10. TAKE ACTION

Implementation Action VI

Inform Student Transitions to Higher Education

Part of IMPLEMENTING Common Core State Standards and Assessments

A Workbook for State and District Leaders

To download the full workbook, go to www.parcconline.org/CommonCoreImplementationWorkbook

Achieve

EDI U.S. EDUCATION DELIVERY INSTITUTE

IN THIS SECTION

10. Implementation Action VI: Inform Student Transitions to Higher Education: Aligning Postsecondary Course Expectations to the Common Core State Standards and Each Other

Diagnostic questions to guide your team's reading of this chapter:

- How does your system ensure consistency of rigor and expectations between and across similar developmental and first-year postsecondary courses and the Common Core State Standards?
- Does your system have clear strategies to train postsecondary faculty on the scope, sequence and expectations of the Common Core State Standards?
- How will postsecondary faculty who instruct first-year, credit-bearing courses and developmental modules/courses in mathematics and English language arts receive this training?

College readiness has become a core policy objective for K–12 systems in nearly every state — an objective often shared with the states' higher education leaders and institutions. Ultimately, K–12 and higher education systems have a common goal of increasing the number of students entering postsecondary education better prepared for success and for attaining market-valued certifications and associate, bachelor's, professional and graduate degrees.

Similarly, college completion has become a core policy objective for higher education systems in nearly every state. Higher education institutions are increasingly under pressure to graduate more students, more quickly and for lower cost while better preparing them for a changing economy. A shared vision of the final years of high school and the first years of college, and a tight alignment of K–12 and postsecondary policies, programs and initiatives, stands to greatly advance the goals of both the K–12 and higher education systems. Through deep collaboration, postsecondary and K–12 leaders can address shared policy concerns around college preparation and college success, leading to improved student outcomes across the board.

Because the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were developed through strong collaboration between K–12 and higher education experts across multiple states for the express purpose of defining a shared vision of the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in postsecondary pursuits, they can serve as the anchor for a wide range of alignment efforts. The widespread adoption of the CCSS and the ongoing work to develop well-aligned common college- and career-ready assessments — through the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and with continuing joint involvement of K–12 and higher education stakeholders — present institutions of higher education with a unique opportunity. These institutions — whether public or private, two year or four year — will have a new, robust tool at their disposal that can signal readiness for the demands of academic pursuits after high school. This tool will enable higher education to more effectively and efficiently focus on the core mission of advancing learning and knowledge to higher levels.

The CCSS will have major implications for higher education systems. The standards can serve to **define entry points** in the colleges of arts and sciences and teacher preparation programs as well as **define new and stronger roles for institutions of higher education in the professional development of in-service educators.** Higher education presidents, chief academic officers, department chairs, faculty, deans, provosts, education governing bodies and faculty organizations can all play a part in the successful implementation of the standards. Higher education leaders must be "ambassadors" of the CCSS and PARCC and are a critical link in the chain of communications with a variety of stakeholders. The stronger the pipeline from K–12, the better prepared students will be for postsecondary education.

Successful implementation of the CCSS will be characterized by efforts that involve and rely on the expertise of both K–12 and higher education leaders. You may be a higher education faculty member seeking to better understand the expectations of the CCSS in mathematics, what students will be prepared for in your college algebra course and how your course should be adapted. You may be a higher education leader looking to drive this work and reach out to local K–12 leaders to coordinate in-service professional development. Or you may be a K–12 leader who realizes the important role higher education plays in the preparation of students and teachers and wishes to work collaboratively on some of the elements in this chapter.

EXERCISE: CREATE A COLLABORATIVE WORKING TEAM

Purpose: To identify and create a collaborative working team to align your higher education system, university or college first-year courses with the CCSS. The team should include both higher education and K–12 membership to ensure coherence. Reference pages 3.5–3.8 of the workbook to inform your conversations of how the governance of this effort is connected to the overall CCSS implementation effort.

Who should participate? Higher education leadership, members of the Board of Regents, deans, provosts, K–12 liaison(s), etc. should complete this exercise.

