



CONNECTICUT STATE
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Early College Program Steering Committee Meeting
61 Woodland Street, Hartford
Minutes of September 23, 2014

Members Present: Sally Biggs, Mike Breen, Carmen Cid, Kate Carter, Elizabeth Cowles, Suzanne D'Annolfo, Elliot Ginsberg, Robin Golden, Robert Henderson, Katie Kelley, Lori Matyjas, Arthur Poole, Ray Rossomando, Judy Resnick, Gail Stevens, Wendi Richardson (representing Gillian Thorne)

Members Absent: Tracy Ariel, Melony Brady-Shanley, Dennis Bogusky, Dolores Garcia-Blocker, Ted Gardella, Stephan McKeever, Steven Minkler, Robert Trefry, Sal Pascarella, Manuel Rivera, Dianna Roberge-Wentzell

Staff and Guests: Robin Golden, Michael Kent, Katie Magboo, Mary Skelly

Welcome New Members:

Robin Golden opened the meeting by welcoming new members. The only new member present at the time of the welcome was Suzanne D'Annolfo representing the Connecticut Association of Schools Board of Directors. Other new members not present included: Melony Brady Shanley, Principal of the Hartford Public Schools Academy of Nursing and Health Sciences; Manuel Rivera, Superintendent of Norwalk Public Schools; Anthony Gasper, Assistant Superintendent of Windham Public Schools; Sal Pascarella Superintendent of Danbury Public Schools; and, Stephan McKeever, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) First Vice President (K-12).

Agenda Items 2 and 3 were switched because Guest Speaker Alice Pritchard was running a bit behind.

College of Technology (COT)/Connecticut Technical High School System (CTHSS) Articulated Credit Model-Mary Skelly (Karen Wosczyzna-Birch was unable to attend)

Robin Golden introduced this agenda item and explained that she would like to revise the Steering Committee Report to include this as a 5th Early College Model for replication. The articulated credit model involves students getting college credit for high school course work. The colleges give the credit through the process of articulation.

Mary began her presentation by explaining that Robin Golden, Karen Wosczyzna-Birch and Tracy Ariel met to discuss developing an Early College transfer and articulation agreement between the CT Technical High School System and the COT. Through the course of this meeting it was revealed that the COT already has articulated pathways with the community colleges and eight colleges and universities. It was noted that many of the programs being offered in the technical high schools align with the community colleges. Questions were raised about how the transfer of the articulated credits occurs. Mary explained that the transfer of credit happens much like the way AP credits do. The credits are not

awarded to students upon graduation from the CTHSS; they are awarded upon admission to Community College.

As the COT and the CTHSS begin to implement this model, the initial focus will be on manufacturing. (The model will eventually expand to other areas.) Significant work has already been done on the manufacturing pathways because of the Advanced Manufacturing Centers at four of the colleges. The pathways include NIMS credentials that then equate to a certain number of community college credits. Credentials can have the weight of as little as one to as many as four credits. A student may have the opportunity to qualify to earn up to fifteen credits in manufacturing (Advanced Manufacturing Machine Certificate- 1st Semester) upon entrance to the community college system. These credits are treated as transfer credits.

The goal of the COT is to create bridges to all community colleges and enable CTHSS graduates to seamlessly transition to ConnSCU institutions. There should be no unnecessary duplication of coursework in this model. The COT and CTHSS collaboration on the articulated credit model meets a lot of legislative requirements for the two systems to work together. This model is still in the development stages. There are 206 career and technical high school programs where a mid-level associate's degree is critical to successful employment and certain pathways where a higher level BS is necessary. This model can pave the way for CTHSS students to achieve the degrees necessary for success in their chosen careers.

