

**DE-CAN**  
**(Delaware College Access Network)**  
**Meeting Notes for May 30, 2008**

The next DE-CAN Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Tuesday, July 15<sup>th</sup>** from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. **Room 112, Tatnall Building. PLEASE NOTE the location change.**

**Welcome/Highlights from April Meeting**

Dr. Joseph Pika, Chair of DE-CAN, welcomed the subcommittee members to the meeting. Introductions were made for the benefit of new attendees. The meeting was held in the Cabinet Room of the Townsend Building in Dover, DE.

The highlights of the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed. No changes were made. Dr. Pika briefly discussed the history and background of the DECAN Subcommittee's work. The questions that need to be addressed are, "How do we encourage students and families to be more proactive about postsecondary education?" and "How do we address the identified barriers and hurdles to college access?"

**Draft Letter of Inquiry to Lumina**

Dr. Pika then asked Mr. John Carwell, chair of a subcommittee working on the draft letter of inquiry for the Lumina Foundation to report on the work to date. Mr. Carwell outlined four areas of action that the subcommittee discussed: 1) Coordination of Services 2) Communication 3) Services/activities around both Access and Success and 4) Evaluation (Ex: a gap analysis of pre-collegiate activities). He then shared five strategies outlined on the NCAN website. 1) College Access Programming targeted at specific audiences such as first generation college goers and other underrepresented groups. Examples of such programs are GEAR UP, Talent Search and Upward Bound. 2) College Access Resource Centers. 3) State-wide networks that both stimulate new programs around college access and provide resources. 4) Information referral programs (Example: Information Hotline) 5) Web based portals for college access information.

Dr. Pika reminded the group of the work already done by the subcommittee. The group has discussed and agreed on a single web portal for college access information. Secondly, a survey of all pre-collegiate activities was conducted and shared with the group. The survey proved beneficial to some institutions in conducting an internal gap analysis. For example, the University of Delaware identified programs at grades 8, 10, 11, and 12, but none at grade 9. The pre-collegiate offerings were also being looked at in terms of their geographic locations to evaluate access to programs across the state.

Dr. Judi Coffield then walked the group through the draft letter. DECAN members were encouraged to suggest changes and/or additions. The first question that was addressed was the time frame of the grant request and the amount of money to be requested. After a discussion about the urgency to get the work done and how drawing the project out over too many years may lead some to believe that we have time to spare, the group decided to identify a three-year timeline for this work. In addition, the amount requested was changed to \$750,000. This change was made after consideration was given to the work that was to be accomplished over the three-year period. Given the

multiple audiences we must reach with our communications plan and outreach activities and the one-time, upfront expense of coordinating information on the web portal, the group settled on a figure of \$250,000 per year.

There was a recommendation made to add the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the GO Alliance to the paragraph on page one beginning at line 41. It was also suggested that we discuss the Vision 2015 Project and then move on to discussing the Vision 2015 Network. It was decided to include more detail about the schools in the network, specifically that there are many middle and high schools that have joined the Vision 2015 Network. In paragraph two on page two, line 21, it was recommended that a definition of the term “career pathway” be provided that would explain that in Delaware we use a broader definition that includes both career and technical pathways and academic pathways.

When discussing the varied levels of support the group plans to provide to different stakeholder groups based upon need, Dr. Coffield likened the approach to the tiered approach used in Response to Intervention (RtI) and other current initiatives. Everyone doesn’t need the same level of support. DECAN proposes to provide a broad message to all Delaware residents, but as the data supports, we have subpopulations that will require specialized messages and activities to reach the goal of college access. Even within subpopulations there are those who will need more intensive outreach than others. The group agreed with this idea of differentiated outreach and that what we plan to do is much more than a mass media campaign. We plan to reach out to the community base in a grass roots effort to reach the targeted audiences. The group suggested adding language that better captured this unique tiered approach to the use of resources.

