

Early College Task Force 3/10/14 Meeting Minutes

Present: Judy Resnick, Steve Minkler, Robert Henderson, Bob Trefry, Arthur Poole, Lori Matyjas, Robin Golden, Gillian Thorne, Dianna Roberge-Wentzell, Dolores Garcia-Blocker and Sally Biggs.

Guests: Aynsley Diamond and Jan Kiehne

Absent: Carmen Cid, Gail Coppage, Gail Stevens, Elliott Ginsberg, Ted Gardella, Mike Alfano, Mike Breen, Dennis Bogusky and Kate Carter

Robin asked that we change the order of the agenda so that our guests could speak first and then leave before the rest of the meeting.

Development of Multiple Measures for College Readiness as Required by PA 12-40: Robin introduced Aynsley Diamond. Aynsley is the Transfer and Articulation Policy Program Manager for the Board of Regents. As one of many roles, Aynsley is the lead person on compliance with the multiple measures requirements of PA 12-40, a major component of the new bill. There is an Advisory Committee on PA 12-40 that includes college and K-12 representatives. They recently held a multiple measures summit to talk about what different colleges were thinking of using and to talk about best practices. During the Summit, there was confusion in the room from the colleges. Some thought that the BOR was going to tell the colleges WHAT to use for their multiple measures. That is not the case. Each college was free to explore multiple measures of assessment. The Advisory Committee is collecting a list of all of the measures that the schools are currently considering. Those include: SAT, ACT, Accuplacer (and affiliated products), MyMathLAB by Pearson, ALEKS software, high school transcripts, interviews, non-cognitive assessments such as the GRIT survey. Eventually the Smarter Balance assessments may be used, but this year the results will not be available by individual student.

Aynsley reported that some campuses are happy with SAT, ACT and Accuplacer. Aynsley reports that Accuplacer has some new products that may make the test even more helpful. But most schools are unfamiliar with these new products. Some colleges are using college challenge essays to determine readiness for college English, but that is very staff intensive. Many of the schools are looking forward to trying something new, often planning to pair the new assessments with more traditional ones.

The next step is to collect data from all of the colleges and universities and to start to funnel down to what will actually be used. Engagement and input from the K-12 districts of each college will be critical.

One Task Force member asked if there was a requirement that at least one of the measures used by any particular college be standardized. Aynsley said that there are no requirements at this point. They have two years to figure this out according to the Act. They eventually need to determine what are “commonly accepted” standards which is what the Act requires. It was mentioned that the state universities do not use the same assessments as each other.

Robin asked if there was going to be a set cut score for all colleges to use across the system for each of the standardized assessments. Aynsley said that there used to be a set “range” for cut scores using Accuplacer. This has been put on hold and the use of cut scores is one issue that will be investigated over the next two years. Dianna said that there is no firm appropriate score that

should be used. You need an evidence based comprehensive picture of a particular student's readiness.

Several Task Force members indicated interest in seeing the GRIT survey. Robin said that she would try to find out and share more information. It is being used as a pilot in a few of the community colleges.

Lola reported that NHPS Principals are asking for better K-12 articulation, so they can better prepare students for college and career. On April 11th from 8:30 am to 3:00 pm there is going to be a "Remediation and Transfer Strategies Conference" at Middlesex Community College; strategies and best practices will be reviewed. This is also being run by the PA 12-40 Advisory Committee.

State Definition of College and Career Readiness: Given all the discussion regarding the selection of measures to determine if students are ready for college, Robin asked if it might not make sense for us to have a shared definition of "College and Career Readiness" that would then inform which measures should be used. This came up at the Convening that Robin and others attended in Baltimore last week. The Convening was hosted by the College Career Readiness Partnership (CCRP) and had teams of college and K-12 representatives from 11 states. There were many issues discussed, but a lot of focus was on implementation of common core and the obstacles that different states are facing. Robin brought Arthur, Lola, Bob Trefry and Lori as the Connecticut team. Several presenters discussed the importance of having a shared definition of college and career readiness and reported that several states have actually put the definition into state statute.

This led to a discussion among the Task Force members. The general opinion was that such a definition did NOT belong in statute. That would put it in the hands of legislators instead of educators. Robin will share the statutory definitions from other states with the Task Force. Task Force members wanted, if possible, to find out why the various states decided to put the definition in the statute. At the end of the discussion, everyone agreed that we (the K-12, college and workforce communities) should have a shared definition, just not one that is put in a statute.

P-20 Council Definition: Aynsley reported that the P-20 Council has adopted a college and career readiness definition and that it is quite comprehensive. It was strongly based upon the work of David Conley.) Robin will share that with the Task Force for future discussion.

Waiver Application Definition: When the SDOE had to put together its waiver application quickly for the Federal Department of Education, they developed a different definition of college and career readiness than the P-20 Council. Robin will share this as well.

