

cde Improving
Academic
Achievement
Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting
March 15, 2010
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Minutes

Attendees

Geri Anderson, CEAB member
Richard Bond, CEAB member
Renie Del Ponte, CEAB member
Channah Fritz, CEAB Member
Chelsy Harris, CEAB member
Dan Jorgensen, CEAB member
Cliff Richardson, CEAB member
Deborah Schmitt, CEAB member
Scott Springer, CEAB member
Scott Stump, CEAB member
Charles Dukes, CDE
Vanessa Roman, CDE
Vanessa Graziano, Consultant

Audience

Vaughn Toland, Metro State College
Brigitte Gustafson, Weld RE 3J School District
Kathryn Presnal, CSSD-11
Matt McKeever, DHE
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC
Nico Adams, FRCC
Steve Alkire, Greeley Schools
Kelly Purcell, Elizabeth H.S.
Greg Wieman, Elizabeth H.S.
Gary Cooper, CCD
Carolyn Quayle, ACHS-Adams 14
Mimi Leonard, Littleton Public Schools
Harry Bull, Cherry Creek School District
Andres Pedraza, College Invest
Levia Nahary, ACT
Anne O'Brien, Unit of Online Learning, CDE
Teina McConnell, D11
Tim Wilkerson, CCA
Cynthia Pesek, D20
Jill Toussaint, GOAL Academy
Michelle Haich, Platte Canyon School District

1. Introduction

Led by Cliff Richardson

The JBC has approved recommendations to include funding for ASCENT participants during FY 2010-11 (\$277 FTE). This is exciting news, but there will be modifications between now and June. The good news is that the program is in there; the bad news is that they may change something.

There was clarification that the CEAB is a recommending advisory board. We do not have the authority to enforce strict rules. We are here as a recommending board to create consistency. We also realize these documents may be reviewed by attorneys at the district and college level; however, if there's a school or college who wants to do something unique, we'll have to allow that.

Today, our goals are to take the ASCENT guidelines, the two concurrent enrollment agreements (ASCENT and CE), the ASCENT and CE registration forms and the rules and move into a formal meeting, create a formal approval from the action items carried forward from this work session. In the formal meeting, we will ask for approval of these documents. Charles will carry these forward to CDE and submit rules to the board on March 25th.

Conclusion – guidelines, agreements and forms will be approved today.

2. COF Eligibility and in-state Tuition

Led by Matt McKeever

There was a question about if a student is an out of state resident or hasn't been in CO long enough, would they have to pay the out-of-state rate? We're looking at this differently than PSEO. In this situation, if a student is technically out of state, they'll still receive the in-state rate, because it's contracted with the local education provider and the community college system. We're going by the contract, not by the student themselves.

Right now, there are two questions regarding COF:

- a. Is the language in the legislation enough that we don't have to require documentation to release the COF dollars? We don't have an answer on that. We're working with College Assist folks to answer that question.
- b. How do we make sure the two systems are aligned? We don't have that answer yet. It will take some reprogramming.

Conclusion – Matt will work on the answers to the two questions and report back at the next meeting.

3. Document Review for Public Comment

Led by Cliff Richardson

Each document was reviewed for public comment.

ASCENT Guidelines:

- Recommendation to add clarification that 12 credit hours must be transcribed. Document amended.
- Charles will draft some language that mirrors 22-54-103. (under Funding, 1st bullet) to distinguish between full-time and part-time students.
- Suggestion to add a bullet that students and parent/guardians should review the best financial options for them in ASCENT Program School Procedures. Bullet added.
- No other comments or questions. Will be moving this forward for action item as amended.

Cooperative Agreement – ASCENT

- No Changes

Cooperative Agreement – Concurrent Enrollment Act

- No Changes

ASCENT Form

- Recommendation to add “Attention Student and High School Counselor” in agreement section.
- Suggestion to remove and parent/guardian under 4th check.
- Recommendation to change the words “Concurrent Enrollment” to “ASCENT in 4th check.
- Suggestion - Last sentence in 1st paragraph, add checkbox before and change wording to ASCENT.
- Section A, suggestion to change “your signature below” to “your signature”. Also changed in last check mark in Section A.
- Suggestion to remove remedial education requirements.
- Suggestion to add “postsecondary institution” to #5.
- Suggestion to delete sentence that says “Section C will indicate which options are available to you” in Section B.
- (#6 in understanding section). Delete 1st sentence.