Directions:

1. Brainstorm possible members of the collaborative working team.
2. Narrow the list by excluding those who would be unlikely to ever support the work.
3. Evaluate your list using the following criteria, and make any necessary changes:
    a. Diversity (sphere of influence, roles, content areas, etc.);
    b. Balance (leadership, expertise, credibility, etc.); and
    c. Potential to work together.
4. Check for overlap, make any necessary changes and finalize your collaborative working team members.

Member/type of position	Level of engagement/ understanding of the CCSS (very low, low, high, very high)	Sphere of influence (content knowledge, leadership, etc.)	Role you want them to play	What it will take to motivate them to work with you

Vertically and Horizontally Align Developmental and First-Year, Credit-Bearing Courses to the CCSS

You must seek to identify and make the necessary adjustments (e.g., content covered in CCSS should not appear) to current first-year, credit-bearing courses; developmental modules or courses; and placement assessments to achieve alignment to the CCSS and to one another, as well as increase the overall coherence of the system. Regardless of whether a student is planning on becoming a teacher, historian, radio technician or scientist, a core set of knowledge and skills should be present in first-year, credit-bearing courses. Conducting a series of vertical (progression of content, performance expectations, outcomes, etc. from course to course) and horizontal (consistency of learning objectives, outcomes, etc. among similar courses) alignment initiatives around courses and placement assessments through diligent faculty engagement will ensure that your faculty and leadership understand what students know and can do upon entry. Once alignment is completed, your faculty will be free to do more rigorous work in first-year courses and offer more innovative and targeted assistance to students in need through more effective and targeted developmental modules/courses. The discussions of vertical and horizontal alignment of courses are presented separately but should be considered in concert with one another and will overlap considerably.

You may find it helpful to develop a plan for CCSS integration into these courses. The development of a plan should be a collaborative effort. Institutions of higher education often operate with a great deal of autonomy and can be very diverse. Local buy-in, support and ownership will be critical to ensure the success of the effort. The plan should stipulate ownership and responsibility for managing the work and moving it forward — including who will lead and be responsible for executing the work, how progress will be monitored and how outcomes will be communicated.

Vertical Alignment of Courses

Examine and Align First-Year, Credit-Bearing Courses and the CCSS (K–12 Exit Expectations)

One policy goal should be for first-year, credit-bearing courses to reflect a logical progression from the CCSS. Vertical alignment is more than just content progression; the strength of the performance expectations for students when they exit high school and enter postsecondary is also critical.

You should solicit sample course syllabi, instructional materials and associated outcomes from two- and four-year institutions. These syllabi reflect courses that are representative of first-year, credit-bearing courses in both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Since the content between courses is expected to vary according to the institution/state from which it is drawn, you should sample a range of institutions. This work should be done by faculty working groups that include representatives from different sectors and institution types within the higher education community. Faculty engaged in this process should identify what knowledge, content, performances and/or skills are expected both in the CCSS and in their own courses.

By comparing first-year, credit-bearing course syllabi and outcomes with the CCSS, you can answer questions such as:

- **What concepts and skills required in the CCSS also appear in the first-year courses?**
- **Where might there be gaps between the CCSS and first-year courses?**
- **What priority standards are emphasized and/or missing?**
- **What are the current areas of emphasis, e.g., fractions, modeling, linear equations?**

Engaging in this process will likely be very similar to a state's process of establishing course equivalencies across higher education institutions to create strong articulation and transfer systems or create common course numbering systems: Examining syllabi, convening faculty, discussing levels of rigor and learning outcomes, and determining course descriptions require a high level of commonality but also accommodate differentiation and customization.

These vertical alignment exercises will complement the work under way at many postsecondary institutions to define student learning outcomes at the degree level — that is, specific definitions of what students should know and be able to do upon graduation at the associate and bachelor's degree levels.

