

Notes – 11/18/13 Early College Task Force meeting at BOR

Overview of meeting – Task Force was charged and emphasis placed on 1) assessing complete inventory of existing community college-high school partnerships for all twelve community colleges, 2) developing list of attributes for a “best early college program” with research on existing best models in and out of CT, 3) using “best practices” research to address consideration of co-location vs. separate high school location for partnership models, and 4) considering funding sources, including corporate partnerships in the implementation of an early college program partnership. Task Force subgroups and individual members will begin working on these issues to share back with the full group.

President Gray’s charge – The Early College Task Force must stay very focused. This Task Force will become a Steering Committee for this mission. Our focus now is only with the community colleges. First task is to get an inventory by community college of what partnerships are in place with high schools. Next we need to come up with what is the best model the Task Force can suggest for all twelve community colleges to develop/maintain an Early College partnership with high schools. The Task Force needs to consider ways to pay for these partnerships that is useful information for the rest of the community colleges. We are here to develop a program that is far reaching for all community colleges. This partnership template will be part of the Excel CT plan for the BOR system of colleges/universities. This template needs to provide not just the early college preparation but the stepping stones to the job market in IT areas, etc. In Iowa, 50% of students are involved in early college programs. We are laying a foundation for community college education for the next 25 years.

Commissioner Pryor encouraged us to figure out what is the right subset of 6 community colleges to get going with template-directed programs in the BOR system now. Are we targeting high achieving students or students at risk? Are we focusing on co-locating of programs at the community college campus or off-campus at the high school? Need to create high quality programming for the students that simulates the college experience. Where and who are we to work on – where to locate the programming and which students to target.

What are the schools that would connect to those twelve community colleges? What is best as an academic priority? Define criteria of what is to be considered a “full early college experience”. In Iowa 50% of the students are taking college courses but it’s not an organized early college experience. Need an inventory of all the different ways that CT high school students are engaging in college coursework experiences. This is a triage inventory. Work with the College Career Pathway program that is already in place at all 12 community colleges? These are 10-12th graders who are involved. Check out the NACEP model used by UCONN in the Early College experience.

Seamless connections between the high school and the community colleges are most important. Robin Golden suggests the PTECH IBM model as a full blown “early college” program. The IBM model prescribes the curriculum and chooses the principal and teachers.

Co-location model vs. separate from college high school location? The value of co-location is to immerse students in the college atmosphere so they envision themselves as college students. The other model is to empower students to make it to college faster. Co-location question? Find out what is going on in our community college system to decide on that question.

Wright Tech HS requires a bus ride to Norwalk CC but is a good program. Work backwards from the profile of what a quality program looks like – for example in New Haven, where there is no co-location in

some quality programs. Describe the alignment of curriculum in the two schools – do a quick view of what we image a quality program looks like. We might try to launch another program of each type. Professional training of teachers involved in these programs. What do you have now and what are its strengths and why go with another model? What do you want done differently and why? What is meant by rigor? What are the assets? What are the deficiencies? What do we want to know about the programs that exist? We can break the big committee into subgroups. Reinforcing the need for a grid of the twelve colleges and what they are doing with the high schools. Need to also list the attributes of high quality models. Need to identify partnership models that we might look to as key models for additional input. Do strategic planning about getting from where we are to where we want to go – do mapping to where we want to go. One model is not likely to fit all the community colleges since the college's physical location can affect transportation, -- need to know what each site has and what are the success rates for those institutions. Go back to the College Career Pathways program data through Arthur Poole of the BOR.

Describe what has worked and what are the challenges in the existing relationships between high schools and each of the community colleges. Work on this from the perspective of the community college.

TO DO check list:

- 1) Inventory of all types of high school and community college partnerships currently in place - presidents will provide the numbers – add a “target audience” column to the matrix and “outcomes” and also a “funding source” (grants, corporate how they pay for it
- 2) Create a list of attributes of what is considered a high quality early college program and do research on “best practices” models – Dolores, Gillian ,Sally Biggs, Ted, Sally, Robin, Mike Bob Trefry, Bob Henderson, Gail and Elliot
- 3) Co-location vs. stand alone separate high school – pros and cons- Work on defining these pros and cons after we compile the attributes. Funding source for the building influences this.
- 4) Need a list of definitions of what is an “early college partnership” vs. an “early college experience”. Gail Carter has a list of these definitions that can be used to provide direction – from her Ph.D. dissertation – shared with Dianna Roberge-Wentzell – Gail will follow up on this.
- 5) Assemble above information into tables for sharing with the full committee.
- 6) Ted Gardella will provide data on best practices for assessment of success in AP courses.
- 7) Ted Hart of the BOR will look at the NACEP model of how things are to be done. We can get BOR IT to create a SharePT portal for sharing information and reports.

1 pm on Mondays is a good time for meeting as a large group or as small subgroups.