The discussion moved to measuring the goals and objectives of the project. After much discussion, the group concluded that our ultimate goal was to increase the number of college graduates in Delaware (degree completion) but this may not be a long-term goal for this project. The remaining long term measures are: 1) Increase the DE public high school students’ graduation rate 2) Increase the proportion of DE high school graduates admitted to 2 and 4-year colleges 3) Increase the proportion of DE high school graduates attending 2 and 4-year colleges. These long-term goals are necessary to identify and show the systemic nature of our plan; however, given the three-year timeframe of the proposal, short-term goals would be used as indicators to measure progress toward the long-term goals. The short term measures identified were:

- Increase number of DE high school students in on- and off-campus pre-collegiate programs
  - Through this grant we will inventory existing programs, identify gaps, identify participants and set a baseline for participation and then track students to determine the impact of interventions
- Increase number of DECAN sponsored initiatives/outreach efforts
- Increase the proportion of DE high school students taking dual enrollment/dual credit courses (AP/IB/Tech Prep, etc.)
- Increase the proportion of students using the Student Success Plan (SSP)
- Increase the proportion of Delaware students on-track to graduate

Secretary Woodruff asked that the group allow her to convene an internal DOE group to discuss the issues around defining “on-track to graduate.” She will bring the

results back to DECAN at a future meeting. Dr. Whittaker shared an article titled *Do We Really Have a College Access Problem?* by Clifford Adelman with the committee that discussed the various forms college access can take (Example: Threshold Access vs. Recurrent Access). The article can be found at:

<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/change/sub.asp?key=98&subkey=2385&printable=true>.

Ms. Maureen Laffey, Director of the Delaware Higher Education Commission (DHEC), will ask Alan Phillips, DHEC data analyst, to look into using IPEDS data, Census data and data in the National Clearinghouse to aid in determining the best source to establish base-line measures.

The issue of college completion in a community college was discussed. Community Colleges serve a very different population than do 2 and 4 year institutions. Stephanie Smith from DTCC shared that in a recent national survey it was found that DTCC students work more hours than students in any other community college in the nation. Their students are older and shift from full-time to part-time status between semesters. Their students do not typically complete their programs of study in a two-year time frame. It was felt that the long-term goal of increasing the number of Delaware public education graduates who complete two and four year degrees as stated would work since it does not specify that the degrees must be completed within any given timeframe.

Finally, the group took a look at the last page and the proposed professional development. This area needed some additional work and Secretary Woodruff and Dr. Coffield will revise the section to reflect more of an outreach/training effort rather than professional development.

### **Draft of Working Plan**

Dr. Pika then quickly shared that a draft of a working plan had been pulled together, but until we received feedback from Lumina regarding the letter of inquiry, it would be premature to go any further. John Carwell stated that he and Paul Herdman had scheduled a conference call with Lumina to ensure that we stay in touch with the foundation. It was requested that Dr. Judi Coffield, Policy Analyst for the State Board of Education, and Maureen Laffey of DHEC also participate in the call. John will send them the phone conference information. The consensus was that it would be ideal if we were ready to present the revised letter of inquiry during the conference call and elicit feedback.

### **Activities/Next Steps**

Dr. Coffield will revise the letter of inquiry based upon the feedback from today's meeting. Mr. John Carwell, Mr. Paul Herdman, Ms. Shannon Griffin, Ms. Maureen Laffey and Dr. Judi Coffield will participate in the conference call to the Lumina Foundation to elicit feedback from the Lumina Foundation. The next step in the work will be to develop a working plan complete with activities and assignments of work that will coordinate what we hope to accomplish focused primarily on the access issue. The group set the next meeting date for Tuesday, July 15<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 a.m.

**Meeting Schedule-**

The next DE-CAN Subcommittee meeting will be held on **Tuesday, July 15<sup>th</sup>** from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. **Room 112, Tatnall Building. PLEASE NOTE the location change.**