

**cde** Improving  
Academic  
Achievement  
**Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting**  
**February 22, 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**

Tim Wilkerson, Community College of Aurora  
Greg Wieman, Elizabeth, H.S.  
Joe Cruse, ACT  
Marilyn Smith, RRCC  
Anitra Galicia, Community College of Denver  
Yolanda Garduno, Community College of Denver  
Heather Exby, Western Colorado Community College  
Jim Henrel, Otero Junior College  
Anita Gonzalez Clem, Jefferson H.S./Jeffco  
Jose Martinez, Jeffco  
Tammy Weatherly, Jeffco  
Arlie Huffman, Jeffco  
Wendy Armstrong, CASB  
Don Keeley, APS/CCA  
Gary Cooper, Community College of Denver  
Dr. Brenda Krage, Pueblo City Schools (PCC Partner)  
Koko Moore, Southwest Early College  
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC  
Matt McKeever, DHE  
Gary Scofield, CDLE  
Steve Alkire, Greeley Schools  
Cindy Gifford, SD27J  
Danny E. Martinez, UC Denver  
Elizabeth Garcia, Harrison School District  
Camelia Moschetti, ACC

Nico Adams, FRCC  
Jennifer Harr, COVA/CCCS  
Harry Bull, Cherry Creek School District  
Cayth Brady, Harrison D-2  
Terry Whitney, The College Board

## 1. Rule Drafting Process

Led by Charles Dukes

We handed out a draft of the rules for the Concurrent Enrollment Programs Act. Charles provided an overview of what today would entail. The goal of drafting the rules is to provide a document that is utilized in the field without going outside the language that is in the legislation. The rules are not necessarily policy, but they do have the force of the law. We intend to be very public and transparent in the process of drafting this document.

Rule Drafting Steps:

1. Drafting the rules
2. The department will request a notice of rulemaking, which will be submitted to the SBE.
3. The final draft of the rules will be passed on to SBE. (After that submission, any comments must be submitted formally to Charles; today, this is much more informal).

This drafting process will hold true for the ASCENT guidelines, forms and cooperative agreements as well.

The next document is a FAQ that covers a lot of questions that have been asked by the field. Charles asked the board to review the document to make sure these questions are the questions that should be answered and that they are being answered correctly. A lot of these questions came from the C.A.C.T.A. conference and other meetings we've had.

The board reviewed the FAQ, added additional questions and modified some of the questions and answers already on the FAQ :

- Are all districts required to offer concurrent enrollment?
- Can you mix and match PSEO and CE or do you have to do one or the other?
- What is the difference between concurrent enrollment and ASCENT?
- Are books and fees included? The legislation says no, but the board determined that the district can include books and fees if they would like?
- Add a question about tuition amount.
- Are students who take remedial courses eligible for ASCENT? Is it feasible to allow students to take remedial courses?

- How are students who are doing CE getting accuplaced so that they can take college courses?
- What about the CLEP courses?
- If you're taking a course pass/fail, does it count?
- Is the college a party to the IEP?
- Impact of grad for AYP? What are the next steps?
- Does this program force kids to choose between AP courses and concurrent enrollment?

The board agreed to post the FAQ on the website and allow for people to send in more questions.

We may need two different FAQs for ASCENT and CE.

*Conclusion – Charles reviewed the rule drafting process and introduced an FAQ document to the board. That document will be edited based on the comments received today.*

## **2. ASCENT Guidelines**

Led by Scott Springer

Scott reviewed the guidelines and for stakeholders

Stakeholders made recommendations (see Attachment 1).

There was a recommendation to add something to the agreement that clarifies who will notify students if credits may not transfer.

There was a recommendation to clarify, in the rules, the minimum number of courses ASCENT students must be taking.

## **3. Forms**

Led by Renie Del Ponte

Stakeholders made comments and recommendations (see Attachment 2).

*Conclusion – When we get to a place where stakeholders and board agree on these forms, we'll have a legal review.*

## **4. Cooperative Agreements**

Led by Chelsy Harris

Stakeholders made comments and recommendations (see Attachment 3)

## 5. Rules

Led by Charles Dukes

Stakeholders made comments and recommendations (Attachment 4). If stakeholders have more comments to the rules or any other documents, they should be submitted in writing before the next meeting.

We will have documents for review and acceptance at meeting in March.

## 6. Formal meeting

Led by Cliff Richardson

- a. Welcome, roll call, approval of agenda, approval of minutes
  - i. All present except for Diana Wenzel
  - ii. Motion to approve minutes made by R. Bond, seconded by R. Del Ponte, passed
- b. Public Input
  - i. No public input
- c. No Action Items
- d. Action plan and next steps
  - i. Documents reviewed at this meeting will be approved at the next meeting
  - ii. Next two meetings are March 15 and April 9, starting at 9
  - iii. Charles reported numbers-277 for ASCENT
  - iv. In April, we will work on the communication aspect.
  - v. Matt McKeever offered to do a presentation at the March meeting.
- e. Adjournment
  - i. Motion to adjourn made by R. Bond, seconded by M. Rangel