CASE STORY: RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island has created high-level guidance documents on how the CCSS will affect higher education and what can be done by arts and sciences and teacher preparation faculty to ensure a seamless transition. For example, arts and sciences faculty can "review content courses that are specifically targeted to teacher candidates (e.g., Mathematics for Elementary Teachers) for alignment with CCSS." Teacher preparation faculty can "change guidelines and rubrics for assignments on planning instruction (e.g., lesson plans, work samples, exit portfolios) to require candidates [to] plan with CCSS in appropriate subjects." ***You can find more details here.***

Examine and Align Developmental and First-Year, Credit-Bearing Courses

Another key policy goal should be for the progression from developmental modules or courses to first-year, credit-bearing courses to be clear and logical. Just as K–12 and higher education expectations for the knowledge and skills required for success in first-year, credit-bearing courses historically have been disconnected, a similar disconnect has existed relative to the exit expectations of developmental modules/courses. Including developmental modules/courses in a vertical alignment process is critical, as the content of the developmental modules/courses must be "forward mapped" to the content of first-year, credit-bearing courses to ensure a successful progression for students.

The majority of developmental education courses are provided at community colleges and less selective public universities. In some states, developmental education courses are offered exclusively at the community college level. If this is the case in your state, it is imperative that stakeholders across your two- and four-year institutions work collaboratively to ensure that developmental education course completion requirements effectively prepare a student to meet the entry expectations of your four-year institutions. This vertical alignment better positions students to access multiple paths to degree attainment.

One approach you can take would be to solicit sample course syllabi, instructional materials and associated outcomes for institutions' developmental modules/courses to determine the strength of vertical alignment between these courses and first-year, credit-bearing courses at sample institutions. These efforts should include representative developmental modules/courses in math, English and/or writing. Again, this work should be done by faculty working groups that include representatives from different sectors and institution types within the higher education community. By comparing course syllabi, instructional materials and associated outcomes with the first-year, credit-bearing courses, you can answer questions such as:

- **What are the areas of redundancy?**
- **What is omitted?**
- **How consistent are current course descriptors?**
- **How consistent are current expected outcomes/course objectives?**
- **What are the current areas of emphasis?**
- **Do curricula for developmental modules/courses align to the CCSS?**

Beyond the course content itself, the CCSS provide an opportunity to think creatively about developmental course offerings and how those courses are organized and delivered so that students spend more time on learning the content they do not understand and less time on content they have already mastered. Historically, semester-long courses have been the norm, but some systems have begun to create more focused, modular courses or offer concurrent enrollment in developmental courses and credit-bearing courses to more efficiently bring students up to speed and simplify the path to credit-bearing courses and eventual degree attainment.

CASE STORY: TENNESSEE

The Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR), in collaboration with the Education Commission of the States and the National Center for Academic Transformation, has worked since 2006 to successfully redesign the delivery of math and English developmental education at community colleges and select universities by leveraging technology to reduce instructional costs, increase retention and improve student learning outcomes. Students advance in their coursework when the identified gaps in their knowledge are filled rather than when the semester ends. English and math curriculum revision committees of seven to nine expert faculty have aligned developmental course curriculum with high school- and college-level expectations. Gathering feedback and monitoring outcomes is an ongoing process: A task force of faculty and TBR administrators are evaluating assessment placement policies and tools to improve placement and measurement of the impact of developmental course delivery. ***More information on the Tennessee Developmental Studies Redesign Project can be found here***.

CASE STORY: VIRGINIA

To better position itself to meet the ***2015 goals*** of its strategic plan to increase access, increase attainment and manage costs, the Virginia Community College System launched a new developmental math curriculum in January 2012 in all of its 23 colleges. In conjunction with a revised placement test, students now take up to 10 units of the modular curriculum and spend time on the most critical areas of need. Changes to the English developmental courses are scheduled for 2013. ***Specifics around the developmental education redesign effort — including the teams involved, process undertaken and recommendations — can be found here***.

