



Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting

November 11, 2010

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Minutes

Attendees

Geri Anderson
Richard Bond
Renie Del Ponte
Chahnuh Fritz
Chelsy Harris
Mark Rangel
Deborah Schmitt
Scott Springer
Scott Stump
Vaughn Toland
Charles Dukes, CDE

Audience

Don Keeley, APS/CCA
Ted Seiler, Cherry creek
Jaime Bertrand, FRCC
Arlie Huffman, Jeffco Schools
Lisa Montez, CO Springs School District 11
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC
Dierdre Cook, Poudre School District
Nico Adams, FRCC
Mimi Leonard, Littleton Public schools
Tim Wilkerson, CCA
Anne O'Brien, Online CDE
Brandon Protas, CCD
Barbara Palmer, CDE
Matt McKeever, DHE
Greg Wieman, Elizabeth HS

1. Introduction

2. Changes to CDHE Policy

Led by Matt McKeever

Matt reviewed a number of technical changes to CDHE policy. These policy changes will go to CCHE and will be recommended from the CEAB. There were no questions or concerns about these changes.

Admissions policy

We have a conflict with the Admissions policy how ASCENT students are classified. Are they first time students at enrollment, or are they first time students when they leave the ASCENT program. The federal definition is that any student still in high school is not considered first time, but these students have been admitted to a degree program. Matt is trying to work this out with admissions officers and data advisory group. They have had comments on this. Matt will delay any decisions on language until next month for the Board to approve.

- Is there a difference in opinion between institutions? Everyone agrees there's a conflict. It's just so far reaching, and federal guidelines haven't caught up to what states are doing.
- We have the option of abiding by the federal rule and counting them in the first time cohort when they transfer in to not being high school students. That will skew the data in a positive manner.
- The choice to be made is if we count them in the cohort with universities because they've earned enough credits. Are they first time full time or transfer students?
- Has it been determined how these students are not going to negatively impact the high school graduation rates? How are they coded there? For districts who don't meet AYP, they'll have the opportunity to submit a supplemental application delaying the reason for not meeting AYP was due ASCENT students.

The other piece on admissions was the exemption of these students from requirements. The feedback is that we don't want to exclude them from admissions requirements. We want them to hit those requirements in order for them to participate in the ASCENT program.

Remedial Policy

The remedial policy: What they want to do as far as how you determine if a student is eligible to take a certain course, is institutional flexibility on the assessment of readiness and they want to recognize if students meet the eligibility of the course in question.

Matt has talked to Academic Council on this one.

There was no concern with this.

Charles and Matt sat in on a conversation with Jobs for the Future. They are looking for several states to link up with on encouraging the expansion of concurrent enrollment, middle college, etc opportunities. We are not clear yet what they want us to offer. They are talking about help with developing policies and financial barriers. Matt will continue to follow up with them and talk with CCE leadership. They are looking at a January or February timeline on signing on with states. They are looking for two additional states to sign on with. They didn't say who these states are. Matt asked to look at a contract when it's been signed. This will be an ongoing conversation and at the appropriate time, the board will be brought in on these conversations. Information will be sent out to the Board.

3. Reports

Led by Cliff Richardson

In the last meeting, we chose to say that we are unable to review the feasibility of a waiver process due to the timing, numbers, and fiscal outlook. We've been directed differently by CDE policy people to reconsider the way we wrote that. We need to be somewhat responsive in our reporting in December. We have a little bit of a modification to propose to the report. There

probably will be requests in the spring for a 6th year. We'll need to do more research on the feasibility of possibilities and opportunities. We are modifying the previous board action that there be some work done on the potential need of a process. If it's determined that there is a need for a 6th year, it will go to a statutory process. We'll look at the data in the spring for students currently in the 5th year program. We'll use that data as a driver for the potential need of a waiver process. The board did not have any concerns with this reconsideration.

We decided to put together a memo to the State Board, CCHE, and education committees from this board. The board looked at a draft of this report. If you have changes to this, please submit any changes to Charles by next Tuesday, Nov 16th. The ASCENT guidelines will be included as an attachment. There will be minor language changes.