Elliot Ginsberg who participated via conference call raised several questions regarding this model. He wondered what the relationship was between this model and the existing manufacturing programs. Mary stated that this model differentiates between certificate programs and AS programs. He went on to further express concern about those CTHSS graduates who did not get this benefit of articulated credit. Robin expressed that this was an important idea and could be viewed as the "Go Back to Get Ahead" for the CTHSS. Tracy Ariel is working with CTHSS on how to alert recent graduates regarding the opportunities available to them through the articulated credit model. It was noted that there was concern that CTHSS manufacturing graduates who hold the Machining Level 1 NIMS credentials might be too advanced for some of the manufacturing community college programs. CTHSS had briefly considered scaling back its curriculum but realized that it was important to continue expanding the opportunities for CTHSS students to earn NIMS credentials. CTHSS is working closely with Tracy Ariel and the Advanced Manufacturing Centers to ensure there is no duplication for qualified CTHSS graduates. Mary Skelly acknowledged that Elliot Ginsberg was right in his concern because if the manufacturing pathways at the CTHSS and the community colleges were not differentiated and aligned efforts would be duplicated. There was also concern over the community college certificate programs. Tracy and Mary will be working on one of the Transform CSCU 2020 Initiatives related to this alignment process and will be developing the Road Map of goals and milestones for this program model.

Judith Resnick added that her group—the Connecticut Planning Commission for Higher Education—came out with a draft plan including specific goals related to how many associates' degrees, bachelors' degrees and career certificates the group thinks are required to ensure a skilled workforce. This relates directly to the work of the Early College Steering Committee, and as Suzanne D'Annolfo pointed out, leaves room for all students and space to figure out what is a best fit for each individual student.

Robin explained that the COT is creating pathways that the BOR is putting through as a kind of “transfer and articulation” process in an effort to make the transition from community colleges to the CSUs easier. The COT already has articulated pathways from the community colleges to the CSUs and is set to have BOR approval soon. Robin sees the COT pathway with the THSS as the first piece to expanding our Early College work to include the state universities.

Suzanne D’Annolfo pointed to the University of Hartford as a model program where there is an open door policy between the university and high school that is housed on campus. She stated that we need to recognize that we are all educators and for students one size does not fit all. A question was then raised about limiting the articulated credit to only CTHSS graduates when there are students in comprehensive high schools that take tech courses and could take more at night. Some information needs to be given to them to alert them of the potential opportunities that exist with articulated credit.

CETC (Connecticut Employment and training Commission) Alice Pritchard (Executive Director of The Connecticut Women’s Education and Legal Fund) and Richard Pierson (Consultant and member of Workforce Competitiveness and Workforce Investment Boards)

Alice Pritchard began this portion of the meeting by giving an overview of CETC’s purpose and charges. During the last legislative session, CETC was asked to write a plan for how to create, expand, and improve programs to develop the workforce- including contextualized learning, early college, middle college and career certificates. Finding common language among all of the players has been critical to their efforts. In their report they will use the Steering Committee’s language for the attributes required for early college programs. They will also provide attributes for the other categories (contextualized learning – including IBEST, and certificates). CETC is looking at school (proprietary, BOR, and private) to career paths. The committee wants to look at these through the lens of what is already happening. CETC chairman- Don Shubert does not want to create unnecessary work and reinvent already turning wheels. The three areas of CETCs focus are already of value to the legislature and therefore there is value to standardizing language and attributes thus calibrating all stakeholders’ lenses. CETC’s plan should include an inventory and they will use our definitions of what already exists to come up with the plan, a rational system for implementation and replication, metrics by which to define and track student success, compare results (which is hard to do), and engage the emerging industries (manufacturing, health, green, and technology) through the five regional WIBs.

Carmen Cid, Co-Chair of the Early College Steering Committee, asked about how the CSUs fit into the CETC equation? Is it possible that the pathways could ensure that the general education requirements are met prior to CSU enrollment?

Alice went on to explain that they are looking at contextualized learning as a basic level of achievement, early college as a way to capture investments, and career certificates as a way to go a bit further but not as far as a four year degree. Carmen added that sometimes students come in with course work that can translate to a minor rather than a certificate. Alice went on to explain that there is not necessarily a flow into early college from contextualized learning because the target for contextualized learning is adults. There might still be some overlap, but not much.

CETC’s plan is due to the legislature by 1/1/2015 and a report on progress is due to come out in September of 2015. At this point CETC is unsure about where the legislature’s preferences lie. The

question of where apprenticeships come into the equation was raised. Alice explained that these might come into the conversation about career certificates.

The Steering Committee suggested that CETC draw a schematic for the legislatures to help them understand the multiple pathways. This would give them a clearer picture of what all of the programs look like.