Examine and Align Developmental Modules/Courses and the CCSS and Collaborate on Delivery of Developmental Courses in High School

There will continue to be students (older students, those who have dropped out of high school, etc.) who seek to enroll in postsecondary programs but do not meet standards of college readiness. Since the CCSS reflect such standards, you should examine your developmental modules/courses and make them reflect the CCSS. In doing so, you will achieve a level of coherence; every path of entry to a first-year, credit-bearing course will have the CCSS as its foundation. So, for example, if a developmental course in intermediate algebra is designed to prepare a student to succeed in college algebra, then the intermediate algebra course should reflect the content and performance expectations established by the CCSS — which have also been designed to prepare students to succeed in college algebra. Similarly, intensive summer programs offered by postsecondary systems that concentrate on building requisite college- and career-ready skills between high school graduation and matriculation to postsecondary institutions should be anchored in the CCSS.

The CCSS should be viewed as an opportunity to rethink and rebuild developmental education to be more efficient, effective and tailored to the needs of students. Developmental modules/courses must be data-driven and demonstrate continuous improvement in closing students' knowledge gaps. Aligning developmental modules/courses to the CCSS also creates avenues for you to collaborate with K–12 systems, e.g., around designing and implementing bridge courses for students who do not score college ready on the high school assessments. Students can close gaps in college-ready skills prior to needing developmental modules/courses at the postsecondary level.

CASE STORY: KENTUCKY

Kentucky is not waiting to signal a student's need for remediation until after high school. Instead the state is prescribing activities and actions in a student's senior year to close any identified college readiness gaps, including bridge courses to remediate math/English deficiencies. Through a collaborative effort with the Southern Regional Education Board, teams of Kentucky secondary and postsecondary educators assisted area school districts and high schools in designing and implementing "transitional courses" in math and reading in high school.

Kentucky administers the ACT to all 11th graders. Students who score below the readiness benchmarks for English, reading or mathematics on the ACT are targeted with the transitional bridge interventions as a strategy to promote college and career readiness and degree completion. Each course may be offered as a full semester but could also be offered as an intervention for students before or after school. ***Additional details on the work in Kentucky can be found here***.

Align Assessment Measures and the CCSS

Vertical alignment should not be limited to course content and performance expectations. Equally as important is the assessment method used to determine student content knowledge/mastery and readiness. For example, if assessments require students to demonstrate their ability to work through problems in K–12 (performance-based assessments), a similar demonstration of such ability should be included in the postsecondary assessments — rather than relying solely on a more traditional multiple-choice test.

You should re-examine college and university placement policies based on assessment measures to ensure that they are anchored in the CCSS. By refining and strengthening placement policies, you will send a clear signal as to what constitutes postsecondary readiness. Additionally, whether the assessment is state developed or national (e.g., ACT, SAT, COMPASS, ASSET), you should consider common placement standards across all institutions in your state for first-year, credit-bearing courses. This is an opportunity to send consistent, clear signals to the K–12 community — including teachers, students and parents — about readiness expectations for postsecondary education.

CASE STORY: FLORIDA

The Florida Department of Education has begun administering the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT), a placement test available to high school and entering postsecondary students that has been aligned to the CCSS. With PERT established as Florida's primary postsecondary placement assessment, the focus of the work moving forward will be to administer PERT diagnostic tests in high school to identify specific student weaknesses. Higher education faculty will customize coursework (mini-developmental classes) to address specific student weaknesses. ***You can find more information here***.

EXERCISE: ASSESS THE PLAN TO ALIGN FIRST-YEAR, CREDIT BEARING-COURSES

Purpose: To assist in any of your planning exercises and to help plan the alignment of developmental modules/courses to first-year, credit-bearing courses and to the CCSS. Completing the stakeholder mapping exercise in Chapter 4 of the workbook will help you identify the individuals most critical for the success of this work.

Who should participate? This exercise should be completed by the higher education leadership team that wrote/manages the plan with input as needed from the collaborative working team.

Directions:

1. Examine your plan for aligning first-year, credit-bearing courses and think through the questions for consideration listed below.
2. For each element, record your self-assessment of progress toward achieving the elements.
3. Identify areas or ideas for improving the element, including specific next steps and responsible parties, and record these in the template.
4. Define priority next steps.