Introduction of P-20 WIN Data Sharing Effort: Robin introduced Jan Kiehne to briefly describe her work on the "P-20 and Workforce Information Network" (P-20 WIN) which is a collaborative effort of the SDOE, BOR and the Department of Labor. Jan says that they are in the process of implementing this and have made significant progress. But, this is not going to be a database that everyone will have access to. It will be controlled by a committee and formal application will need to be made to get reports. Any reports requested and approved for entities outside of the SDOE, BOR, and DOL will only be able to get information in the aggregate. Eventually, it may be possible to provide the public with some canned aggregate reports.

Diana says that there is concern among parents regarding what information is being collected and shared about their children. We all need to be very sensitive about this right now.

Bob Trefry explained about Strive in Norwalk and how reports from this data base could be very helpful to groups like theirs. Jan says it would be good to know from Strive and other like groups exactly what aggregate reports will be most useful so that they can make sure they are planning for this in the future. Lola says that a workforce report would be very helpful to K-12 folks (and college folks) like the Clearing House data is helpful regarding college completion.

New Legislation Regarding Mastery Based Learning: Dianna reported that there is new legislation that addresses the granting of high school credit for college courses. Robin will send the legislation to everyone. Prior to this legislation, when college courses were allowed to be used for high school credit, it was only for .5 credits, which did not appropriately reflect the amount of work completed by the student.

There is union concern about granting high school credit for courses taught by faculty that are not certified to teach high school students. UCONN has used high school teachers as “precepts” or co-teachers to address this issue. Trinity Magnet High School has the high school and college faculties work together over the summer.

Superintendent Concern about Creaming of Students: Dianna said that there was some concern being expressed by superintendents around the proliferation of formal early college programs. They are already concerned that Tech High Schools and Magnet Schools are taking their best students.

Draft Budget for Early College Funding in Governor’s Budget: Robin explained that she was asked to quickly put together a budget for these funds in response to a request from the Appropriations Sub-Committee for Higher Education. Robin attended a workshop with several other members of the BOR staff including Dr. Gray. In general, the reaction of the Appropriations Sub-Committee was positive. They did feel that there needed to be more money for remediation. The \$4 million for remediation in the Governor’s budget is not part of the \$2.5 million for the early college programs. Robin hoped that an increase there would not result in any decrease of the \$2.5 million.

The group talked about how there was still a need for on-going funding for staff to support early college programs at each college. Some expressed disappointment that these funds were not multi0year. As stated by the Governor, this \$2.5 million has to be seen as just a down payment. The Task Force (soon to become the Steering Committee) will need to advocate for future funding with the legislature. The group was also concerned that this funding will not be approved until after the legislature finishes the session in May. There is a lot of work that should be started now to properly expend these funds and to begin all the efforts that we outline.

Finally the group thought that, given that the \$2.5 million is only for one year, we should not spend \$100,000 for membership in the JFF’s Pathways to Prosperity Network. Rather, we should use those funds to convene our own state-wide events to bring together the teams college/K-12 teams working on early college programs at each college. The Task Force felt that this would help us make much more progress in solidifying the partnerships at the local level.

Brief Report on Data Sub-Committee: Robin reported that the data sub-committee had its first meeting and it went well. We will give a more in-depth report at the next meeting. Robin asked

one clarifying question. She heard Phyllis say that Banner does NOT collect information on non-career related CCP courses. Bob Henderson clarified what he thinks she was referring to. There is a report called the 604 Report from Banner that only shows the students that have taken the career courses. The colleges have to submit this every spring. But, there is another report (the SWRKA16 report) that includes all courses and that will have to be the one that gets used going forward.

Standardization of the CCP Program: Robin talked about identifying four or five colleges to participate in the first cohort to try to achieve NACEP accreditation. She said that Aynsley has funding to pay for an afternoon session on May 9th (piggybacking onto the morning conference on NEASC accreditation). We talked about some first steps that we could start taking including:

- Arthur and Lori will help identify which colleges should participate (in addition to MCC) in this first cohort and help identify team members.
- Gillian says that there are a lot of courses that overlap with the UCONN ECE courses. She will put together a matrix of those courses.
- We will start to put together a matrix of all courses that are articulated at each college and with which high schools. The idea is to get a comprehensive list of all the articulated courses currently, so we can examine which ones we think should become part of the standardization.
- Dianna indicated that the professional development that would come as part of this standardization for high school teachers might be able to count towards their score in the professional domain part of the teacher evaluation process. This might help encourage teachers to participate. We would need to meet with the Talent Office at the SDE about this.

Future Meetings: We all agreed that, to the extent possible, we would plan future Task Force (soon to be Steering Committee) meetings for 3:00 pm so that the two teacher members can more easily attend. Robin will provide dates for discussion at our next meeting.