Ohio Department of Higher Education
College Credit Plus Advisory Committee
25 S Front Street
Main Conference Room, 7th Floor
Wednesday, December 14, 2016
1:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Charles See, Assistant Deputy Chancellor of External Relations at the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE), Co-Chair, called the December 14, 2016, College Credit Plus (CCP) Advisory Committee to order. He said that proper public notice of the meeting was posted. He welcomed the CCP Advisory committee members back to ODHE and called the roll. The following members were present:

- Rebecca Gawsyszawski, District Advisor, Ohio PTA
- Dr. Steven Gratz, Senior Executive Director, Ohio Department of Education (ODE) *(CCP Advisory Committee Co-Chair)*
- Traci Haynes, Faculty Member, Columbus State Community College
- Tim Kraynak, Private K-12 Counselor /Assistant Principal, Worthington Christian Schools
- Karla Krodel, Director, Metro Credit Education Outreach, Youngstown State University
- Charles See, Assistant Deputy Chancellor of External Relations, ODHE
- James Smith, Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management, Mount Vernon Nazarene University
- Matt Smith, Guidance Counselor, Benjamin Local School District

ODHE and ODE staff members present were:

- Wendy Casterline, CCP Program Administrator, ODE
- Dr. Stephanie Davidson, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, ODHE
- Dr. Larisa Harper, Director, CCP, ODHE
- Jennifer Morack, Data Analyst, ODHE
- Stephanie Siddens, Senior Executive Director, Curriculum and Assessment, ODE

Individuals who signed in as guests at the meeting can be found on Attachment #1.

II. Approval of Minutes

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that the members received a copy of the draft September 19, 2016, CCP Advisory Committee minutes in advance of the meeting for review and asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. There being none, Mr. (Matt) Smith made a motion to approve the September 19, 2016, minutes as drafted and the motion was seconded by Mr. (James) Smith. All members of the CCP Advisory committee voted in favor of the motion approving the minutes as submitted from September 19, 2016.

III. Meeting Overview

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said he wanted to begin the meeting by discussing what they wanted to accomplish today; summarizing what has taken place to date, and introducing the Director of College Credit Plus, Dr. Larisa Harper who would lead most of the meeting.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they have been having a lot of conversations surrounding performance metrics for CCP and those were based upon the original statutory requirements of this particular body. He said they were charged with determining a particular set of performance metrics and recommending those to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor; and to also provide ongoing advice and counsel with respect to the CCP program. He said they started off by making sure that the committee had a firm foundation with respect to the rules and regulations; review of the data for the first year; and at the last meeting a full review of the data to date. He said as a result of the full review of the data to date, they had questions that stemmed from that meeting and he said that Dr. Harper will review responses to those questions along with updated data.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they have also had continuing discussions around potential performance metrics for the program and copies of these were distributed to the committee members. He said that hopefully the document reflects the conversations that they have had to date and they can further discuss whether or not the document that is before them is in a sufficient state in order for them to make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor with respect to the first set of performance metrics for CCP. He said they fully anticipate this to be a living document but they need a framework and scope to proceed based upon their statutory responsibility.

IV. Introduction of New College Credit Plus Director

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See introduced Dr. Larisa Harper, Director of College Credit Plus and welcomed her to the ODHE and ODE. He said that the thought behind Dr. Harper's hire was that she would be the liaison across both of the agencies with respect to CCP. He said that this will ensure that there is one official response as it relates to questions and shared data information. He said that she joins them from Zane State College where she was actively involved in their dual enrollment programming and she has already shown her value with respect to some of the suggestions that she has made for the CCP program and the performance metrics. He said that they are very excited to have Dr. Harper with them and he turned the meeting over to her.

Dr. Harper began by saying that she was glad to be here and that she was looking to forward to working with the CCP Advisory Committee as it is such a valuable and important committee. She said that they will be seeking their feedback during their formal meetings as well as on an ongoing basis.

V. Open Discussion, Update and Reflections on First Year Data

Dr. Harper began by sharing an update on the first year data by giving a PowerPoint presentation and supporting information which can be found as Attachment #2. She said that this is expanded and added information from the first year data document that they received at the last meeting. She said this information will be the basis for the CCP annual report that is required to be posted on the ODE and ODHE websites.

Dr. Harper shared the following updates: Over 54K students were enrolled at campuses in 2015-2016; and the majority of CCP students (93.3%) were in public district and shared the other types of schools (6.7%) as outlined in the presentation. She did note that the home and private school participants have a separate funding stream.

