Middle College High School
Grantees Meeting

May 5th, 11 am – May 6, 3 pm, 2014

Mission Inn, Riverside

Attendees:
Steve Hoffman, James Espinoza, Sandra Sanchez, Mattie Adams, Sherry Balian, Kathleen Apps, Leo Pastrana, Sue Groff, Diane Stewart, Pete Getz, Sara Lundquist, Sharon Neumann, Adelfa Lorenzano, Carolyn Hamilton, Kathy Carroll, Jo Glenn, and Barbara Illowsky

Absent:
Dave Bolt, Susan Gasca

Agenda & Minutes:

1. Welcome: Barbara Illowsky

2. Program Information - Barbara Illowsky for Adelfa Lorenzano

   You should have received by email, the draft program information from Adelfa. Please forward your comments to her as soon as possible. The document will be sent out to the group via email once it has been finalized.

3. NCREST – Discussion about $3000 per MCHS for a data project: Sara Lundquist

   It is not mandatory that MCHS join this organization. The fee is a flat fee. Santa Ana has found the organization to be a useful way of corroborating data that we might develop locally when we talk about the program overall and the outcomes because of the different ways they cut the data. Santa Ana wanted to find out if this was universally used by everyone. The more programs that opt in the more combined research we have to present our work as a model overall that is applied in a variety of different settings. Currently, 6 colleges pay the fee. Both College of the Canyons and Grossmont College do not.

   There was discussion on how NCREST not only disaggregates the number of community college courses completed and grades received but it does a senior survey where it has quantitative and qualitative data – it will actually gage the atmosphere of your school. It provides a piece that colleges are unable to provide because it is not typical data that colleges normally seek out from their students. This is similar to the Community College Survey for Student Engagement but NCREST is able to do a nice triangulation between the high school academic, the college academic and qualitative.
Although it is hard to predict when programs are going to be vulnerable, Santa Ana has found NCREST’s data most often makes it on to their fact sheet. If you need to give someone the cliff notes about the scope and the impact of your program relative to obtainment, completion, however you frame the mission critical work that justifies institutional contributions to that instead of something else. Even someone who is anticipating the possibility of moving into a more robust concurrent enrollment or early college program that was imagining the benefits that might accrue to their learners if they did so would be able to say in a school similar to ours here are the here are the kinds of results that they got academically. It’s not just the active colleges but it is a potential view into the future.

Barbara will check with Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry to see the MCHS Grantees submit to the Chancellor’s Office the names of the graduating seniors and identifying material which is now going to be a part of AB 1451 if we would have that same information and not need the NCREST or if it is still valuable. MCHS would not be submitting qualitative data as that would not be part of what you have. She wasn’t sure if this is something the CCCCO can track if the colleges submit the names of seniors.

4. Alternative Criteria in Lieu of CST Scores for Admission: Kathy Apps

With the CST test scores going away, other avenues need to be explored to use for admission policy. Currently, 6 schools use the CST scores. The colleges have looked at a number of things in conjunction with the CST score, such as GPA, first in family, 7th grade scores, the AVID model, teacher comments, letters of recommendation, essay’s, grades, honor’s course work, 8th grade algebra scores, behavior, attendance and interviews. Some colleges have a sibling preference, other don’t. A lot of the colleges use a lottery and a wait list as there are more qualified students than there are spots available and others over enroll by 10% with a wait list.

5. DSPS Accommodations: Sara Lundquist

Sara Lundquist requested a discussion regarding DSPS accommodations as it relates to the high school and the college in MCHS. Good discussion ensued and Barbara shared that the state is working on an assessment for community colleges at no cost. Plans are that will be in its pilot phase by Fall 2015. This is under Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski in Student Services and Special Programs at the Chancellor’s Office. Colleges that decide they would like to sign up would have free assessment for their student. The students test scores would then go into a massive database so that if a student starts at Contra Costa and then goes to San Joaquin Delta the student wouldn’t need to be reassessed; rather you could look up the score in the master database.

One of the suggestions that Sherry had was listing how many graduating seniors we have because most of the MCHS programs often have higher graduation and API rates than the home district.
5. Extensions and Amendments: Jo Glenn

Jo provided an update on the MCHS extensions and amendments. The 2014-15 facesheets will be sent to the field with a due date of June 30, 2014, to allow for the approximate 1 month approval process at the Chancellor’s Office. Note that the Chancellor’s Office cannot return signed facesheets until the California budget is signed.

