Early College Program Steering Committee Meeting  
61 Woodland Street, Hartford  
Minutes of December 9, 2014

Present: Tracy Ariel, Suzanne D’Annolfo, Tony Gasper, Robin Golden, Arthur Poole, Judy Resnick, Ray Rossomando, June Sanford, and Dianna Roberge-Wentzell

On the phone were: Kate Carter, Carmen Cid, Katie Kelly, Elliot Ginsberg, Katie Magboo, and Bob Trefry (Several people were unable to get on the call due to a technical difficulty and are therefore not reflected as attempting to participate. We will make sure this does not happen again.).

The meeting was called to order by Robin Golden at 3:00 pm. Robin welcomed everyone. Robin reported that Mike Breen, a critical member of this committee, is leaving teaching to work fulltime at CEA. He wanted to be at the meeting to tell everyone personally because he thought he would have to leave the Steering Committee. However, it turns out that he may be able to stay on the Committee and will let us know.

Review of the Minutes: Ray Rossomando suggested, and offered changes, to the Minutes of the November 10th meeting. The Minutes will be updated and posted on the webpage.

CETC Draft Report Review – Robin had provided the committee with a draft of the “Plan to Provide Education, Training and Job Placement in Emerging Industries: Contextualized Learning, Early College and Career Certificate Programs” prepared by the CETC work group in advance. She asked if there were any substantive comments. The final report needs to be submitted to the Legislature in January. She noted that, in the report, the CETC work is formally recommending support of the Early College efforts:

**Recommendation 3: Early College**

The Work Group supports the plan developed by the Early College Steering Committee to guide implementation of early college initiatives going forward. The Steering Committee will continue its efforts to identify promising strategies, seek funding and resources, and promote replication of successful models. The Steering Committee seeks ($3,497,095 for FY16 and $4,470,710 for FY17 to support Early College efforts in the next biennial state budget. CETC supports these efforts and will include Steering Committee leadership in future related CETC planning activities.
The CETC work group also asks that the Early College Steering Committee continues to align our efforts in the following ways:

The Steering Committee should align its efforts with those identified in this report by:

- Encouraging alignment and linkage of Early College programs with the efforts of local/regional employers, in partnership with the Workforce Investment Boards, Department of Economic and Community Development, and Connecticut Department of Labor.
- Adopt/apply/reporting on consistent performance objectives and outcome measures to assess program effectiveness, promote continuous improvement and link future funding to program performance.
- Developing and maintaining an accessible inventory of programs in each early college category, including funding, program details, outcomes, etc., in a customer-friendly format.

Robin asked the EC Steering Committee to review these statements and formally approve them.

During discussion, Judy Resnick said that she supports the BOR’s work (and the statements), and understands that funding may be needed, but she is not comfortable saying that the Steering Committee supports the specific budget request until she and others understand how the $3,497,095 will be used for the FY 15 and $4,470,710 for FY 17. Judy’s concern comes from the fact that the draft says that the Steering Committee is seeking the funding. This is actually not accurate, Robin offered to make it clear that it is the BOR seeking the funding, not the Early College Steering Committee. Arthur suggested that she make that change in the language, and all were in agreement and are comfortable with this. Carmen said the good thing is that CETC supports the work the Early College Steering Committee is doing. Robin will share the budget break down with the Steering Committee for a full discussion at the next meeting.

Vote to Approve: Arthur made a motion to approve alignment of efforts and the three recommendations. Tony seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed the motion. Language regarding this approval will be added to the CETC report.

**Planning Commission on Higher Education:** Judy spoke about the Planning Commission’s process and goals. Judy chairs this Commission. Robin suggested that the Committee should become familiar with the specific goals and metrics so that we can align our work with those goals. Judy will provide Robin with the most up-to-date version and she will provide it to the Committee for discussion at our next meeting. Robin will share the link to the Commission’s website with the EC Steering Committee. Judy said the more we align the better.

**Carl D. Perkins – Career and Technical Educational Improvement Act of 2006 Fact Sheet** (handout) was reviewed and discussed by June Sanford. There could be duplicates in the 131,000 participation number cited in the report. June explained how the secondary programs and the post-secondary are determined. Reserves are used for competitive funds. One half is used to fund CCP. The other half is for
special secondary innovation model programs. These can change every year. They are looking for accountability with student success. Core indicators are established by government by law. Arthur works with SDE to define the core indicator goals and reports these numbers in December.

