from a private institution to a public one, practices that discourage partnerships between delivery systems, and competition for resources that rewards dollars over improved delivery.

2. **Accountability must be the basis for an effective governance structure.** The proposed education governance model is first and foremost an accountability system for education. In a dramatic departure from the old way of thinking in education governance, Florida has established the accountability system first, and will build the organizational infrastructure to support it. It’s the tried and true “form
follows function” approach that has been all but ignored in education. Accountability first, governance second.

Florida - the fastest growing state in the nation with one of the most dynamic and diverse populations in the nation – cannot wait and hope that another state addresses these issues first. Our objective has not been to merely rearrange the organizational chart. Our charge has been to change the mindset of education delivery — to take the focus off what works for the system to what works for the student. This is a fundamental shift not only in philosophy but also in our state’s approach to accountability-based management in education.

**Changes in Structure**

The changes in Florida’s education governance structure can be described as going from three separate systems to one single, seamless system. The fundamental changes in Florida’s education governance structure are derived directly from the *Guiding Principles* set in Florida law (*S. 229.01-06 F.S.*):

1. Accountability is the common thread that runs throughout the system.
2. The heretofore separate delivery systems (public schools, community colleges and universities) have been combined as divisions within the Department of Education. Their chancellors will be required to work together on policy development, partnerships and strategies to promote student success at each level.
3. There is a new division devoted to providing parents and citizens with more options in education, encouraging partnerships with independent education providers such as private schools, and ensuring that policies are supportive of students moving back and forth from independent education options to government run schools.
4. There are fewer boards to segment the systems and that tend to protect systems at the expense of common goals.
5. There is a clear line of accountability to the Governor, envisioned by the constitutional amendment. The citizens of Florida can make their voice heard regarding education directly through their choice of governor.
6. There is one Florida Board of Education to which citizens and students can appeal regardless of their role, their grade level or their status.
7. Appointees to the Florida Board of Education will represent the needs of the entire spectrum of education delivery and will not be appointed to represent specific constituencies or special interests in education.

*Position papers and final recommendations regarding specific areas of governance are provided in the Appendices.*
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CHANGES IN ACCOUNTABILITY

A seamless system of education requires a different and cohesive approach to accountability. The accountability system for any endeavor should provide clear goals and performance measures to inform everyone of the progress made toward attaining the goals. The process begins with a consensus on the purpose or mission of the endeavor. To unify Florida behind a common purpose for its education governance structure, the Transition Task Force offers the following mission statement for all of education in Florida:

“The mission of Florida’s K-20 Education System is to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless efficient system by expanding their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents, and communities; and to maintain an accountability system that measures student success toward these goals: Highest Student Achievement, Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access, Skilled Workforce and Economic Development and Quality Efficient Services.”

The performance accountability system ultimately implemented to assess the effectiveness of Florida’s new K-20 education delivery system should answer the following questions in relation to the proposed mission statement and goals:

1. What is the public getting for funds it invests in education?
2. How is Florida’s K-20 education system performing in terms of educating its students?
3. How are the major delivery systems performing, including student achievement?
4. How are individual higher education institutions, school districts and schools performing their responsibility to educate their students - how are students performing and how much are they learning?

The performance accountability system implemented should:

- be based primarily on student learning and performance;
- have clear goals;
- include easily understood performance measures;
- contain realistic yet challenging performance standards;
- be based on accurate, valid and reliable data;
- include steps to widely report results to the public;
- link performance to the budget when feasible, and
- provide incentives for good or improved performance and consequences for poor performances.

Most importantly, the accountability for education in Florida should be shared by all involved. Members of the Florida Board of Education, school board members, institutional board trustees and presidents, superintendents, faculty, students, parents and the communities they serve should have a role in improving education. Literally no one outside the education system can articulate how we are to know if our education institutions are performing.