A member asked if it was known how the home and private school participation aligned with the normal distribution as it related to race/gender across all of the student population. Jennifer Morack, Data Analyst, ODHE said that this information has not been compiled; however, it can be.

Dr. Gratz asked if all of the private school students received CCP funding; and all home school students who requested CCP funding received it. Ms. Casterline replied that all of the home school participants that applied received some funding - not necessarily 100% of their request; and all of the private school participants who applied for funding received 100% of their request.

Dr. Harper went on share a pictorial of CCP student participation by county; every county had participation. Dr. Gratz said that the CCP student county participation was affected by a lot of variables such as access to community schools, driving distance, and how many of the schools are participating in CCP at their high school site. The members began discussing the data of the various counties and what impacts it in those counties. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that the data give them a strategic road map to ask specific questions in certain areas. He said that this was consistent with the demographic chart and their suspicion was that in the urban areas the participation was lower. His said this will dictate some of their strategies as they look to causation and areas to improve.

Dr. Harper discussed the common assessments/college ready data and said the new information that appears in the data was the identification of the remediation free areas that have mean scores that are below the threshold. She said the questions that they are asking around this are the following: making sure that ODHE is receiving multiple measures reports within the documentation that are supposed to be submitted by institutions of higher

education; and the 'bright line test' of students who are participating and possibly more stringent participant standards. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that this was one of the areas where the data were not as robust as they would have liked in terms of reporting by post-secondary institutions and that is going to be one of their focused areas. He said when they start thinking about general policy recommendations the committee can help them think about how they underscore the messaging around the importance of testing and assessment.

Dr. Harper began to discuss the courses the CCP students were enrolled in based on the subject area. She said the blue in the chart indicated those who registered for courses and either failed or withdrew; and red in the chart indicated those who completed the courses. She said that the subject of Science had a large amount of attempts vs. completions.

A member said as they go out to speak in the district, specific information on the risks, benefits, and success rates would be good information to help them educate the families.

Dr. Harper continued and began to discuss the GPA information by sector as outlined in the presentation, which was the following: Community Colleges 3.19; Independent Private Colleges 3.39; University Regional 3.29; and University Main 3.30. She said that average student GPA did not vary much by the sector of the institution. She also shared the GPA by discipline and said that when comparing CCP participants GPAs against undergraduate students enrolled in the same courses the CCP students had approximately .5 GPA points higher. She shared more specific GPA information as outlined in the attachment as well. She said this can answer some of the student preparedness and course rigor questions that have been raised.

Dr. Harper shared the data by grade level of those CCP students who received a passing grade, failing grade, and withdrawals as outlined in the presentation. She said that the 7th grade group had a much higher withdrawal rate than the 12th grade group. She said the success rate was in the upper 80% through middle 90%; and the failure rate was under 5%.

Dr. Harper said this additional data will be included in the CCP annual report. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that most of the inclusion of the additional data was in direct response to discussions and questions that were raised during the last committee meeting. He said that the overall question now is whether the committee thinks that it has all its questions asked about the data as presented and if there are any new questions specific to data.

A member said he has not had an opportunity to go through the newest data in detail but he believes that the GPA Ranges by Campus and delivery mode have potential. He said that there are some schools that stand out as it relates to pass and failure rates. Dr. Harper made comments about the Achieving the Dream initiative and identifying gateway courses with high rate of failures. She said that institutions could gather this information and determine which courses students are struggling with the most and she could see perhaps a similar approach where students are less likely to be successful in online courses at a particular institution; such as "are there more supports that need to be put in place?," etc. She said these are conversations that institutions could have as well as ODHE.

A member said that the data that were covered is excellent. He said that not every institution does a great job of reporting data and he said that half of the institutions likely do not know what detailed data ODHE has. Dr. Harper said she believed that many of the institutions are in "recovery" from the first year and data submissions are still being revised and cleaned up.

Dr. Gratz made comments about the data on the different delivery modes at institutions. He said that this is informative data especially in public districts.

A member asked if there were data on course outcomes for students who took courses but did not meet the remediation free standards. Dr. Harper said they have not done data analysis to that level of connecting remediation and multiple measures by course. She said that is something that they can keep in mind as they transition to the next phase.

