



CONNECTICUT STATE
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Early College Program Steering Committee Meeting
61 Woodland Street, Hartford
Minutes of October 15, 2014

Present: Tracy Ariel, Sally Biggs, Mike Breen, Suzanne D'Annolfo, Kate Carter, Tony Gasper, Robin Golden, Katie Kelley, Michael Kent, Katie Magboo, Lori Matyjas, Steven Minkler, Arthur Poole, Ray Rossomando, June Sanford, Mary Skelly, Gail Stevens, Gillian Thorne, and Dianna Roberge-Wentzell

Via Phone: Carmen Cid, Bob Henderson, Elliot Ginsberg, and Sal Pascarella

Absent: Dennis Bogusky, Delores Garcia-Blocker, Elizabeth Cowles, Ted Gardella, Stephen McKeever, Judy Resnick, Manuel Rivera, Melony Brady Shanley, and Bob Trefry

Guest: Rick Walker (COSC)

The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm when Robin Golden welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A conversation about the new NEASC standards occurred where the question was asked: If your high school instructor meets the standards, can site visits by college faculty be put off? There was general concern, especially from the K-12 representatives, that depending upon what standards were used, there could be a large reduction of eligible high school instructors.

Middlesex Community College uses the same standards that they use for their typical college adjunct instructors. This is what NEASC and NACEP expect. But, some colleges do not have clear criteria for adjunct faculty at their colleges.

The conversation then shifted to how an initial decline in course offerings will result in a subsequent dip in CCP enrollment. CCP Grant funding is tied to CCP enrollment numbers. If the numbers are lower, less funding will be allocated to the colleges for their programs which will have budgetary implications. Lori then spoke about Perkins funding and how many factors are considered when determining grant status such as programmatic size, scope, and quality. Lori and Dianna agreed to draft a one page document explaining the legalities of Perkins and CCP Grant Funding. If the number of course offerings goes down, Dianna explained that the high schools need to adjust their programs of studies and could add the expectations of the dual enrollment program so that it is clearly explained and communicated to parents and students.

The Early College budget request to the legislature includes funding for one full time staff person to work on collaborations with K-12 partners, including dual enrollment, at each community college. While we are asking for this, we cannot depend on it.

In terms of the many required changes to the dual enrollment (CCP) programs Robin stated that while transition can be difficult, the dual enrollment program will come out of it stronger. Adherence to the standards is essential to maintain that the program runs with the rigor and excellence necessary and is ultimately best for the system and for students.

The conversation then shifted towards teacher credentialing. Mary said what is coming across to the high school teachers is that they need to have a content specific master's degree in the area of their courses. Robin said that, currently, the 12 CCCs are handling this process differently. They need to match whatever they require for their adjunct faculty teaching the same course at the campus. Most of the Chief Academic Officers were involved in the development of the faculty standards phase-in plan. The first part of the NEASC approved phase-in plan is below.

2014-15 Faculty Standards Phase-in for Connecticut Community College Dual Enrollment Programs

August 22, 2014

In order to come into compliance with NEASC's accreditation requirements, Connecticut's community colleges will begin immediately adopting policies and procedures to ensure that the ***"institution selects, supervises, and evaluates individuals who teach the dual enrollment courses."*** This document provides a framework for phasing-in the faculty oversight responsibilities. This work will be supported by the Board of Regents and will involve the active participation of trainers and consultants from the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP).

Summer 2014 – September 2014: Each college with a dual enrollment program operating in the fall of 2014 selects all dual enrollment instructors for fall 2014 determining which instructors meet the relevant college department's specified credentials and which will be considered "provisional veteran instructors" for the 2014-15 academic year.

1. Colleges will request from each partner high school principal a completed spreadsheet that includes the following summary information on each high school teacher scheduled to teach a college credit bearing course: Name of Teacher; Title of College Course; Yes or No response to "Has this person successfully taught this course in the past?"; If Yes, For How Many Years; Number of Total Years Teaching High School, Bachelor Degree Major; Master's Degree (kind of degree); if no Master's Degree, Number of Graduate School Courses in Relevant Content Area; and List of Any Other Relevant Degrees or Certificates.
2. Colleges will send provisional approval letters to all veteran teachers who have successfully taught the same course in the past, have, in the determination of the college, significant teaching experience, and for whom the College has no reservations about approving based upon prior year experiences. The teacher will be informed that he/she is provisionally approved to teach a particular course for the 2014-15 academic year provided that he/she completes a full application with resume and transcripts no later than November 1st.
3. High school teachers that are not deemed qualified to teach the college course will be notified and the high school principal will be informed that no college credit will be available to students taking that course during the 2014-15 academic year. This will include any high school faculty/teacher teaching the course for the first time who does not meet the relevant college department's specified credentials for an adjunct teaching the same course at the

college. Currently, Connecticut community colleges do not charge students for dual enrollment courses. Therefore, there will be no financial implications for the college if a particular course cannot be offered for college credit.

