



Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting

January 29, 2010

8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Minutes

Attendees

Geri Anderson, CEAB member
Richard Bond, CEAB member
Renie Del Ponte, CEAB member
Chelsy Harris, CEAB member
Dan Jorgensen, CEAB member
Jhon Penn, CEAB member
Mark Rangel, CEAB member
Cliff Richardson, CEAB member
Deborah Schmitt, CEAB member
Scott Springer, CEAB member
Scott Stump, CEAB member
Diana Wenzel, CEAB member

Audience

Koko Moore, Southwest Early College
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC
Nico Adams, FRCC
Jaime Bertrand, FRCC
Camelia Moschetti, ACC
Anne O'Brien, UOL
Terry Whitney, College Board
Gary Cooper, CCD
Levia Nahany, ACT
Gully Stanford, College in Colorado
Joan Root, School District 27J
Steve Alkire, Greeley Schools
Cindy Gifford, School District 27J
Don Kelly, APS/CCA
Toni Larson, IHEC
Matt McKeever, DHE

1. Overview of Operating Agreement

Led by Cliff Richardson, CEAB Chair

Updated CEAB Operating Agreement was reviewed.

2. Committee Reports

Led by Cliff Richardson

a. Communication

Led by Diana Wenzel

The Communication committee is scheduling a work session in Denver soon. They will have a first draft of the communication plan for the February meeting.

b. ASCENT Procedures

Led by Scott Springer

Charles and the committee made edits to the ASCENT guidelines. Last meeting, we discussed that the problem with starting in the summer is that schools won't know about funding until June; so the timing only allows for fall and spring.

It was decided that we include a section about high school counselor guidance in the best practice toolkit for counselors on the website.

Gully Stanford – College in Colorado would be happy to use the wiki for Concurrent Enrollment just as they do for ICAP. March or April will be the timing to launch the wiki.

Board requirement for Colorado revised statute says that it should be possible to have a waiver process for using ASCENT for two years. So, maybe we need to be clear about this possibility. It was decided that the Board should clarify in guidelines that we will consider the feasibility of a waiver at a later date. December 2010, we have to remember about the waiver.

Gary Cooper, CCD – The system isn't always clear about financial aid. We need to make sure that students don't do the FASFA if they're participating in ASCENT. This should be part of the best practices piece. We will have to track that.

Conclusion – ASCENT guidelines were reviewed and minor edits were suggested, including a clarification of the feasibility of a waiver at a later date. It was determined that high school counselor best practices for ASCENT be part of the wiki as well as a piece about the FAFSA. This will be launched in March or April and Gully Stanford will help.

c. Forms Committee

Led by Scott Springer

At the committee meeting, committee members brought sample forms: communication forms, district registration form, promise to retake form, waivers, guaranteed transfer forms, ICAP forms. All forms were discussed

and the main point was whether these should be standardized or used for a resources. Committee decided to put all forms on the website as a resource, but we should have a common registration form and combine the high school and college side; use one form. Renie combined a CCCS document and a DPS document, added some comments from others and developed a form with pertinent information. The Board reviewed the form. The following suggestions were made:

- Add cell phone number;
- Add selective services info (only as best practice, not on form);
- Add release schedule to parent/guardian;
- Add more space for registration for college courses;
- Get rid of grade 13;
- Clarify state benefit eligibility;
- Add a place where superintendent or designee needs to approve;
- Change "community college" to "eligible postsecondary institution" and remove CCCS logo;
- In all documents, replace "college" with "college or system";
- Include college and high school transcript in Section C (not just college);
- Section C, #6 – suggestion to allow students to participate in collegiate experiences with the exclusion of intercollegiate athletics and financial aid;
- Clarify Section C., #2
- Cut down to 2 pages, front and back
- Send out via email
- In Section C, #2 change "degree" to "degree or certificate in line with the ICAP"
-

Renie will work on it and send back out for review. Vanessa will distribute to everyone once Renie has edited.

The question was raised from the audience as to whether it would be possible for people to provide general feedback after the meeting. If you have feedback, send to Charles or Cliff and get it to Renie, before the next meeting so that we can have a final document for stakeholder input.

It was decided that we will move forward with the common form and other forms posted for resources. The primary form will be posted on the CDE website and others will be posted as resources on the wiki.

It was determined that CE students would not have to apply for COF. It was suggested that we hold on COF until February when we have more information.

What happens in a situation where two districts and colleges don't use COF? Those colleges would cross through that part of the form.