4. Online Service Area Clearance

Led by Cliff Richardson

Community Colleges have designated service areas which they can provide educational classes. If a high school student is utilizing an online high school educational provider, the location of that online educational provider determines which college the high school student needs to co-enroll in. If a high school student taking an online course wishes to enroll in a college closer to their home but outside the service area of the college where the high school online provider exists then the student needs to have the college they desire to enroll in obtain a service area clearance from the college which has the online high school provider residing in their service area.

Community Colleges are very familiar with this process and only need to be informed of the requested service area clearance request.

For example, if a student lives in Sterling but is enrolled in an online high school provider that is located in Colorado Springs. If the student wants college credit from Northeastern Junior College (NJC) and not Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC) then the student needs to ask NJC to seek a service area clearance from PPCC.

5. ASCENT district checklist and student checklist.

D added for advanced placement on ASCENT checklist.

Recommendation to complete college applications prior to testing, because if they do so, it's free to test. That's also the process at CCD.

When does the superintendent designee sign and when does the college sign. It was tweaked at DPS. Had all high schools email Scott who wanted to participate in CE, checked ICAPs, sent email to colleges and said that the students would go with CE applications and then bring back the applications to sign.

Put dates on the bottom for last-revised.

6. Prioritization of Funds

The point was made that Fast colleges, fast jobs would be priority for the prioritization of funds based on the legislative language. The subcommittee continues to work on this process.

7. Verification of ASCENT numbers

During the last meeting, we talked about the ASCENT numbers and looking at a way to make sure they're verified and accurate. We would like to try to find a way to ensure that those numbers are accurate by January or February to assure that students are on course. This will be part of the prioritization of funds recommended process. If we do put names, cut scores, then there's no fudging. The date to decide will be by February 1. At that point, we'll ask for verification.

There was a recommendation that we talk with districts to see if it's even feasible to provide names. We probably don't want names for as long as possible. If CLEP is to be accepted, you could have seniors in their last semester. It's a very different process if you're allocating students vs. slots. Legislators don't want to see the rural schools lost in this process. There are a lot of issues to resolve.

Will they take into account the differences between CTE and academic slots? They have both at Aurora. The CEAB tried to think about a ratio of CTE to academic last spring.

There was a recommendation to look at the student, because if you're doing the ICAP right, you should know the names by August of their senior year. We did talk about criteria. Are some of these students going to be better off leaving and getting the Pell federal grant?

From the district level, what would that submission look like to CDE? Wouldn't CDE set that criteria and the districts comply? The parameters will be outlined, but districts need to help with what's reasonable. We could have a transcript, confirmation of the ICAP, test scores, or just provide the SASID number.

8. FAQ

We will get rid of the CLEP question and just say that transcribed credits count.

When is the turnaround coming back to know how many students we've submitted, we'll actually get? We won't know the amount of money until April, May, maybe even June. That's a challenge.

If a student is in a second semester class, we can use the best guestimate as to whether the student will pass the class or not. Is that correct? Yes; reiterate that it still hasn't been determined what will have to be submitted.

Will there be a time when the board considers changes to the agreements and registration forms? Yes, we will look at again before the next year. We'll look at it again in March. Forms committee will meet in February with recommendations to present in March, with public comment.

9. Formal meeting

a. Welcome, roll call, approval of agenda, approval of minutes

- a. Absent: Dan Jorgensen, Jhon Penn
- b. Minutes approved by S. Stump, seconded by R. Del Ponte

b. Public Input

- a. No public Input.

c. Action items

- a. Vote on modification of report on the waiver process. Instead of having a board recommendation on the potential change, we will incorporate it into a report that will be approved via email.
- b. Recommendation from the board to approve report via email, moved by G. Anderson, seconded by M. Rangel, approved

d. Next meeting, December 16, 1:00

- a. ASCENT prioritization subcommittee will meet at 11:00 that day.
- b. Communications committee update

e. Meeting adjourned