A member said he thinks it is interesting that the students seem to be more successful when participating in CCP on the high school campus; but the goal should be that the professors at the high school are creating the same type of rigor as the professors at the college campus. He said the data could reflect that it is easier to take the class at the high school campus. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that is one of the areas of quality that they will be looking at. He said they are relying on post-secondary institutions to assist them because the instructors are deemed adjuncts of the institution and it is a section of the institution's course. He said institutions must also adhere to other statutory requirements such as professional development, classroom observations, etc. to ensure that the course is reflective of a section of the post-secondary institution's course.

Dr. Gratz made comments about Course Level GPA Ranges by Campus and Delivery Method based on location and he said we do not know if the difference in GPA based on location could be dictated by the types of courses that are delivered. Dr. Harper said that there is a qualitative piece that they do not have. She said there are support systems in place at a high school that are not necessarily available at a college campus. She said this is information they would like to gather and that is what the high schools are doing to help support or supplement their students in CCP.

VI. Performance Metrics, Discussion and Recommendations

Dr. Harper began to discuss the performance metrics. She said that they reviewed all of the minutes from previous advisory committee meetings; supplemental information that was emailed to them in response for the committee's ideas for performance metrics; and had internal conversations about what they need to review and know about CCP and what information could help them formulate suggestions for policy changes. She said all of this information was combined into the eight matrices (see Attachment #3). She said that they are hopeful that the committee will provide them with some feedback on this today; and if the committee feels that they are satisfactory, maybe with amendments, they can vote to move them forward.

Dr. Harper provided an overview of each of the following matrix: **1.** Participation, Enrollment, Credits, Discipline, Delivery Mode; **2.** Performance - GPA, Pass rate, Credits, Grades; **3.** Under-Performance – Case Study; **4.** Performance – Enrollments, Credits, GPA; **5.** Participation – Demographic Comparison; **6.** Attainment/ Completion (Annual snapshot of graduating classes, etc.); **7.** Attainment/Completion (Longitudinal study of graduating class of 2016); **8.** Attainment/Completion – Demographic Comparison.

A member asked for an explanation of the term 'unclassified' as it relates to Matrix 1. Ms. Morack replied that is a subject code that was not required until later in collection.

A member commented that there is a lot of concern about 7th graders participating in CCP and these are helpful data to share with parents and families to assist them with making more informed decisions. Another member added that the bulk of the credit hours are taking place between the 11th and 12th grade years and that may speak to the success of the CCP students and their GPA as opposed to other undergraduate students so those are great data to share as well with parents.

Dr. Gratz asked if they had a comparison of academic subject course and grade level as it relates to counseling students in a class where they would likely be more successful as opposed to a class that may fit. He said that may be valuable information when counseling students on what courses to choose. A member added that the way they counsel students on which courses to choose is to take courses related to their career pathway at their home high school and take non-foundation courses elsewhere. A member said this data information may be best not as part of the metrics but it would be part of longitudinal data that they use.

A member commented that delivery mode by grade data is relevant. He said that it would be interesting to know if a 7th grader is capable of managing themselves in an online course; or is a 9th grader capable of navigating themselves on campus successfully. He said after review of the data maybe they will find that there is nothing that stands out.

A member asked about the rationale for Matrix 3 and failing one vs. two courses; he said that they should not be admitting students that are going to fail. Ms. Morack replied that the discussions seemed to center more on multiple failures; they were approximately 3,400K students that failed one course. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they can defer to the committee to look at one course if that is more relevant.

A member made comments about the End of Course Assessments data in Matrix 3. She said that there has been some discussion if a student has passed an English and Math course at the college level should they have to take the end of course exam. Dr. Harper said that there are some end of course exams that are required by federal law/federal reporting requirements. Dr. Gratz added that federal law required them to assess students in English, Mathematics, and Science once during high school. He said they not only have what is required for federal accountability purposes but what is required to graduate in the State of Ohio that has to be taken into consideration.

A member made comments about Demographic Comparison in Matrix 5 and wanted to know if the data could be further defined by location (i.e., urban, rural, city, etc.). He said they are trying to determine how a CCP student is performing based on where they live and they need to know if they are performing better in certain areas. Dr. Harper said that she believed that they could define the data at the high school level by typology otherwise they would have to look at residence or zip code information. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said the ODE already has the high school classification so they can look into whether or not they can do a typology breakdown with percentages by demographic.

A member asked about the Unknown data notation in Matrix 5. Ms. Morack replied that this could be attributed to SSID issues; lack of a match or private institutions did not provide these data. She said that with better direction to private institutions their hope is to have better data in this area this academic year.