Concurrent Enrollment Form

- Same changes from ASCENT Form as appropriate.
- Recommendation to break the title into two lines.
- Recommendation to add parenthesis after “example”.
- Recommendation to make font uniform.
- Add “es” to classes – class(es)
- Suggestion to replace “full” with “not available”
- #9 in Section B, move a checkbox below signature, delete “or”.
- Suggestion to move “The school district agrees...” directly under Section D, above principal designee signature.

Rules

- 2.01(c)(9) – suggestion to add something about ASCENT
- 2.02(2)(c)(5) – take directly from ASCENT guidelines.

- 2.02(2)(c)(5) – should it say C- or better? Recommendation to change denied
- Suggestion to add “with the exception of basic skills courses 2.01(2)(c)(5)
- 2.01(2)(d)(i) – suggestion to change grade to failing grade.
- 2.01(2)(c)(vii) – suggestion to add “college and high school” before transcripts

Questions raised during public comment:

- What is the attractiveness of ASCENT as compared to enrolling in a 2 or 4-year institution for students who are eligible to graduate and live in a community with a community college in the area? Sometimes it is true that a student is better off going to a college and getting financial aid. But you also have students who may not have those financial packages available to them, so this is another opportunity, another revenue stream for these students to complete the ASCENT program. Each student needs to be counseled as to his or her particular revenue opportunities. It may go both ways depending on the student’s circumstances.
- Can we build something in to agreements regarding students who drop classes and are no longer full time? We have to figure out how CDE is going to adjust the funding that we receive in June for the actual numbers. It’s going to take a 3-party group: finance, counselors, CDE. We don’t know yet, we’ll have to work through it with financial leadership at CDE and the board to figure out how the true distribution works. In this case, the school district would have a reduced bill, but still have the full funding. We need to work with CDE, because are in the process of developing the finalized plan. Example: if a student takes 12 credit hours and then drop down to 9, there’s supposed to be a pro-rated PPOR. All of those mechanics need to be worked out. If there’s extra funding based on this, it would likely be a red audit. With PPOR audits, you have to pay back funds if students drop.
- Would this apply for students who fail? Students who fail have their own responsibility for funding.
- Is the 277 an FTE allocation which would then be disbursed across the state, without availability to all districts? Correct. It is only available to schools who submitted their number count in September.

4. Formal Meeting

Led by Cliff Richardson

- a. **Welcome, roll call, approval of agenda, approval of minutes**
 - i. Mark, Diana and Jhon absent
 - ii. Motion to approve minutes made by R. Bond, seconded by C. Fritz
 - iii. Motion to modify agenda to include 6 forms in the action items carried forward to the formal meeting made by R. DelPont; seconded by S. Schmitt
- b. Public Input
 - i. No public input
- c. Action Items
 - i. Motion to approve items in a block made by C. Harris, seconded by R. Bond

- ii. Motion to approve ASCENT guidelines, ASCENT cooperative agreement, Concurrent enrollment cooperative agreement, ASCENT forms, Concurrent Enrollment forms and rules made by R. Bond, seconded by R. Del Pont; no opposition, all approved. Board recommends that documents be forwarded to CDE for necessary action
- d. Action plan and next steps
 - i. Request to start meeting next week with an open forum where public can come and ask for clarification
 - ii. Next Meeting, April 15th, 9:00 am
 - iii. Communication Plan next meeting
 - iv. Matt McKeever to discuss COF next meeting
 - v. May meeting will be about the waiver process (December 1st).
 - vi. Allocation of funds for the ASCENT program
- e. Motion to adjourn made by S. Stump, seconded by R. Bond