	Questions for consideration	Self-assessment of progress	Areas or ideas for improvement
Leadership and stakeholder engage-ment	• Has an individual been identified to lead and be responsible for the work? • Does the individual have the leverage and/or relationships necessary to coordinate the effort? • Have the relevant experts been engaged? • Do the stakeholders have a high degree of influence? • Is there wide buy-in for the aspiration inside and outside of the department responsible for this work?		
Awareness and shared under-standing	• Is the plan posted or easily accessible to stakeholders? • Have all of the stakeholders reviewed the plan? • Have risks been identified? Is there a strategy to mitigate or address risks that surface?		
Established criteria for quality	• Has the working team established criteria for high quality? • Does the plan address all of the criteria? • Is the plan specific and comprehensive, providing enough detail and accounting for everything relevant? • Is there a clear timetable and set of milestones to measure progress? • Is there a process and strategy for communicating the outcomes of this effort to a broader set of stakeholders?		
Logic and coherence	• Is the logic behind the plan sound or arbitrary? • Is the plan coherent overall? • Does it align with existing activities, mechanisms and campus/institutions goals?		
Next steps:			

Horizontal Alignment of Courses

Another policy goal should be for first-year, credit-bearing courses that are similarly titled to have similar content and rigor across all higher education institutions (and for these courses to reflect a logical progression from the CCSS detailed in the vertical alignment discussion on the previous pages). Rather than look exclusively at course descriptors — the typical level of detail used for horizontal alignment — you should seek more information on the content, rigor and consistency of the first-year, credit-bearing courses. Horizontal alignment is more than just matching coverage of content; the performance expectations for students at the beginning and conclusion of a course are also critical.

This exercise will allow for a better understanding of the current horizontal alignment between courses across your system. You should solicit sample course syllabi, instructional materials and associated outcomes from a range of two- and four-year institutions. These syllabi reflect courses that are representative of first-year, credit-bearing courses in both ELA and mathematics. This work should be done by faculty working groups that include representatives from different sectors and institution types within the higher education community.

By comparing first-year, credit-bearing course syllabi and outcomes with one another, you can answer questions such as:

- **What concepts and skills required in similarly titled courses are missing from others?**
- **How consistent are current expected outcomes/course objectives?**
- **How consistent are current course descriptors?**

CASE STORY: COLORADO

The CAP4K legislation requires that all educator preparation programs at [institutes of higher education (IHEs)] align their content to the new [Colorado Academic Standards (CAS)] by December 15, 2012. The [Colorado (CO)] Department of Higher Education (DHE) and the CO Department of Education (CDE) have been working over the last two years to bring about these changes.

Additionally, CO is one of 10 states to receive a Lumina/Gates/Hewlett grant to align K-12 and postsecondary standards and assessments. A specific focus of the grant is the use of the aligned assessments as one element in the determination of a student's readiness for placement into credit-bearing courses by postsecondary institutions. In partnership with the DHE, CHE is planning outreach to IHE faculty related to alignment of academic expectations for pre-school through postsecondary students and revision of educator preparation programs. CDE and DHE have initiated plans for outreach through the Council of Colorado Deans of Education. Regional meetings with both content and education faculty will be conducted through 2012 to introduce the new standards and promote shared understanding of increased academic expectations. Specific training on the Colorado English Language Proficiency Standards will be provided to higher education faculty as a support for English language learners in mastering the CAS as well as a means of supporting all students in developing academic language to meet content area standards.

Excerpted from the approved ***Colorado Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Request***.

Align Professional Development for Higher Education Leadership and Faculty to the CCSS

Successful implementation of the CCSS will not happen without engaging the higher education community in building an understanding of and support for the CCSS. Content faculty must understand how the CCSS will improve the work they do in their first-year, credit-bearing courses; teacher preparation faculty who train new teachers must make certain that new teachers will be able to teach the CCSS; and depending upon your state context and local conditions, higher education faculty who provide in-service training of veteran teachers will need a deep understanding of the CCSS. The advent of the CCSS provides new opportunities for collaboration between colleges of arts and sciences, schools of education, and faculty who provide in-service professional development on the CCSS.