A member made comments about Matrix 6 and lowering the threshold of earned credits and said that she believed that there was some research that showed earning any credit, even as little as three credits, while still in high school increases matriculation to college and eventual completion. Dr. Gratz added that he has also read similar research in this area referencing a range of 9-12 credit hours. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked if the recommendation was to add an 'any credit' reference to this Matrix as well. The members said breaking down the columns further might be helpful (i.e., 1 -5 credit hours). Dr. Gratz said that these data are reported and could be obtained without in being a metric.

As it relates to Matrix 7, Dr. Gratz asked if they tracked students through CCP earning an 'In Demand' credential. He said that some students may earn an In Demand credential that will land them a job and they may not matriculate onto college and this could still be looked at as a success. Dr. Harper replied that they cross compare the Certificate or Associate Degree and Beyond that a student receives to the In Demand list. She asked was this something they would like added to the performance metrics. The members said this may be important information that could show additional success to the program; however, they want to make sure that the earning In Demand credential can be attributed to participation in the CCP program.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked if they would be able to have the mechanisms to have data on out of state matriculation. Ms. Morack replied that if they attended a public institution in the State of Ohio they receive the information through the HEI system via a 'name file' and they submit it to the National Student Clearinghouse for in-state and out-of-state institution matching. The members discussed whether the CCP Portal and the HEI system information could be compiled into one list for student matching against the National Student Clearinghouse data. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that this is something that could be explored.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See made comments about identified pathways for students for CCP. He said that some districts have created these pathways and some are still in the process of creating these pathways. He said that if they can get to a place where there are a sufficient number of pathways that exist, they can take a look at the students that have identified a certain pathway vs. students who are randomly taking courses. He said they would have to develop a policy with obtaining data around which school districts have these pathways, and what students are in the designated pathways in each district. Dr. Gratz added that the statute requires school districts to put together fifteen and thirty hour pathways. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they have encouraged the secondary institutions to work with post-secondary institutions to develop these pathways, especially if they want to do them around a specific area.

The members began discussing identified pathways and the work that has been done on this. One member said that they have worked with an institution to develop a core pathway for students who would take 12-15 credit hours in high school and enter college with a semester completed. He said they really tried to be intentional and map those courses out. Another member commented that they have a core pathway that is then complemented by stackable secondary pathways such as STEM, Engineering, etc.

A member asked if there are core identified pathways for CCP students at the post-secondary institutions. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that it can be seen in both ways. He said that at times students are able to choose what courses they want to take with the help and guidance of the counselor and when they arrive at the post-secondary institution they also can avail themselves of a choice of courses. He said there are some school districts that are very structured around it and try to assist with the decision making process and have core pathways of fifteen or thirty credit hours that is established to guide students.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked the committee members if it was of interest to develop more information around the identified pathways for students vs. randomly taking courses. After no comments from the committee members, he said from what he understood from the members that they will continue to gather information on this area but it will not be included as a metric.

VII. Possible Vote to Move Recommended Performance Metrics to the Chancellor and Superintendent

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said if there were no further additions to the actual metric framework, other than what has been suggested which were the following: Delivery Mode by Grade; Demographics by District Typology; Underperforming students failing one or more classes; and Assessment Scores as it relates to students that fell below and were admitted CCP, he asked for a motion to amend these criteria into the framework. This motion was approved by Mr. (Matt) Smith and the motion was seconded by Mr. (James) Smith. All members voted in favor of the motion to amend these criteria into the framework.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said at this point he believed that the committee was at the stage where they can decide if they are ready to make a recommendation to the to the Chancellor and Superintendent that this be the beginning performance metric framework for CCP.

Ms. Gawsyszawski made a motion to submit recommendations for beginning performance metric framework for CCP to the Chancellor and Superintendent and this motion was seconded by Ms. Krodel. All members voted in favor of the motion submitting these recommendations to the Chancellor and the Superintendent.

VIII. Policy Suggestions and Other Considerations for Improving the Program

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said throughout the performance metrics discussions they have engaged in policy discussions as well. He said that he still wanted to give the committee the opportunity to bring forth other policy suggestions if there are some others that they would like to suggest to the Chancellor and Superintendent based upon data or based upon their understanding of how the program operates.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said one of the areas he heard mentioned a few times by one of the members was that they were not able to do anything at this time to CCP students that are underperforming and giving them guidance on whether or not they should continue in the program. He said that he took that as they might want to accelerate their regulatory stance on underperformance.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said another area that arose was around the area of communication. He said that right now post-secondary institutions and secondary institutions really hold the vast majority of the communication responsibility to parents and families about the CCP program. He asked if there were ways they could think about doing some direct communication to parents and families about the CCP program especially around the demographic information and if they would benefit from this in certain targeted regions around the state. He said they may ask for the committee's assistance with the direct communication component as well.