6. October Webinar: Carolyn Hamilton

Carolyn had suggested to Barbara and Sherry having a webinar as a follow up dealing with some aspects that were covered at the conference such as ECHS and MCHS. Carolyn also had a conversation with Rose Owens-West of WestEd who stated before WestEd could make a final commitment they need to have the commitment from the CCCCO. As it is unknown at this time when Barbara’s replacement will be identified, Barbara was unable to commit to this at this time so the item was tabled.

7. 2014-2015 Funding: Barbara Illowsky

There was a lengthy discussion on budget dollars; how they were spent this year and they should be spent next year. Two options were discussed. Option 1 – raise the allocation to $110,000 per college with the remaining going toward the conference expenses. Colleges may be on their own for the conference and midyear meeting expenses, or Option 2- $99,000 allocation per college with the remaining going toward the conference and grantee meeting. The vote ended in a tie; Barbara broke the tie choosing Option 2. Should there be funds leftover, a second meeting will be held if desired; if not, the following year the funds could be divided evenly.

8. RP Group Data Collections Study Update: Sherry Balian

The RP Group was contracted to do two studies, a quantitative and qualitative. The qualitative survey should be done fairly soon. The quantitative study has been difficult, as it took a long time to put all the pieces together. With that said, all the CCCCO needs is the student’s names and IDs, which are being sent to the CCCCO; in turn they will forward the raw data to the RP Group. We have four signed M.O.U.s with couple pending board approval therefore, we will not have the 15 colleges we had hoped for, but we are moving forward.

9. Upcoming Possible Legislation Affecting MCHS: Sherry Balian

AB 2352 would allow Early Colleges to be included in the language that AB 230 gave to Middle Colleges. A MCHS student is exempt from low priority. If AB 2352 passes it will read this subdivision does not apply to a student attending a MCHS as described in section 11300 or an ECHS as described in section 11302 if the student is seeking to enroll in a community college course that is required for the students MC or EC high school program. The college will still have discretion on placement. On 4/30/14, the bill was in committee then referred to appropriations and then next to that it says suspend file. Sherry will reach out to the legislative team at the CCCCO to get an understanding of that term.
AB 1540 is basically adding computer science to the list of those courses that are exempt from the 5% cap on summer school. Ed Code 48800 talks about a 5% cap on special part-time students enrolled in summer school courses. This bill just adds computer science to the language. This leads to language that is now getting tied to AB 1451 that begins to touch on the concept of a high school student being taught by a credentialed teacher.

AB 1451 - This is the most dynamic bill out there coming from the Chancellor’s Office. This bill would really change the landscape of dual enrollment in many ways. One of the big provisions is that it is promoting a partnership agreement. This bill advocates increasing the number of units a dual enrollment student who is being taught under this partnership agreement from the existing 11 units to 15 units. It will also change section 48800 of the Education Code where currently the 5% cap ended on January 1, 2014 and would extend it to 2017.

Information on legislative bills can be found at www.leginfo.ca.gov.


Determine possible dates and locations: Preference is a Thursday/Friday and the dates chosen were 1) Jan 29-30, 2015 or 2) Jan 22-23, 2015. A preconference will be held on Thursday with the main conference taking place on Friday. If costs are prohibitive, the second choice would be Wednesday/Thursday and the dates chosen were 1) January 28-29, 2015 or 2) January 21-22. Everyone would be there on the second day with the first day optional.

North: Bay Area, East Bay or Sacramento: A one, two-day conference for approximately 500 attendees to be held in the north next year. Barbara, Sherry, Sharon and Mattie will check into pricing in various areas.

South: LA? Orange County? San Diego? It was decided a second conference will not be held.


