



Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting

January 27, 2011

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Minutes

Attendees

Geri Anderson
Richard Bond
Renie Del Ponte
Chahnuh Fritz
Dan Jorgensen
Mark Rangel
Cliff Richardson
Scott Springer
Scott Stump
Vaughn Toland
Charles Dukes, CDE

Audience

Randy Nielson, Denver JROTC
Ted Seiler, CTE Cherry Creek
Casey Sacks, CCCS
Gully Stanford, CiC
Carolyn Quayle, ACHS
Nico Adams, FRCC
Arlie Huffman, Jeffco Schools
Tim Wilkerson, Community College of Aurora
Don Keeley, CCA/APS
Jeanne Thompson, Counselor SD27J
Dierdre Cook, Poudre School District
Terry Whitney, College Board
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC
Greg Wieman, Elizabeth HS
Brandon Protas, CCD
Mimi Leonard, Littleton Public Schools
Barbara Palmer, CDE

1. Welcome

The main agenda today is for the Board and the audience to look at a suggested prioritization of funds process.

2. ASCENT Program Update

Led by Cliff Richardson

When CDE submitted ASCENT numbers for funding in September, it raised a lot of concern, because to fully fund ASCENT, it would cost roughly \$15M. The other concern is that there are some colleges and high schools potentially reporting completed seniors in a fifth year program and they really don't belong there unless it was a program that was grandfathered in. We're working with the colleges to clarify their process. Right now the JBC staff and those connected to them are concerned about ASCENT and whether we should continue ASCENT funding. I do believe we have support from CDE and CDHE on the program

Verification of ASCENT numbers

Led by Charles Dukes

As of right now, we haven't asked districts to submit an official verification of numbers. That request will come soon and districts will be asked to submit by February 28th. Informally, we've been hearing that numbers have dropped dramatically. When the budget is being balanced with ASCENT funds, we're asking to hold the amount of money based on numbers requested. The amount of money we requested to hold is not necessary, because numbers aren't as large as originally reported. This year, we requested 277 students and only 98 enrolled into a college.

General discussion followed concerning the items below

This will be a much easier process to predict. Districts are just figuring out how to establish procedures.

What if we just move that up to their junior year instead of their senior year so that by September when we ask for counts, you've really got your students packaged.

Just connecting this to the bigger picture which is postsecondary and workforce readiness. This is a piece of that overall picture. If done well, we can use ASCENT to better prepare these students to enter the workforce.

3. February Report Update

Led by Charles Dukes

Legislation requires that a report be submitted to the joint education committees. The report that we're submitting is a joint effort between CDE and CDHE. It's just a report on the data from the previous year. We only had two institutions of higher education who submitted data and there was no ASCENT data for the previous years.

A couple of weeks ago, Matt McKeever reported some recommended changes to guidelines. CDE approved that last week.

4. ASCENT graduation rates

Led by Charles Dukes/Cliff Richardson

ASCENT students will not be counted in the 4 year grad rate, but in 5th year grad rate. We're applying to the US Department of Education to use the 5th year graduation rate so that it would

be the standard rate for ASCENT students. As of right now, students in ASCENT program will count against AYP. There's a group at CDE looking at that grad rate. It won't be real quick, because there's a glitch in it. It'll eventually get done. The glitches are with the federal end and what we can submit and what we can get. We probably won't get a waiver for the next years. The group that's looking at it is looking at all aspects of students who are taking the 5th year, including students with disabilities.

It was determined that the CEAB would need to look at a superintendent's perspective of this. Also, Charles and Barb Palmer will get a status report on the application to the USDOE. Charles also committed to obtain more information regarding whether schools get credit for concurrent enrollment classes on the state report card.

5. Prioritization of Funds Update

Led by Cliff Richardson

Cliff went through a report compiled by the Prioritization of Funds subcommittee. The purpose of this report is to prioritize district slots. We discussed the factors that are important in terms of giving these slots out. The legislation points out that we want to serve kids who are traditionally underserved. We want to also reward districts who are good at serving kids who are underserved. We used completion rates instead of dropout. Factors are equally rated in terms of overall index score. The subcommittee looked at how to distribute slots based on the priority list, trying to make sure everyone gets a slot at something. First, we said everyone show submitted gets 1. Then, what's 10% of what they requested? Then, 20%, then 30%, until we run out of slots.

There was general discussion about prioritization of funds.

- a. Fast College Fast Jobs Students should receive priority.
- b. If a student is Pell eligible, we're discouraging them from ASCENT, but free and reduced is a prioritization factor. Those free and reduced lunch kids are likely Pell eligible. There are lots of students eligible for free and reduced lunch who isn't Pell eligible.
- c. Should there be a factor (for prioritization) of how many concurrent enrollment students you have in a district?
- d. Why not consider comparing students against each other? Say, as a state, we have 1,000 eligible students and we want students to submit applications.
 - i. Are you suggesting the state does the ranking?
 - ii. The criteria would be this proposed prioritization. It would be merit-based. We could set other criteria that's important in the legislation as well.
 - iii. In essence, the state takes over the distribution.
 - iv. The top students are the ones that get funded. Then, the dollars follow the student to the district.
- e. The number will never be real, because even when I submit a true number in Feb, that'll go down because some students will get Pell and I'll tell that student to take the Pell rather than ASCENT.

The committee will take back what we've heard and we'll work on this. We do know that we need to be prepared because all students probably won't be funded.

6. Formal Meeting

a. Welcome, roll call, approval of minutes

- i. Absent: Chelsy Harris, Jhon Penn, Deborah Schmitt
- ii. Motion to approve minutes by R. Bond, seconded by M. Rangel. Minutes approved.

b. Public input

- i. Is February when the forms will come up again? After Spring enrollment. They'll look at it again in May. Use the old forms for this fall's enrollment and we can have new forms in the spring.
- ii. Do we need to submit high school and college transcripts? High school. If you have college, submit them. Charles will send out the procedure, instructions and will clearly detail what is needed to the email list of those who submitted in Sept.
- iii. For students applying to admission to community college, both CE and ASCENT students need to be degree-seeking. If a student applies and puts undeclared, it's the college's responsibility to change it to degree or certificate seeking. We need clarification on that.

c. New Meeting Schedule

- i. Thursday, Feb 24, 1pm-5pm
- ii. Thursday, March 24, 1pm – 5pm
- iii. Thursday, April 28, 1pm – 5pm
- iv. Thursday, May 26, 1pm – 5pm
- v. Thursday, June 23, 1pm – 5pm

d. Adjourned