



**CT Career Pathways Commission
Student Access Working Group Meeting
June 12, 2026**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Commission Members Present: Paul Costello, Gabrielle Hendricks, Radenka Maric, Henri Martin, Jeffrey Newton, Alice Pritchard, Christina Royal, Charlene Russell-Tucker

Others Present: Anthony Barrett, Ajit Gopalakrishnan, Reilly Harris, Paige Rasid, Grace Suh

Commission Members Absent: N/A

Ben Stang called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

3:01 – 3:05pm Roll Call and Approval of May 29th Meeting Minutes

- At 3:03pm Alice Pritchard made a motion to pass the previous meeting minutes dated May 29th, 2026. Jeff Newton seconded. No corrections or discussion was made on the previous minutes. The motion was passed at 3:04pm.

3:06 – 3:12pm Review of Working Group Purpose and Commission Plan

- Ben Stang reviewed the project overview, key dates, and upcoming deliverables

3:12 - 3:36pm Current Landscape

- Christina Royal walked through data on dual enrollment
 - CSDE has made significant progress with its \$6 million toward dual enrollment
 - 30% of students engage in dual enrollment
 - UCONN is the leading course provider on dual enrollment
 - Approximately 30% of courses that students take are related to a career pathway in dual enrollment—remaining are general studies
 - CT is trailing the national average percentage of community college enrollment represented by dual enrollment
- Ben shared that CT has made strong progress on dual enrollment policies (9 of 12 suggested indicators met)
- Jeff Newton discussed credentials of value and school models
 - Credential data has historically been limited but new systems are in place for better data next year
 - Many different school model types—need flexibility
- Group discussion—what do we know and what are we missing
- Alice Pritchard shared that CTECS credential data is available including how many students received which credentials and their associated costs. She noted that credential attainment is

strong at CTECS and coursework is well-aligned, and suggested the language be revised to reflect that there are pockets of excellence, though not yet statewide.

- Alice Pritchard shared that accountability, and metrics must be aligned to these goals, noting that what gets measured drives action and helps justify investment.
- Radenka Maric stated that the goal is student employment. She raised questions about how students are prepared regardless of technology—what skills and knowledge are needed—and how to connect individuals with an employer database, with enrollment matching beginning early. She asked about workforce demand projections, such as whether employers will need 2,000 or 10,000 engineers in five years, and envisioned a system that would match employer needs to relevant educational programs.
- Ajit Gopalakrishnan raised the question of what the adequacy threshold is for credential attainment. He cautioned against offering credentials of limited labor market value to students and emphasized the need to balance pathway programs with broader exploration.
- Grace Suh asked who is currently participating in dual enrollment and raised concerns about the equitable distribution of limited resources—whether the approach should prioritize broad access or targeted support for underserved students. She noted that early exposure to college can increase college-going rates.
- Jeff Newton asked how the state and CSU can be better supported in expanding dual enrollment, noting that cross-institutional collaboration presents additional challenges.
- Radenka Maric shared that through open houses and conversations with students, job opportunities emerge as a top concern. She noted that a college degree no longer guarantees employment and that student outcomes must remain central to the Commission's work.
- Alice Pritchard expressed enthusiasm for the emerging narrative.
- Henri Martin described envisioning a continuum in which students can identify career paths that match their talents and abilities, with credentialing serving as milestones for advancement and dual enrollment integrated throughout. He acknowledged that there are pockets of excellence across the state, but expressed concern that the group's focus may be weighted too heavily toward credentialing rather than pathways more broadly.
 - Reilly and Ben clarified that this work extends beyond K–12 and that the continuum goes beyond the scope of this working group
- Alice Pritchard suggested softening language that implies college is the right path for all students. She proposed reconsidering where high school ends and college begins, revisiting where courses belong within a professional career continuum, and examining which subjects are best placed in higher education and who should deliver them. She also raised the question of whether certain subjects—such as physics—should be reserved for the college level.
- Jeff Newton and Ben Stang shared examples of best practice models in dual enrollment, early colleges, and similar programs.

3:36 – 4:00pm Bold Vision: What Could CT Look Like?

- The group discussed how to define 'low' performance and what the appropriate threshold looks like. Questions were raised around equity in funding and access, and whether the elements discussed should operate as separate silos or be integrated.
- Alice Pritchard suggested that every student have access to early college credits and/or credentials of value, regardless of school model
- The group expressed concern about spreading resources too thinly versus investing deeply, and what is realistically achievable. Discussion focused on where to concentrate efforts, noting that

some schools are already ahead. Recommendations should be centered in equity, with consideration for whether all schools should be elevated to the same baseline.

- The group also emphasized the need for flexibility and ensuring that what is developed is accessible to all students, building on models that already exist.
- What is created for students should not be over-engineered—students should not be constrained to rigid pathways, as individual circumstances are varied.

The meeting concluded at 4:00 p.m.