September 2014 – January 2015: Each college will conduct an application review process.

1. Colleges will collect the applications for all the provisionally approved high school teachers (and for any new faculty who request approval to teach a course for the 2015-16 academic year). Representatives from appropriate academic departments will review materials to determine the following:
 - High school faculty that meet the relevant college department's specified credentials will be notified that their provisional approval has been changed to a full approval for the 2014-15 year and for the 2015-16 year to teach the same course, if offered, providing the teacher complies with all program requirements.
 - Veteran faculty that do not meet the relevant college department's specified credentials, but are deemed to be provisionally qualified to teach the dual enrollment course, will be notified that their provisional status will remain only for the 2014-15 academic year. They will be informed about what other materials they need to submit and/or requirements they need to fulfill in order to be re-certified to teach in the 2015-16 academic year. Among other requirements, they must have at least one site visit from a college faculty person during the 2014-2015 academic year which will be used to make the final decision about approval to teach in the 2015-16 academic year.

It was then stated that there are inequities for students depending where their school is located due to the lack of unified systemic faculty standards across all 12 community colleges. The ethics of this were then discussed. It was suggested that the variance of offerings be mapped out region by region to determine the equity of access to dual enrollment courses. Robin said Steve developed a comprehensive chart that defines the credentialing requirements for adjunct faculty at MxCC. The colleges have the right to determine when a content degree is necessary. Robin will continue this discussion with the college Presidents next week. [UPDATE: There will be a meeting on Wednesday, November 12th with the CAOs to discuss this issue. There is some lack of clarity as to the flexibility that colleges have for accepting credentials other than a master's degree in the content area.]

NEASC was comfortable with our phase-in plan in part because we are using resources to provide training to college staff and to send individuals to the NACEP conference. NEASC also liked that there was a coordinated effort to have all 12 institutions working towards NACEP accreditation.

At 3:40 PM, introductions were made and the NEASC conversation continued

Michael Breen asked if we are letting NEASC drive this process. Robin explained that faculty credentialing is the area they were focused on / most concerned with. By 2016, all 12 institutions will need to be in full compliance with the faculty standards. Michael's concern is schools will look at CCP as a hassle. Schools may go in a different direction. Gillian said everyone who goes to the NACEP conference will see what this looks like in other regions and the relative flexibility that can exist when

necessary. Gillian said almost all departments at UCONN do a provisional certification for high school instructors to allow them to be properly supervised and guided by college/university staff and show competency in alternative ways. This is especially important when long term substitutes are brought into the high schools. Sal asked if there will be someone in Dr. Gray's office to help them get a provisional certifications because we are not going to remove students or put them in a study hall. Robin said each college has their own way to handle these situations.

Robin stated that because UCONN's ECE program is so strong and has been in compliance with NEASC/NACEP standards, this will help us as we transition the CCP program. Some Community Colleges have held meetings with high school principals and district Superintendents to explain the new standards and how they will roll them out. So far the meetings have been extremely positive.

Dianna suggested that we have a conversation with NEASC about the implications of the new standards on the K – 12 side. Suzie, Tony, Kate Carter, Sally, and Dianna would like to participate.

The competitive funding pool is one way that we have given assistance to the community colleges to move towards NEASC standards and NACEP accreditation. There are two different deadlines for colleges to accommodate for those who needed more time to do a needs assessment. Representatives from each community college will attend the NACEP National Conference along with representatives from the SDE, BOR, and CEA. Having representatives from all effected parties will be important in developing a shared understanding and vision. Arthur and Lori have regular meetings with CCP Coordinators where the program is discussed and cross-institutional collaboration occurs.

The next NEASC standards that must be addressed are the student standards.

Students should be treated like any other college student. We are trying to get a process for student registration. Phyllis Perry from the BOR's Banner team will be attending the NACEP conference to see how other programs do this. We are also trying to figure out how to extend the point when a student can drop the class because if a "W" goes on college transcripts it can affect eligibility for financial aid and academic standing later on. Withdrawals before or during the designated add/drop period does not affect college transcript or financial aid. We are also working with the IR office to determine how the federal reporting of dual enrollment students will be handled with regards to IPEDS.

Michael Breen asked if it might not be easier to run this program if all dual enrollment was offered exclusively through Charter Oak State College? Robin said this might be something we could consider but she was not sure how it would work. One of the benefits of the dual enrollment programs are the creation of closer working relationships between the colleges and their partner districts. Working with just COSC would not allow for this kind of relationship to develop.

P-TECH Update -

Robin announced the branding of the P-TECH model for Connecticut. The new name is: Connecticut Early College Opportunity (CT-ECO) program.