Public schools have received greater scrutiny in recent years, with citizens becoming active participants in setting expectations and helping to achieve goals. Accountability of this type is less definable in higher education. While there is no question that universities serve a different mission than public schools and community colleges – and therefore require different measures – it must be stressed that those measures should be easily understood and targeted toward student learning. The proposed accountability system will move Florida toward achieving educational expectations at all levels. Please refer to the following table for the performance measures that the task force is recommending to the Legislature.
## Proposed K-20 Accountability Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the public getting for the funds it invests in education?</th>
<th>How is Florida’s K-20 education system performing in terms of educating its students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(these measures would be identified in substantive law)</td>
<td>(these measures would be included in the General Appropriations Act Implementing Bill)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Highest Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
<th>% of 3rd – 10th students gaining one year of learning in 1 years time – FCAT.</th>
<th>Students are achieving at a rate sufficient to be ready for the next level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and % of schools that improve at least one letter grade or maintain an A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation/Completion Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td># and % of students retained in the 4th grade because they are not reading on grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS, Adult Ed., and GED</td>
<td></td>
<td># and % of students who substantially meet the sunshine state standards at 4th, 5th, 8th, and 10th grades (defined as level 3 and above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td># and % of high school graduates needing remediation in public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
<td># and % of AA transfers that perform well in the state universities (maintain at least a 2.5 GPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td># and % of first time test takers that pass the CLAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate degree – FTIC and AA transfer students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulation and Maximum Access</th>
<th>% ready for next level (index using readiness at K-postsecondary)</th>
<th>Measure that evaluates how well exit requirements match entrance requirements for the next system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and % of students needing remediation</td>
<td># and % of students needing remediation in 6th and 9th grades (FCAT test).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Floridians with AA, AS and Baccalaureate degrees</td>
<td># and % of students who need remediation after graduating from High School by subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and % of credits not accepted from one institution to a comparable institution.</td>
<td># and % of students who complete remediation at Community Colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of High School graduates enrolled in postsecondary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of High School graduates entering postsecondary education from low income families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of High School graduates eligible for Bright Futures Scholarships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State grant aid for low income families as a percent of federal Pell Grant aid to low income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of students enrolled in postsecondary education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access (continued) | # and % of AA grads entering and graduating from state universities.  
# and % of AA grads required to take lower division courses at state universities.  
access to high demand postsecondary degrees  
1. % of high demand bachelors degrees available through distance learning or joint use facilities at CCs  
1. % of credit hours earned through distance learning or joint use facilities  
% of distance learning occurring off campus |
|---|---|
| 3. Skilled Workforce and Economic Development | % of graduates/completers placed in a job related to their training  
- HS  
- Adult ed, GED  
- Certificates  
- AS  
- AA  
- Baccalaureate Degree  
- Advanced Degrees  
% of graduates/completers earning more than $XXXX (to vary by level)  
- HS  
- Adult ed, GED  
- Certificates  
- AS  
- AA  
- Baccalaureate degree  
- Advanced Degrees  
# and % of programs training students for occupations in which they will earn more than $XXXX ($9 per hr?)  
Externally generated research funds per ranked faculty member |
| 4. Quality Efficient Services | Cost per completer or Graduate  
Cost disparity across institutions offering same degrees  
Average cost per non-completer  
- HS  
- Adult ed, GED  
- Certificates  
- AS  
- AA  
- Baccalaureate degree  
- Advanced Degrees  
% of customers (K-12, CC, SUS) satisfied with the support and responses provided to district inquiries by DOE.  
| Cost per completer or graduate  
[Use total cost – state (operating and capital), federal, private, etc.]  
# and % of students who graduate from the CC and SUS with excess hours  
# and % of students not promoted annually  
# and % of students who accelerate through programs such as AP, IB, and Dual Enrollment  
% of education funds spent in the classroom  
Cost of distance learning programs DOE:  
% of actions that meet timeliness standards [educator certification, response to district inquiries, producing TA memos/information for districts, fund disbursement both grants and appropriations] |