

**DE-CAN
(Delaware College Access Network)
Meeting Notes for April 25, 2008**

Welcome/Highlights from March Meeting

Dr. Joseph Pika, Chair of DE-CAN, welcomed the subcommittee members to the meeting. The meeting was held in the Cabinet Room of the Townsend Building in Dover, DE.

The highlights of the March 28th meeting were reviewed. No changes were made. Dr. Pika highlighted the three A's: 1) Access 2) Alignment and Rigor, and 3) Actionable Networks that would be the framework around which we would seek to increase the number of Delaware students going to college. While we are working to increase access for all Delaware high school students, we would be attentive to underrepresented groups. In previous meetings, committee members recognized that we would make the greatest progress by working with groups already in existence to push the agenda forward. The committee is exploring funding options from at least one source, the Lumina Foundation, who has funded similar projects in other states. Dr. Pika reviewed the proposed framework (see March highlights pg. 3).

Delaware Data Report

Dr. Jennifer Bausmith, Mid-Atlantic Regional Lab, pulled together data from a variety of sources to create a context of general efforts for today's meeting. It was felt that it would be helpful to have all data compiled in one place from sources known to be both valid and reliable. She acknowledged that there was no public national source that tracks students in K-12 system through postsecondary that included admission, retention or 4-year success rates. Looking forward, Delaware will be able to track such data through the P-20 Higher Education Data Cube with unique student identifier in our data warehouse. This newly developed system would allow Delaware students who attend an in-state institution to be tracked beyond high school. It was stated that 65% of Delaware high school students who attend college enroll in out-of-state postsecondary institutions. This is a design issue that would dramatically limit conclusions that could be drawn through the data in the system. There was some conversation around linking to the national clearinghouse, but that system requires the use of social security numbers. Delaware does not use SSNs for our unique student identifier. High schools could help to gather data regarding access; however, their data would not allow us to track success.

The report presented by Dr. Bausmith, *Trends in Demographics, Labor Market Projections, Student Achievement, and High School Completion in Delaware*, provided a broad picture of the pipeline starting with achievement data in the middle school and addressed item #3 of the DECAN Framework. The census data in the report provided trend data on educational attainment in Delaware across counties. While it doesn't address only those residents who attended Delaware high schools, it does represent the community at large. The report also provided employment data from the Department of Labor including projections about the kinds of jobs that will be available to our

graduates. *(Note: job categories for these data were developed some time ago from federally accepted categories. They may be outdated.)* Dr. Bausmith highlighted NAEP results for Delaware students in Mathematics and Reading. She called the groups' attention to charts on pages 20-21 of the report and pointed out outliers that we may want to explore further (ESL achievement). AP data (page 22) and SAT data (page 25) were also highlighted. Dr. Pika reminded the committee of Delaware's Advanced Placement Incentive Program (APIP) Grant and mentioned that it might be helpful to look at the districts who were early adopters of the initiative (ex: Seaford). Additionally, dropout rates (page 27) were provided based upon the NCES formula. Dr. Haberstroh, DOE, shared with the group that Delaware reports five different graduation rates depending upon what question needs to be addressed. One group member brought up the idea of increasing the age at which students could dropout of school. Vicki Cairns was a member of the Compulsory Attendance Task Force and the Alternative Education Task force and stated that those groups did not want to increase the age at which students could drop out of school because at that time it was felt that there were not enough alternative programs out there for students who really did not want to be in a traditional high school. Dr. Noble stated that grade retention is a strong influence on dropouts. She thought it could be helpful to look at these data in various states and explore the corresponding state policies on retention. The group was reminded of the information related to alignment and rigor presented at the previous meeting and that the effects of these efforts are not yet visible in the data presented today.

Dr. Pika stated that this group has been primarily focused on the access issue and that the higher eds need to be talking about the retention and success issues. He shared that a subgroup of the P-20 Council will be meeting to begin this conversation. He further stated that Communication was the principle task of this group, and that the task centers on trying to design a more effective general message and targeted messages in multiple subpopulations.

The group discussed the possibility of using Acceleration via Individual Determination (AVID) data. This program is specifically focused on underrepresented populations and collects data on the number of students entering 4-year colleges and the number still enrolled two years later. There was discussion around the meaning of "underrepresented" populations. The term can mean different things to different people. For example, some believe that it refers to first time college-goers while others believe it means minority racial/ethnic groups. It is believed that the information will flow through our K-12 public schools, although the messages and events would be open to the public.

Developing & Prioritizing Measurable Objectives

Dr. Pika then directed the group to the measurable objectives that were identified in item #5 of the draft framework. We need to determine outcome measures for our proposal, for example, increase the percentage of Delaware residents with an Associates or a Bachelors Degree. Both Dr. Pika and Dr. Bausmith had developed logic models of outcome measures that included both short-term and long-term (proximal/distal) measures. The short term measures are important so that funders are able to see their dollars are having an impact. These data can address short term changes through surveys that could collect information about beliefs/perceptions through patterns in course taking

and college going. The group expressed a strong interest in targeting earlier grades and including measures that would indicate that students are “on-track” to college access. For example, we could measure units earned per year by content area, completion of Student Success Plans (SSPs) and FAFSA submissions. There was some concern expressed regarding the higher eds’ capacity to accommodate additional students, especially students who may require additional supports.

Agreed upon measures (to be disaggregated to the extent the data permits):

- Increase number of DE high school students in on- and off-campus pre-collegiate programs by (how much over what time period?)
- Increase number of DE high school students and parents attending and/or accessing DECAN sponsored initiatives/programs by (how much over what time period?)
- Increase the proportion of DE high school graduates admitted to 2 and 4-year colleges
- Increase the proportion of DE high school graduates attending 2 and 4-year colleges
- Increase the proportion of DE high school students taking AP/dual enrollment courses
- Increase the proportion of DE high school students taking specific rigorous courses (work on this one?)
- Increase the number of students using the Student Success Plan (SSP) and the proportion on-track to graduate
- Increase the DE public high school students’ graduation rate

Activities/Next Steps

The next step in the work will be to develop a set of activities that will coordinate what we hope to accomplish focused primarily on the access issue. Dr. Pika created a subcommittee whose purpose is to draft a letter of inquiry that could be sent to the Lumina Foundation in order to determine if we are on track. The subcommittee will be chaired by John Carwell from Rodel. Additional members are: Judi Coffield, SBE; Melva Ware, UD; Maureen Laffey, DHEC; Paul Herdman, Rodel; Shannon Griffith, Rodel; Sally Coonin, the Gov’s Office and Dr. Jennifer Bausmith (ad hoc). The group will bring the draft letter/working plan for the entire groups’ feedback at the May meeting.

Meeting Schedule-

The DE-CAN Subcommittee will meet as follows:

Friday, May 30 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. Cabinet Room Townsend Building