The Federal Act that makes these funds available should be reauthorized in the next year. The future Act may require stronger relationships with the Workforce Investment Boards and business. June spoke about the Association of Career Technical Education (ACTE) (https://acteonline.org/) which has been focusing on the policy issues in the reauthorization process. The Steering Committee should keep on top of this reauthorization process to see how it will impact early college programming.

June stated that 85 percent of federal money must be given to LEAs, and only 5 percent can be applied to administration which includes clerical support and travel. SDE asks that 5% percent be set aside for professional development. Lori Matyjas has defined what a program of study is. June explained some new polices that will be implemented next year. If anyone needs further explanation, please contact Lori.

June talked about how the tech high schools get different funding than the comprehensive schools. June said we can look into what are other states doing. It can help advise us what we do here. Bob affirmed that we are going to take some students from the CT Vocational Technical High Schools.

**Update on NEASC Conversation:** Dianna and Suzanne had a conversation with NEASC Higher Education Commission President Barbara Brittingham (Pat O’Brien was not available). They expressed their concerns regarding the impact on K-12 of the new Dual Enrollment Policy. Barbara explained that each institution is separate when it comes to NEASC accreditation, so state-wide standard processes would not be implemented. NEASC sees them as 12 different processes. The biggest concern for SDE is equity with adjunct credentialing. The weak link is understanding which college requires what from their adjuncts. What is needed is a grid of each college and what they need. The Commission will meet again in March. Because they only meet a few times a year, we need to be specific in what we need. If we need to be grandfathered another year, we need to specify this. NEASC would be happy to get a letter from SDE and CAPSS explaining more detail about the particular stresses. It was suggested that the Early College Steering Committee might be the appropriate body to send the letter.

Robin is working with the BOR Academic Council (the committee of all the Chief Academic Officers) and a few individual CAOs on new guidance regarding credentialing of adjuncts. She hopes to take this guidance through the BOR in February or March. The guidance will encourage all colleges to go through the process that Middlesex CC did which provides clarity on what the alternative minimum credentials are for each relevant course. It might be helpful for the Committee to get a copy of what the CT Community Colleges sent to the NEASC Commission regarding the Faculty Standards Phase-In plan.

Dianna emphasized that we need to consider what we need to say to high school principals. In January 2015, students select classes. Suzi indicated that NEASC said clearly that the community colleges are the ones to select their faculty. They will not tell you how you are to do it. Dianna suggested that we could have a communication plan, but Robin reminded her that each college has to handle its own communication. Bob said colleges need to communicate directly with the high school faculty. Robin advised to be sure to include the CCP Coordinators.
CT Community-Technical Colleges Service Regions – There were questions raised about the particular challenges for Tech High Schools who sometimes deal with multiple colleges and who may have different credentialing standards. Robin said that this should not be happening as much since schools can only go outside the service region under special circumstances (there is a new policy). The document specifying the CT Community College Service areas was mentioned. Dianna asked for the Service Regions map. It will be provided to this committee.

Other NEASC states have not had our problems, because other New England states were already following processes that were up to NEASC’s standards. Connecticut’s existing program was large, but many parts of the process need to be tweaked. Even though we have a good teaching force, the education process needs to go on—and college faculty have not been dealing with this. There is a need to educate college faculty on how good high school teachers are. Robin spoke about the educational process.

Use of remaining Funds: Robin talked about the various potential uses for the remaining Early College Funding after January. There are several moving pieces (such as whether or not we will be purchasing dual enrollment software – see Katie’s report below). Uses include: Software interface to support NEASC standard dual enrollment programs, Mentoring software for CT-ECO program, professional development for high school/college faculty, convening the four CT-ECO program partners, 2016 CT-ECO program development funds. The majority of the colleges have indicated that they would like to have access to additional funding to assist with bringing their dual enrollment programs up to NEASC standards.

MCC and UCONN ECE Collaboration: Bob and Gillian will be meeting in early January to begin to figure out how jointly, they can provide training to guidance counselors regarding dual enrollment programs. They hope to help high schools make sense of all of the options available and maximize them for their students. They want high schools to help students think about using their credits for particular pathways. June asked if they were using the CCP pathway documents and Bob affirmed.

