



Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting

October 28, 2010

1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Minutes

Attendees

Cliff Richardson
Chelsy Harris
Dan Jorgensen
Richard Bond
Vaughn Toland
Mark Rangel (phone)
Sunny Schmitt (phone)
Charles Dukes, CDE

Audience

Anne O'Brien, CDE Online
Matt McKeever, DHE
Sheena TeBeest, FRCC
Jennifer Harr, Jeffco Virtual
Arlie Huffman, Jeffco CTE
Steve Alkire, Weld County Dist 6
Mimi Leonard, Littleton Public Schools
Carolyn Quayle, ACHS
Jaime Bertrand, FRCC
Anitra Galicia, CCD
Barbara Palmer, CDE
Lisa Montez, CO Springs School Dist. 11

1. Introduction

Led by Cliff Richardson

Agenda was changed. CDHE Policy Recommendations shifted to the beginning.

2. CDHE Policy Recommendations

Led by Matt McKeever

Reminder that one of the functions of the CEAB is to make recommendations to the CCHE on any policy recommendations for the implementation of the Concurrent Enrollment program. In August, the Board was briefed on thoughts around this issue. Matt needs input from the CEAB so that he can draft policy changes.

Matt handed out a summary of the policy recommendations. Once Matt receives formal recommendations, he'll draft policy. Then, that'll be taken to the Provosts and CFOs of all of the IHEs. Some of these changes do hit financial policies. Once those hurdles have been cleared, the recommendations will be taken to the CCHE.

Admissions Standards Policy

- Issue #1: For the purposes of the ASCENT program, legislation requires that the district withhold the diploma from the student. Legislation also requires students to be accepted into a degree or certificate program at the institution that signed the cooperative agreement with the district. Current CCHE policy requires any applicant to a four year institution to have a high school diploma, GED or equivalent. The Board explored various options.
 - CH - #2 allows most flexibility, because there are some schools that have developed certain standards for their students. This wouldn't negate the standard, but would minimize only one specific standard. Requires them to meet all other standards with the exception of the diploma.
 - The board overall supports option #2: Exempt ASCENT students from certain admissions requirements
 - Not necessary to impose limits at this time.
- Issue #2: The policy consists of 3 pieces (1) course requirements (2) the index (3) transfer GPA for students with college credit hours on a transcript. Students who participate in ASCENT don't have clarity as to where they fit. They are exempt from all three requirements. So, how should the policy treat CE and ASCENT students who are applying for the first time to four year institutions? Strictly transfer students? Hybrid transfer students where they have to meet some freshmen standards? Strictly freshmen (HS GPA and coursework)?
 - VT – Inclination to go with the policy as it is now and treat these students as any other transfer student. You would only have to look at the transcribed college credit GPA.
 - CH – do schools have a cap on transfer students? VT – not, in general, but if they're in the transfer window, yes.
 - CR – don't want to interfere with the established policy at the higher ed level. Which one of these ensures that this does not happen?
 - Matt will go back to talk to college admissions officers and come back with a report from that conversation. We'll postpone any decision on this for now.

Service Area Policy

- There may be some service areas that include a high school that is closer to a community college outside their service area. The question is should this CCHC policy contain a clarifying section for the ASCENT and CE programs? Or should we leave it as is and continue to answer questions about this as they come up?
 - CR - Sometimes schools will “shop” the IHEs for the best tuition rate. There is a concern that if we try to influence or change CDHE policy, we might open up a box we don’t want to open.
 - CH – GOAL academy is an example of a school who works with every single school. They have to create a separate agreement for every college. Seems to be more trouble than it’s worth.
 - This question is not talking about an exemption to the service area agreement for ASCENT and CE programs. It’s more about stating that ASCENT and CE programs have to abide by these service area agreements.
 - The Board was comfortable with leaving the Service Area Policy as is. Consensus reached.