Conclusions – Suggestions for edits of the preferred form were made and Renie will make edits. Vanessa will distribute to the Board. It was decided that we will move forward with the common form and other forms will be posted on the wiki as resources. We will share a final version of this form with stakeholders and hear their review at the next meeting.

d. Cooperative Agreements

Led by Sunny Schmitt

The Cooperative Agreements committee met and decided to leave in the "facilities used" paragraph. They determined that it was important to leave that provision in. They also left the COF statement in there.

In Additional Provisions section, (c), is it up to each district? What is the thinking about the length of time? Are we going to make it a suggestion to make it two-year or three-year? If we can create a simple process where we can do all review in one process, then three-year would be fine. It was suggested that there might be value in having the Attorney General endorse it.

Is the intent of these agreements to be a best practice model or is it a requirement as a contract? There are hopes that we will get to a point where this is something that everyone would accept. These will become part of the rules. It was suggested that districts might not be comfortable with a one-size-fits-all contract. It was decided that we would go with "highly recommended best practice, used by many", and allow alterations. It was suggested that perhaps CDE give it endorsement for this as an approved form. *Charles will orchestrate that endorsement and legal review on the CDE side.*

Conclusions – It was determined that these would be three-year agreements. These agreements will be "highly recommended best practice, used by many" and alterations will be allowed. Charles agreed to orchestrate an endorsement and legal review on the CDE side.

e. Funding Priorities

Led by Cliff Richardson

Committee developed some policy principles.

In the beginning of September, all districts submit numbers. Then, CDE reports those numbers in the legislative process. CDE develops the pool of ASCENT numbers submitted in September. We will ask districts to modify

those numbers around this time of year (January), because there's so much speculation in the fall. We won't ask districts who didn't submit in the fall to submit again in January, only those who submitted in the fall. We know that it's unlikely that we'll have funding for all students who've submitted for ASCENT. We run into problems, because we won't know about the funding until student is about to graduate. We recognize the challenge, but don't yet have an answer for it.

How will we allocate slots? Recommendations follow. They may be weighted.

- Base threshold
- College Readiness
- Historically Low College Participation
- Two-year degree or certificate

The question to the Board is, is this enough? Are there more factors we should look at? Let's open the conversation:

A few concerns were raised by the Board and audience members:

- If we don't know until June about funding, graduations happen mid-May and we're not supposed to graduate them (ASCENT students). That's another hurdle. There's the option of holding the money in the rears, because then you know what you can plan for.
- Another hurdle is scholarships/ Students may not apply for scholarships if they think they're going to be able to participate in ASCENT. You still want to encourage students to apply. Then, what happens when they are accepted as ASCENT students? They're double funded.
- There's an internal committee at CDE looking at ways to report and make sure districts are in compliance with AYP. There will be further need to sit down with them again to discuss this issue.

There was some discussion about the option of holding the funding, however, this suggestion was revised to call a meeting with high schools that submitted to divvy up funding. It was determined that this option is better than no program at all.

Conclusions – It was decided that at the end of May, when we have a better idea of funding, we will call a meeting with high schools that submitted in order to divvy up funding. Charles and Cliff will meet with Vody Herrmann to discuss the time frame of funding. Diana will design a visual of critical pieces/decisions, on-ramps as part of the communication effort.

3. Formal Meeting

Led by Cliff Richardson

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

- i. Chahnuh Fritz absent, all others present.
- ii. Motion to approve minutes made by R. Bond, seconded by R. DelPont;

b. Public Input

- i. Parent currently taking advantage of Concurrent Enrollment program. Thanked the board for being here. She's now concerned about the risk of ASCENT. Concurrent Enrollment, however, is still out there and viable, better than any other option out there. That will be good at least until 12th grade. It was clarified that her daughter is actually participating in Concurrent Enrollment, not ASCENT, so there is no concern for her.

c. No action items

d. Action Plan and Next Steps

- i. For the next meeting, we will act as a board on the agreements, ASCENT procedures, forms. We will approve next month. We need to get these forms to the stakeholders who aren't here.
- ii. We will focus on Communication efforts in March. If available, there will be a Communication report in March.
- iii. Gully will bring website in March to present.
- iv. Matt McKeever will present in February and March on data processing.
- v. Is there a strategy for disseminating to superintendents? We can send through the Scoop
- vi. Next Meetings
 - 1. February 22
 - 2. March 15
 - 3. April 9 (2nd Friday of the month)
 - 4. May 14 (2nd Friday of the month)

e. Adjourn

- i. D. Wenzel motion to adjourn, S. Springer seconded.