# MEETING MINUTES COLLEGE AND CAREER INTEREST TASKFORCE

# January 10, 2019

A meeting of the College and Career Interest Taskforce was called to order shortly after 10:00 a.m. via Zoom meeting.

**Attendance:** Dr. Eric Lichtenberger presided over the meeting. The following task force members were present:

# **College and Career Interest Task Force Members**

8	
Name	Affiliation
Peg Agnos	Legislative Education Network of DuPage
Eddie Brambila	Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Scott Belobrajdic	Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
John Burkey	Large Unit District Association
Jaime Britt Conley-Holt	Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Cassie Creswell	Raise Your Hand
Jon Furr	Northern Illinois University
Kurt Hilgendorf	Chicago Teachers Union
Stephanie Kelly	Chicago State University
Bobbi Kingery	Eastern Illinois University
Alison Maley	Illinois Principals Association
Sue McCance	Illinois Association of School Boards
Thy Nguyen	University of Illinois at Chicago
Kevin Pitts	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Mary Reynolds	Illinois State Board of Education
Cynthia Riseman	Illinois Federation of Teachers
Nathan Wilson	Illinois Community College Board
Eric Lichtenberger	Illinois Board of Higher Education

The focus of the meeting was to have a discussion regarding the emerging themes from the first two meetings and a discussion about taking those themes and developing them into potential recommendations. The charge of the task force is to develop recommendations that will be sent to the General Assembly specific to sharing college and career interest information of high school students with public colleges within the state.

#### **Discussion Items:**

- Predictable and sustained funding for higher education
- Mutual Exchange of Information
  Helpful to have more time to discuss and sort out the information that could be shared or better
  ways to be sharing information between K-12 and higher education. Dr. Lichtenberger tried to
  get the time extended during veto session but that was not possible.

Consider mechanisms that would allow information from the public colleges to be shared back to the high schools. Talks are underway between IBHE and ISBE to do just that. Some concerns with the level of personal information shared were raised.

Student survey pushed out using directory information

- o This was in the initial legislation that the Higher Education Working Group was considering. They wanted ISBE to conduct an annual student survey. Embedding it in a current data collection so it is not redundant would be helpful to avoid survey overload.
- Linked to existing data tools: ISAC, IBHE, ICCB, ISBE
   There wouldn't be an exchange of education records. Students would be asked about their potential career interests and college interests. Try to capture information using coding and a process that the colleges would understand such a mapping to CIP codes.

#### • System for Parental Consent

This would address FERPA concerns. Could be a statewide portal that students or parents on behalf of students are able to use to sign up for information on state institutions programs and financial aid. It could be done online and promoted out through all the agencies. ISAC should not have a problem with fitting this into a current system such as the PaCE framework. Looking at ways to minimize duplicity, while still being accessible. PPRA might need to be considered based on how the survey questions are structured.

- Obtaining information/surveying students earlier in a student's academic career It needs to be fairly early in a student's academic career although the majority do not know what they want to do at an early age. ISAC has been testing out a tool which is a game that students play on a mobile device.
- Considering reframing future state contracts with assessment companies
   It was mentioned that the state has a contract with the College Board to supply state-wide assessments yet they charge colleges money to license that information and they are also sharing it with entities outside the state. One member of the task force would like to urge the General Assembly to do an investigation as to whether the College Board's current practices violate Illinois

Assembly to do an investigation as to whether the College Board's current practices violate Illinois law. Other members of the task force mentioned that the task force does not have enough information to request an inquiry into the current practices of the College Board.

Admissions teams at Illinois public colleges would be happy to not have to pay for this information, or to share in the licensing of that information. Licensing the information is cost prohibitive due to the current economic climate in Illinois. The ability to get the information earlier without having to pay for it would be highly beneficial.

- Other populations to consider
  - o Adults with some college but no degree/certificate Community colleges would be interested in this information.
  - Recent admits that do not enroll anywhere
     There is a whole population that is being missed and should be included.

# • Acceptable use of the data

Some of the concerns mentioned could be addressed by the development of an acceptable use policy associated with any data that is shared with public colleges. It could also be imbedded in any data sharing agreements.

# • Cost considerations

A potential administrative burden on the agency that is responsible for collecting data or developing acceptable use policies or data sharing agreements. Cost could be fairly minimal if the agencies are able to absorb the costs.

# • Illinois State Scholar scholarship

The top ten percent of the Illinois graduating seniors are Illinois State Scholars (roughly 15,000 – 20,000 students annually). The data on these students are potentially available through ISAC. A task force member suggested developing a scholarship to be awarded to each Illinois State scholar that enters an Illinois public or community college. That will allow ISAC to work with colleges to provide the information on Illinois State Scholars.

No formal action or votes were taken. No public comment was requested. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.