State-Funded Financial Aid

- This would require legislation, so it wouldn’t be a quick policy change. Under current guidelines, ASCENT students aren’t eligible to receive financial aid during the ASCENT year, because they don’t meet the federal guideline of having a high school diploma or equivalent. The Board could explore legislation that would change the guidelines to allow students to get financial aid.
 - CH – They’re already getting state aid. Allowing financial aid would put them on a level playing field with community colleges.
 - Financial aid would cover all other fixed costs: books & fees, room & board.
 - SS – We have to consider the point about “double-dipping”. It’s an equality issue with other college students who don’t have the ability to “double-dip” and get more state-supported tuition help.
 - CF – we’re pulling resources from other students who aren’t ASCENT eligible.
 - CR – There seems to be a feeling that ASCENT should be a priority pool for those who don’t have other aid available. If you have other aid available, you shouldn’t be part of that ASCENT pool.
 - The CDHE doesn’t necessarily have a stance on this. Anything that would change legislation has to come from the Board and it is within their purview.
 - It was decided that the Board would postpone a decision on this.

There were a few other technical changes that Matt didn’t go over. The Board was asked to review and let him know if they have comments.

The statewide extended studies policy will be updated to define extended studies so that there's clarification.

The board will be voting on Issue #1 (Admissions Standards Policy) in the Formal Meeting.

3. Report 1 – Consideration of a Waiver Process

Led by Charles Dukes & Cliff Richardson

Charles provided a detailed timeline of the 3 reports that the legislation requires.

The legislation requires that the CEAB make recommendations to the State Board regarding the feasibility of a waiver process in which a student can stay for a second year in the ASCENT program.

Charles reviewed a timeline for this report.

This report requires us to deal with students who would like to request a waiver in order to participate in a 6th year as 2nd year ASCENT students. Cliff expressed that we are not quite prepared to allow for 2nd year ASCENT students. In the future, if this holds to be a valuable need, we reserve the right to come back and establish a waiver. If the Board likes, we can create a committee for a waiver process; however, we'd be working on a process for unknown. We haven't had any applicants for a waiver process yet. The 6th year student would be one who hasn't finished requirements of the 5th year. It was agreed that we are not ready to deal with a waiver process at this time, because it's not feasible.

4. Report 2 – ASCENT Guidelines & Recommendations for Improvement

Led by Charles Dukes & Cliff Richardson

This report requires that the CEAB prepare a report on ASCENT guidelines created by the CEAB and any recommendations concerning the improvement or updating of state policies relating to concurrent enrollment programs.

There have been some concerns about the SASIDS. It was reiterated that the SASIDS should be released to the IHEs by the school.

This report is going to go to the State Board of education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Are there items that the Board would like to have in the report concerning improvements or updating of state policies? There were no recommendations. Charles will have the report ready for the November meeting.

5. Report 3 – Annual Report

Led by Charles Dukes & Cliff Richardson

This report is in collaboration with CDHE. The Board will view the draft of this report the week of December 13th. We are pulling data from data warehouses at CDE and CDHE.

6. ASCENT Numbers

Led by Cliff Richardson

The numbers submitted by school districts for the September deadline has increased from the previous year. This year, we're at 2450 students. We had no idea that it would be this kind of number. Vody Herrmann with CDE will be reporting this number to the legislature. We will report the numbers as submitted.

A subcommittee met today to discuss how we would prioritize funds if we didn't get all of the funding needed for this amount of students. We have to go forward with the most valid numbers possible in September. In addition to dealing with prioritization of funds, this subcommittee talked about having the appropriate base. We are concerned that some of these numbers are exaggerated, so we need to go back and really study the September submission requirement and create a little validity to that number. We are going to ask for more support of the data for the next September submission. It was requested that audience members think about how to prove that students are eligible so that we can get a more valid number next time.

There is concern in submitting low numbers because the popularity of the program may increase.

The ICAP is a proof of intent that may increase validity.

7. FAQ Updates

Led by Charles Dukes

The Board reviewed the new questions on the FAQ.

- Can this model be used for alternative programs for adult education?
- Are students eligible for financial aid? This question will be removed from the FAQ for now
- Can high school students or parents pay for tuition themselves?
- What happens to funding if a student drops out of ASCENT or drops to part time?
- Can Perkins or Colorado Technical Act monies be used for tuition? No change.
- What happens if a course is full? No change to the answer of this question.
- Do CLEP credits count toward the 12 needed for ASCENT? The answer is yes. The answer to this question will be re-drafted.