Perhaps the most critical element of engaging higher education is simply improving the general understanding and awareness of the CCSS and assessments. General awareness sessions on the CCSS and assessments may be most appropriate for directors, deans, provosts, department chairs, education governing bodies and faculty organizations to build support and buy-in. You will need to consider the existing channels for delivering information to faculty and determine whether these will meet the needs of this type of awareness campaign.

Some state higher education systems have begun the work of integrating the CCSS into colleges of arts and sciences and teacher colleges, as well as into in-service teacher training conducted by higher education. In some states this work has been initiated by higher education institutions, while in others is has been catalyzed by legislative action, P–20 structures or directives from senior leadership in the state. What will work best in one state or system with a strong P–20 governing body will not be effective in a state with autonomous higher education institutions that historically have had a disconnected relationship with K–12.

Professional Development for Arts and Sciences Faculty and Teacher Educators

You can take a variety of approaches to engage higher education faculty around the CCSS. Targeted, intensive professional development will be appropriate for college faculty teaching introductory-level courses and general education courses, content faculty in the arts and sciences, developmental education faculty, and part-time faculty. This professional development may include first working to build a full understanding of the new CCSS through a detailed study of the the standards: structure, content, rigor, progression, etc. Particular emphasis should be placed on the fact that the CCSS are a significant departure from any previously developed state standards. As it is not common practice for entry-level course faculty to examine the state's K–12 content standards, this activity will be very new for many participants.

Teacher educators should look to the CCSS to signal what their own students should know and be able to do to succeed as effective teachers. Among the questions to consider:

- **How are the state's K–12 standards currently embedded in teacher preparation programs?**
- **How might this need to change?**
- **How can faculty ensure that their aspiring teachers know how to analyze and interpret standards to guide their teaching?**

Depending on the level of commitment required, higher education institutions might encourage faculty participation in professional development activities through a stipend, course release time, or other positive incentives and recognition.

CASE STORY: TENNESSEE

[The s]tate has launched two projects for teacher and principal training programs: (1) Integrating Common Core into Pre-Service Training, and (2) Integrating TVAAS into Pre-Service Training.

[The Tennessee Department of Education], in collaboration with the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), has undertaken a number of key activities to ensure a solid foundation for these projects: A small team of Deans of Colleges of Education in public and private universities has been assembled to develop the plan for CCSS integration; [r]esearch has been gathered from institutions with success in standards integration into pre-service curriculum as well as national organizations focused on implementation; [i]nterviews have been conducted with several institutions regarding current practice on standards integration; [a]fter sending out an RFP, the state will choose a vendor and convene a committee to work with the vendor to develop a statewide curriculum for integrating CCSS into pre-service training. The curriculum will provide a common tool for all programs to use, but will allow for enough flexibility so that it can meet the specific needs of individual programs and [local education agencies].

Excerpted from the approved ***Tennessee ESEA Flexibility Request***.

Professional Development for In-Service Teacher-Educators

The majority of teachers in schools today will require in-service professional development on the CCSS; only a small percentage of a state's overall teaching force enter from teacher preparation programs each year. Higher education can play a key role in bridging the knowledge gaps for the majority of teachers already in the classroom and in meaningfully engaging educators through professional learning opportunities to ensure that the CCSS can be translated into the day-to-day life of the classroom experience.

Just as the vertical alignment of courses and standards between K–12 and higher education is important, so is the consistency between the preservice education aspiring teachers receive and the in-service professional development that teachers in the field receive. One way to ensure alignment between in-service and preservice education is to involve higher education faculty members, at varying types of institutions and in the fields of both education and arts and sciences, in the development of professional development modules. These modules might include tasks, lesson plans and standards mapping exercises. Additionally, the coordinated development of these modules allows for the possibility of faculty at partner institutions of higher education to administer or teach the modules to their K–12 peers.