Robin reported that it has been significantly more difficult to get industry partners to sign on than originally anticipated. It is hoped that 3 new programs: 1) Windham; 2) New London; 3) Danbury will still launch in the fall of 2015. The Windham and New London programs have a unique structure with a shared Industry Partner in the Eastern Advanced Manufacturing Alliance (EAMA) with Electric Boat as the lead EAMA member for the purposes of the program. We are 2 weeks from confirming Electric Boat

as the lead EAMA member. In 2016, it is hoped that four new additional programs will launch including one with GE and one with ESPN along with two in the area of Allied Health.

Elliot asked how do we integrate CT – ECO with the technical high schools? Robin said this model does not work there because technical schools typically have 11 or 12 Technologies or Trades per school and therefore the number of students in each Technology is relatively small. The P –TECH / CT – ECO program model requires a cohort of 70-100 students. The technical high school Technologies typically have enrollments of 18 students per class. Integrating a CT – ECO program would mean collapsing some technical high school Technologies and limiting the number of pathways offered there.

Each CT –ECO program is a unique partnership between a school district, community college, and industry. The industry partner should have a need or projected need for middle skilled employees that they want to cultivate through developing a programmatic scope and sequence of both hard and soft skills. The preference is to house CT –ECO programs within comprehensive high schools in Alliance Districts. In New London however, the Board of Education is moving to transitioning all their schools to magnet schools. So, the CT-ECO program there would be in the STEM Magnet High School.

Entrance to CT – ECO programs is based on a lottery system. There are applications to enter the lottery but the information on the application form is not used to select a student. What makes CT – ECO programs unique is that when 9th graders sign up, they are literally registered at both the high school and community college. Students will get their associate's degree for free. Each student gets an individual industry mentor. The collaboration and engagement of all three partners is what makes the programs effective. Robin suggested that the Steering Committee coordinate a trip to Norwalk Early College Academy, Connecticut's first CT –ECO program. This is a collaboration between Norwalk Public Schools, Norwalk Community College, and IBM (the developers of P –TECH model programs).

The college courses for CT – ECO programs need to be offered in the most affordable way possible. In the beginning especially, the plan is to bring NCC faculty onto the high school campus to teach. This way the cost is for the faculty person rather than a per-pupil, per credit price. Students may also go to the college campus at times when there is space and time available. Some course work will also be taught using high school faculty that are credentialed to teach dual enrollment courses through NCC.

Legislative Proposal:

The BOR legislative liaison is Kyle Thomas. Kyle is drafting a legislative proposal creating the CT-ECO program and amending current legislation where necessary to implement certain aspects of the CT – ECO programs and to secure funding for the college courses. Robin would like to have all of the Steering Committee engaged with specific input from the SDE to ensure that all possible obstacles are addressed properly and that support for the passing of the legislation is generated.

The letters of understanding for each program will be unique. The letters of understanding are not legally binding documents but rather an acknowledgement of commitment for each party.

The legislation will state that priority for CT – ECO programs will be given to alliance districts. It will also address the 9 -14 nature of the program and speak to how high school diplomas are not conferred until all programmatic requirements are met. Therefore, students will need to acquire their associates' degrees before receiving their high school diplomas.

Carmen asked about the TAA manufacturing grant and how it connects. Tracy Ariel explained that Three Rivers Community College will receive money to put together a metal prefab program and can work in alignment with CT – ECO . The intent of the manufacturing grant was to build out manufacturing programs. Tracy said the \$4 million career pathways proposed in the grant application did not get funded. However, at the rate we are going is sure going to happen anyway.

Road Map Milestones –

Robin said the BOR Transform 2020 Strategic Plan was done with assistance from the Boston Consulting group. The decision was made at the outset to have two separate Initiatives, one for P-TECH and one for Early College Programs. Robin feels that they could have been combined. The Steering Committee members were provided with the road map milestones for the two initiatives for comment. Robin provides a regular update to the Transform Executive Committee on where each initiative is relative to their goals and how the budget has been expended. .

Next meeting: It was asked that we put articulation credit on the next agenda for discussion.

Last Funding Pool –

Robin spoke briefly about the two competitive funding pools. The \$200K for a second competitive funding pool may need to be reallocated. IBM uses an on – line mentoring platform for their P – TECH programs. It was previously thought that all the CT-ECO programs would have access to this program at no charge. But it is uncertain at this point. She will know at the end of the month from IBM. We may need to spend some resources on a new program, if we don't get access to IBM's. [UPDATE: Also, we may need to use some of the funding to purchase a companion database program for Banner that will facilitate the administration of the dual enrollment programs going forward.]

The Early College Steering Committee 2015 proposed meeting dates were shared. All agreed on these dates. It was asked that a Microsoft meeting invitation be sent to the Early College Steering Committee for these meeting dates. Conversation followed on whether or not we have snow dates for the winter meetings, and one meeting in Norwalk CC.

The meeting ended at 5:05 PM.

The next Early College Steering Committee meeting will be on November 10th, from 10 – Noon at 61 Woodland Street in Room 206.

Respectfully submitted,

Constance Rotondo
Administrative Assistant