- Does an ASCENT student have to meet the graduation requirements to participate?
- Do certificates count as degree programs for the ICAP and ASCENT program? No change
- Does a cooperative agreement need to be in place for ASCENT participation? No change
- How do service areas of the community college work? Can a high school make an agreement with a community college outside of the service area its in? If there's a specific class that's not offered, they can go outside of the service area. Not the program.
- Can an IHE participate in multiple agreements? No change
- Can a stipend be provided for teachers in the high school by the IHE? No change.
- What is the process to determine if funding is available for ASCENT? No change.
- Is there a minimum number of credit hours in which a student must enroll during their participation in the ASCENT program year? No change
- Do remedial hours taken as Concurrent Enrollment count against the credit hour limit for COF?
- Can online college courses be used for these programs?
- Do online courses have the same tuition cap as in person courses?
- Are there any other considerations when using online courses for Concurrent Enrollment or ASCENT programs?
- If an IHE charges more than the CC rate, can the institution receive COF on behalf of that student?
 - Why wouldn't they?
 - We need to check the statute on this. The original intent of the statute was that you can only charge the CC rate to receive COF, but there was an addition that says that you can charge...
 -

8. Communications Update

Led by Charles Dukes

The communications subcommittee has been working to create a resource toolbox. We do need to make some tweaks to the Concurrent Enrollment website, but overall, the foundation for communication has been created. The Concurrent Enrollment website (housed within the CDE website) has been enhanced, especially around secondary initiatives.

There has been a need for individual conversations with districts. If districts are interested in visits by Charles and Matt, please let us know. We have noticed that there has been a group of

people who haven't been at conferences. We may need to create a "facts & myth" presentation to address people who haven't attended some of the conferences.

Where is the audience getting information? We could have more attendance if we tried doing webinars. Maybe the next session that Matt and Charles do, it can be recorded as a webinar. CASE and CASB needs to know what's going on.

Are more people hearing about the program? K-12 isn't hearing much about the program. Counselors need to be more in the loop about the whole process. A good way to hit small schools is through BOCES.

A possible strategy is to train trainers. Charles could do trainings for points of contacts at the colleges and those people could identify school districts that need to hear more about the program.

We will continue with the subcommittee. At the next meeting of the subcommittee, designating a chair will be priority

9. Update on Students with Disabilities

Led by Barb Palmer, CDE

One of the issues that came up was confusion around students with disabilities who were requesting accommodations and who would provide those accommodations. Barb handed out some documents that clarify this issue. It will be distributed widely. After much conversation, it was decided that it would be labeled as dual enrollment options. Concurrent enrollment is a specific program with clear parameters and clear funding. Concurrent enrollment is clearly defined, so those 18-21 programs would necessarily fall under that. We ended up with a side-by-side matrix. A "fast fact" document was also created. For Concurrent Enrollment classes, college rules need to apply, since they are college classes. Since participation in concurrent enrollment is a choice, they are not being denied services. If a student is receiving 18-21 services, they cannot participate in Concurrent Enrollment.

- What about the student who stays on the high school campus and takes Concurrent Enrollment campus? Since it's a college-level class, the college still has the responsibility for disability accommodations.

10. Prioritization of Funds Committee Update

Led by Cliff Richardson

When we get to next spring, we will have to have a prioritization process in place that we recommend to CDE on the distribution of dollars. The committee talked about looking at data

variables of the different districts requesting funding so that districts could look at the impact of different factors. We're concerned that this money is put to the best investment possible. There are a number of variables that the committee is considering. Dan Jorgensen has volunteered to start massaging some of the elements. We'll be looking at that in the next meeting and then will be coming forward with a recommendation.

We are going to look at waiting factors that keeps everyone in the game. We also don't want large districts dominating the pool.

Perhaps we need to consider documentation that the schools would submit. Maybe we create pools and fund a portion of each pool. The reality is that this year, we've got to prove great success on the investment, so that we can get more money next year and the year after.

11. Formal Meeting

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

- i. Absent council members: Renie Del Ponte, Geri Anderson, Jhon Penn, Scott Springer, Scott Stump
- ii. Minutes approved by R. Bond, seconded by V. Toland

b. Public Input

- i. No public input

c. Action Items

- i. Vote of Issue #1 on CDHE Policy Recommendations: Revise admissions standards policy to exempt ASCENT students from certain admissions requirements. Moved by C. Harris, seconded by R. Bond. approved
- ii. The Board will not recommend a waiver process at this time. M. Rangel moved to approve this recommendation. S. Schmitt seconded. Approved.

d. Action Plan and Next Steps

- i. Next meeting is November 11th, 1-5pm
- ii. Changes to CDHE Policy
- iii. Reports 1 & 2 for formal approval
- iv. Online service area clearance