Potential Dual Enrollment Software –

Katie Magboo reported on two software products that she, Nancy Melnicsak (Director of Student/Academic Information Services at the BOR), and Phyllis Perry (Support Specialist for Student/Academic Services at the BOR) have been looking into purchasing for the colleges to help manage their Dual Enrollment programs. Nancy and Phyllis work with the Banner student information system which is used by the entire CSCU system for student registration and reporting (one Banner program is used for the 12 colleges and each of the four universities has their own Banner program). The new NEASC standards will require the colleges to register Dual Enrollment students earlier than they have done previously. Nancy and Phyllis want to make sure that processes required by Banner and the software management solutions are not duplicated thus making more work for folks.

Katie and Phyllis discovered the two software products while attending the NACEP Conference in Chicago. The two products are DualEnroll.com and Canusia,Inc. Both products provide a
comprehensive management solution for Dual Enrollment programs. Each product is completely customizable to the needs of our colleges. Student applications, enrollment, instructor and course credentialing, instructor management, and accreditation process tracking are all functions of both products. Where the products are significantly different is in the way the information is housed and how the cost is determined. DualEnroll.com is a cloud-based encrypted solution hosted on the Amazon cloud. The cost for DualEnroll.com is calculated on a per registration basis. The estimated cost that we have received is $2.50-$5.00 per registration. DualEnroll.com estimates that the cost primarily in human resources per registration without their product is $10-$12 per registration. Canusia, Inc.’s software would be housed directly on our current servers. The pricing for Canusia, Inc. is a large initial purchase fee quoted at approximately $50,000 for the whole system to have access and a $20,000-$30,000 system wide yearly maintenance fee. Both products would allow for registration of students to occur in either their software and then be dumped into Banner or vice versa. Ultimately, the choice of which product if any would be for the BOR’s IT team to decide once the security of each software was evaluated.

Katie, Phyllis, and Robin attended the 12/5/14 CCP coordinators meeting at Capital Community College. At this meeting, six of the twelve community colleges were present and voted unanimously for us to move forward with trying to purchase the software. While Three Rivers Community College was not present at the meeting Katie spoke with their CCP coordinator, Erin Sullivan, who was also in favor of purchasing a software management solution. The CCP coordinators cited the high rate of turn-around in their positions as a reason to purchase the software as it would provide an existing structure for a new person to transition into easily.

Purchasing a software solution would enable the colleges to keep their dual enrollment information in a more organized and sustainable way. Because the processes would be managed online, the CCP coordinators would not have to spend as much time tracking down papers and could focus their energy on overseeing the program and expanding it as we move towards NEACS compliance and NACEP accreditation. The Early College Steering Committee’s budget has funds available for the initial purchase of a software solution and could even potentially pay for an additional year(s) in advance. The colleges would have to determine how to institutionalize the annual cost in the future.

Katie, Phyllis, Nancy, and Robin are going to be meeting with the IT folks from the BOR within the month of January to get their input.

**General Comments:** Dianna clarified that we need to make it easy for students to access early college programs. Tony specified that we also need to make it easy for the parents who are helping them navigate. Dianna said we need a road map. Robin shared that Steve Minkler went to an AP meeting, and that Connecticut is one of the worst states for not having policies on AP. Robin said one of the Steering Committee’s goals for 2015 is to have our colleges post their AP policies.
Dianna reminded everyone that SDE pays for students in Alliance Districts to take PSATs. AP potential comes from PSATs. Suzie advised not to let a student’s PSAT scores interfere with taking AP course—if their performance proves they can do the work. Arthur asked about 9th graders. Dianna said SDE pays for 10th, 11th, and 12th grade PSATs. Ready step is for 7th grade. Robin is trying to get it for CT-ECO. Dianna affirmed this makes sense.

The meeting ended at 5 PM.

The next Early College Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for: January 13, 2015 from 9 – 11 AM at 61 Woodland Street, Hartford.

Respectfully submitted,

Constance Rotondo
Administrative Assistant

Connecticut State Colleges & Universities
CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
Hartford, Connecticut