A member said that the amount of fees waived by an institution, as it relates to data reporting may need some clarification as to what an institution is supposed to be adding up to account for the fees waived. She said along with this is the funding for the program and the issues for some of the high schools being over-burdened with the cost of the program. She said she would like to see a study of the actual cost of the delivery of the program by institutions of higher education and the high schools. She said there have been studies in other states of what these programs cost institutions of higher education but she does not believe she has seen one done on the cost for high schools. She said she believed this would better inform the funding strategy. She said that the longitudinal data that will come out will be incredible and may be worthy of reward. She said if they have facts and data about the investment then they may be able to make some changes.

A member commented that the resources online for parents and counselors need to be improved. He said that at this time he has to direct parents to multiple websites for timelines, deadlines, applications, remediation free scores, etc. He said as a counselor it is hard for him to keep current. He said it is impossible for the parents and students to navigate what they do not know. He said if they had a dedicated central resource with all of these things that help counselors, parents and students they could all use the tool.

A member asked if a course could last the entire school year. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied yes; a course could last the entire school year right now. He said one of the things they are considering is making all courses term-based but if the institution had an offering of their course that goes that full year then that would be the only course that would be able to be offered through the program that spans the same time period. He said that it is part of their quality analysis to determine whether or not a longer course has an effect on the grading at the high school level.

A member asked if there could be a more clear definition on text books vs. fees. He said that in the cases of an online class the 'site' is the book for the course. He said there is still too much ambiguity and it puts schools and institutions in precarious situations at times. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that it is a very difficult issue. He said it is challenging to have a broad enough definition to cover every variance; but the current definition of fees and textbooks lends itself to some ambiguity so it is something that they are looking at.

A member said that there still remains the issue of some courses that have large fees, such as the equestrian and aviation programs. She said that she did not believe that this was the intent of CCP and it puts institutions in a bad position. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that they are in agreement with that and one of their recommendations in the Mid-Biennial Review/Lame Duck was more authority to look at course eligibility.

A member said that it was difficult for private high schools and home schoolers to understand funding. He said that if they could develop a more reliable and predicable system to assist them it would assist these students. He said it puts them at a disadvantage because they do not know how to plan. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that they have very limited ability to address that issue specifically since this is a General Assembly calculated allocation. He said what they can do for the General Assembly is articulate these types of concerns as they continue to be raised so they can have this for consideration as they deliberate around these issues.

A member brought up the issue of the cost of textbooks and how they are unused after one semester. He said that the textbook issue has become a major burden. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that these things continue to be incorporated into the conversation and they know the entire subject of textbooks is likely one of the number one issue. He said that they tried to communicate best practices that others are engaged in, such as multi-year deals, consortiums, etc. He said he knows that another review of the textbook policy is warranted.

A member said ensuring that the information and data are accurate and routed to the schools is important. She said that the public schools and the students that are utilizing these programs need this information.

A member said that there needs to be a CCP 'tip line' for infractions. Assistant Deputy See said this is part of their overall communication strategy plan. He said as their web services are increased, one of the things that they are considering is something like this where someone is able to leave general comments. He said if ODHE and ODE do not know they cannot address it.

IX. Future Meetings and Next Steps

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said they are targeting the next meeting for the month of March. He said that they will send out dates to check the members' availability in the upcoming weeks. He said in the meantime if any of the members have any issues or comments that they would like to bring to the attention of ODHE/ODE to email them to Dr. Harper.

X. Adjourn

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked if there were any further questions or comments, there being none Mr. (Matt) Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting and this motion was seconded by Ms. Krodel. All members voted in favor of the motion adjourning the meeting and Assistant Deputy Chancellor See declared the meeting adjourned.

Charles See, Assistant Deputy Chancellor See, ODHE
Co-Chair
ODHE, CCP Advisory Committee

4-6-2017
Date

Dr. Steven Gratz, Senior Executive Director, ODE
Co-Chair
ODHE, CCP Advisory Committee

04-06-2017
Date