The conversation then circled back to dual credit courses. In terms of dual credit vs not dual credit courses, the question was raised as to how students are aware of all of their options. Does this occur within high school guidance offices? Robin explained that we need to inform the consumer (students) of their options. There are stories where students entered community college unaware that they already had credits earned. Elizabeth Cowles suggested that we make a map for the consumer because politicians don't understand the nuances. Sally Biggs added that credit cannot simply be awarded on a yes or no basis because there are combination ways to achieve credits. Thus, a technical map may not be appropriate but something should exist for students. We cannot just assume that a student is watching over herself because some will and some won't.

Add COT/CTHSS Articulated Credit Model as a 5th Early College Model for Replication

Robin proposed that the COT/CTHSS articulated credit model be added to the Steering Committee Report as a 5th early college model for replication. The committee agreed to this.

Confirm Next Steps

The Committee reviewed the revised Next Steps that Robin changed based upon the conversation at the last Steering Committee meeting. She asked if there were any additional changes that the Committee wanted before we posted the full Revised Report.

- A. The additional Early College Model program connecting COT and CTHSS will appear as a new section of the Next Steps.
- B. Another section will be added to reflect the need to work on a variety of issues related to the expansion, improvement and implementation of Early College Programs. For example, with the Dual Enrollment changes required by NEASC (and NACEP) high school students must be treated the same as other college students. This will have an implication on how the students are entered into Banner (and how they are reported to the Federal database called IPEDS). Robin and Katie are going to meet with the folks from Banner and IR to find a resolution that meets with the needs of IPEDS and NEASC. Robin added that as of now, the community colleges do not need to do anything with this until the fall of 2015 (unless we hear differently from IPEDS). Robin pointed out that this will not be the last road bump that early college encounters; citing the example that there is currently no legislation to cover 9-14 programs like P-TECH.

Another issue is how to treat high school faculty. Robin explained that UCONN gives ECE high school teachers a version of adjunct status. Katie Kelly then brought up the need to standardize how we register students and treat and compensate college faculty. Currently some colleges are paying faculty for the additional time dedicated to early college efforts while others are using release time.

- C. The Committee asked to have the section on Metrics revised. Elizabeth Cowles spoke about how the College Board promises institutions granting AP credit, that students will achieve an A or B in the next course. She then expressed concern over the term “metrics”. A conversation about how the Transform 2020 metrics have been explained to the colleges then ensued. Robin interjected and explained that for the purposes of the Steering Committee, metrics are clearly defined. One is for colleges to report on how they are using the money the Early College program of the BOR provides them. The other metrics are general across all institutions (for example, the number of students who participate in early college programs and then go on to enroll in community colleges; how successful these students are, etc.) These general metrics should get at measuring early college goals to give students better access to higher education through lowering the need for remediation, making college affordable, increasing completion, and addressing issues of equity.

P-TECH Update –Robin Golden and Katie Magboo

Katie informed the Steering Committee that there were still hopes of launching 3 new P-TECH model programs for the start of the 2015-2016 school year (Danbury, Windham, and New London). She explained that Robin and she met with Liz Donahue, Aaron Frankel, and Kerri Kelly from the Governor’s office about creating sustainable funding for these programs. It was advised that we shy away from a corporate/state fund in favor of drafting legislation to support these programs going forward. Katie explained that there were plans for Robin and her to meet with Kyle Thomas to draft such legislation. In the meantime, to support the existing program in Norwalk, three new programs in 2015 and those slated for 2016 the BOR would be asking for a set dollar amount in the biennial budget to cover costs associated with just the FY2016 and FY2017.

Other Business

Wendi Richardson, representing Gillian Thorne, is the Assistant Director of the Office of Early College Programing and the Director of Enrollment Management at UConn and she spoke about the regional chapter of NACEP opening and the meetings in October and November as a possible sounding board for these discussions because other states will be present and able to articulate how they do business.

The question of AP then came up. AP course articulated credit is up to the purview of the college or university faculty and can sometimes vary by department. An AP exam score of a 3 might work for the English department but the Biology department might require a 4 or 5. There is not set policy from the College Board or at individual institutions. Carmen Cid expressed her desire to standardize the admissions requirements for granting AP credit to make sense system wide. Michael Breen expressed his concern with AP being at the table at all. He explained that Rockville High School where he is a teacher has done away with AP entirely in favor of Dual Enrollment courses.