CASE STORY: KENTUCKY

Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education is leading the professional development for postsecondary faculty on the CCSS and related assessments. To date, more than 2,000 faculty have participated in online modules, face-to-face workshops and webinars created to outline the impact of the CCSS on general education, developmental education and college of education faculty; postsecondary coursework and curriculum; and classroom learning. Also, as part of Senate Bill 1, Kentucky's higher education institutions have created professional development plans focused on integrating the CCSS into teacher preparation course instruction. ***More information can be found here.***

CASE STORY: OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education has partnered with the [state education agency (SEA)] to implement Common Core systems across the State. The Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP) oversees colleges of education and teacher and leader certification examinations. The SEA is currently partnering with OCTP and the Regents to develop standards, curriculum, and a certification test for Elementary Math Specialists that will target implementation of the CCSS in elementary schools. In addition, the SEA is collaborating with OCTP and the Regents to explore possibilities surrounding CCSS certification as a way of validating the work that teachers and administrators are doing to understand, master, and lead implementation of the CCSS.

The SEA representative to the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (OACTE) provides regular information to the Association members and receives feedback from the members regarding implementation strategies. Additional training for the OACTE members, who are deans of Oklahoma's colleges of teacher education preparation programs, related to implementation of the CCSS was provided.

The SEA provides leadership and guidance to support teachers- and principals-in-training as well as in their entry years. The SEA conducts principal academies for new principals as well as principals in School Improvement Schools, conducts first-year superintendent training, and provides leadership coaches to principals in struggling schools. Through the 60 REAC3H Coaches and the program formerly known as the State Superintendent's Master Teachers Project, the SEA develops teacher leaders in all six regions of the State focused on implementation of the CCSS. The REAC3H Coaches will model lessons for and facilitate collaboration between educators in all regions of the state.

Excerpted from the approved ***Oklahoma ESEA Flexibility Request***.

Additional Higher Education Issues

Beyond the scope of this chapter but worth noting is the necessity for higher education systems to connect with K–12 schools and provide feedback on how well prepared for and how successful students are in first-year, credit-bearing courses. For students requiring developmental modules/courses, the feedback includes how quickly students are remediated and students' specific areas of weakness. These feedback reports may be issued by postsecondary coordinating boards, higher education institutions, P–20 organizations or a hybrid of different stakeholders. States should also incorporate developmental education module/course success benchmarks into accountability systems to reinforce and signal the critical role these courses play in shoring up the pipeline to attaining a postsecondary degree. Absent a feedback loop or benchmarks to inform the K–12 system of student (and school) achievement after high school and drive action, high schools lack important data that could inform decisions to improve policies and practices around increasing student preparedness. Higher education systems also benefit from collecting and analyzing data on the effectiveness of their developmental education modules/courses.

EXERCISE: INVENTORY OF COURSE ALIGNMENT

Purpose: To create an inventory of the alignment of CCSS, development modules/courses and first-year courses offered by your state higher education system (or college, university, etc.) and identify priority areas of work for the alignment teams.

Who should participate? The collaborative working team should complete this exercise.

Directions:

1. Audit the universe of course offerings within your higher education system/university/college that build on one another and the CCSS.
2. Consider the courses that will need to be culled, adapted, etc.
3. Regularly update this inventory to drive action and monitor progress over time.
4. Consider how these will be connected to broader routines for the effort (see workbook Chapter 11 for additional details and exercises).

CCSS/high school course	First-year, credit-bearing course	Alignment rating (low, middle, high, very high)	Rationale summary	Degree of challenge to align (scale of task, obstacles)	Next steps

EXERCISE: INVENTORY OF COURSE ALIGNMENT

Developmental module/course	First-year, credit-bearing course	Alignment rating (low, middle, high, very high)	Rationale summary	Degree of challenge to align (scale of task, obstacles)	Next steps

EXERCISE: INVENTORY OF COURSE ALIGNMENT

CCSS/high school course	Related developmental module/course	Alignment rating (low, middle, high, very high)	Rationale summary	Degree of challenge to align (scale of task, obstacles)	Next steps

Conclusion

The higher education community should play a pivotal role in increasing the coherence of the P–20 system by vertically and horizontally aligning developmental and first-year, credit-bearing courses to the CCSS and aligning professional development for higher education leadership and faculty to the CCSS. It is now time to put all this planning together by creating a set of routines that will allow the strategic implementation team to drive implementation and solve problems as they arise.

NOTES