Agenda planning

Most common suggestions from January Summit:
- a. Please host another conference again next year.
- b. Consider having both a north and a south conference next year.
- c. Add a theme and/or session on how to get started with dual enrollment programs.
- d. Have a panel instead of a key note next year with panelist describing the different types of programs.
- e. Keep and/or expand the time for networking and small group discussions.
- f. Develop working definitions for “dual enrollment,” “concurrent enrollment,” “middle college,” “early college,” and “programs versus high schools.”
REPORTS FROM THE THREE PLANNING GROUPS:

DAY 1 (Pre-conference) for new or future dual enrollment programs/high schools:

- What is the purpose of day one?
- Who is our audience?
- Schools who expressed interest on how to get started?
- What do we want to accomplish?
- Look/focus on “newbies” who still have questions pertaining to starting or establishing these schools/programs at their sites.
- Keeping in mind the audience and remarks provided at dual enrollment summit.
- Encourage “newbies” to visit sites that are successful; to understand how and why a site may be working. Networking is the key. Possible mentorship?
- Create a MOU; need to see the big picture; Discussion with Academic Senate; Establishing strong relationships; Much collaboration student support.
- Rather than breakout sessions; do a whole day with various discussions; possible panels
- Create five focus areas
- Definitions and Themes
- “Supporting students in Dual Enrollment/EHS or MCHS”
- Definitions of National Middle College Consortium
- Jobs for the future Ed Code Definitions of Early and Middle College. (Put in print, one page)
- Key terms
- Possibly mention FERPA pertaining to privacy; Refer to Ed Code
- Sample MOU’s; to assist new schools; understanding how efficient they can be school to school.
- How to start/ number of students are allowed in your program (some are four years/others are two years)
- Student recruitment
- Program vs. School; What is the difference?

DAY 1 (Pre-conference) for CTE dual enrollment programs/high schools:

Panel Discussion on Perkins Reauthorization-Dual Enrollment Requirements (75 min)
CTE Programs Track/ Career Pathways

(How do you leverage resources?)

Speakers Different Perspectives:
1. CDE
2. CCC Chancellors Office-
3. CCCAOE- Association for Occupational Educators
4. Maybe consider representation from the ROP’s? Others?

1. Regular breakout- Panel Discussion (3 panelists)
   Best Practices for CTE Dual Enrollment Pathway Programs CC & K12 Partnerships
   (Need to identify colleges and K-12’s who would present on current best practices)
2. Perhaps a breakout session on Linked Learning? Need to talk to CDE folks about what such a session would look like. (Do they have experts or current partnerships they would like to highlight?) http://linkedlearning.org/about/

3. A breakout session on the CTE Trust grants. Need to identify projects that were funded with CPT funds that could present on their partnership and how dual enrollment will be implemented in their project. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/gi/ccptinfo.asp

**DAY 2 (Everyone):**

9:00 Welcome from senator/assembly

9:15-10:00 Panel is to define dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment, EC/MC, CTE/Perkins, Programs vs. high schools

10:00-10:45 Session 1

11:00-11:45 Session 2

12:00-1:30 Lunch + Student/alumni panel (Steve Hoffman)

1:30-2:15 Session 3

2:30-3:00 Closing session with Q&A; collect evaluations

**Breakout Sessions:**

1. Best Practices: e.g. K12/college faculty collaborations
2. Ed Code Panel
3. Counseling Nuts & Bolts + Student Success
4. Legislation
5. Common Core
6. CTE
7. Collaboration Models
8. Share information
9. Student support for dual enrollment

12. Old business: None

13. New business: Updates:

Mattie Adams gave an update on the Middle College National Consortium’s Student Leadership Conference held in Washington DC at the Capitol. The theme of this year’s conference was “Be The Change You Want to See: Achieving Social Justice Through Leadership and Advocacy.” Each school team was able to meet with member of Congress or their staff to advocate for support of local legislation that supports or expands opportunities for college access for underserved youth in high school to share the benefits
and impact made by Middle and Early Colleges and Dual Enrollment programs for high school students.

Sherry Balian encouraged everyone to check out the California Coalition of Early & Middle Colleges (CCEMC) at ccemc.org website. Their mission is to establish and document best practices, develop and sustain supportive environments that strengthen K-12 and college partnerships in which students graduate college and career ready by accumulating substantial college units concurrently with high school graduation credits. They work in collaboration with partner colleges, the California Department of Education and the California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office, CCEMC will collect data that substantiate the early and middle college initiative, publicizes schools’ work and successes, and keeps the educational community informed of laws, California Education Code, and statutes that impact the early and middle college initiative. CCEMC also hopes to have a section on how to start a MCHS program.

Everyone thanked Barbara for all of her hard work on MCHS and for bringing new life and excitement back to the MCHS program, with special emphasis on the conference.