



## **Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting**

*December 14, 2009*

*9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.*

### **Minutes**

#### **Attendees**

Geri Anderson, CEAB member  
Richard Bond, CEAB member  
Renie Del Ponte, CEAB member  
Chahnuh Fritz, 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 Members**

Sheena TeBeest, FRCC Westminster  
Laurie Quinlan, Greeley-Evans District 6  
Steve Alkire, Greeley-Evans District 6  
Andres Pedraza, College Invest  
Gully Stanford, College in Colorado  
Julie George, Colorado Association of School Boards  
Levia Nahary, ACT, Inc.  
Amy Werpy, ACHS, District 4  
Terry Whitney, The College Board  
Cindy Grifford, Brighton School District 27J  
Gary Cooper, CCD

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Rulemaking Timeline Draft  
Cooperative Agreement MOU Template  
ASCENT guidelines draft  
P-20 Sub-subcommittee "Concurrent Enrollment Quality Standards"

#### **1) Explanation of Rulemaking Process**

Led by Charles Dukes, CDE

Charles presented information concerning the method for developing rules, how the rules are used, and provided a brief overview of the proposed timeline for the rulemaking process. The goal of the presentation was to familiarize the CEAB members with the rulemaking process and to reinforce the

charge of the legislation. That is, the legislation requires the State Board to establish Rules for schools and school districts to follow in satisfying state and federal reporting requirements concerning the enrollment status of ASCENT program participants on or before June 1, 2010.

The legislation also requires the Rules to ensure that schools and school districts are not adversely affected in calculating and reporting the completion of high school graduation requirements by qualified students who have been designated by the department as ASCENT program.

In order to meet the June 2010 deadline, key tasks shall include:

- Internal CDE/DHE staff meeting to discuss state and federal reporting and data needs;
- Development of Rules draft;
- Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board review and feedback of Rules;
- CDE will revise and refine draft, finalize Rules;
- Submission deadline for approval of notice of rulemaking;
- State Board office sets rulemaking hearing;
- State Board approves notice of rulemaking;
- State Board holds rulemaking hearing;
- State Board may adopt rules, if adopted, rules effective June 30; and,
- If State Board does not adopt rules in May, may adopt in June, if adopted, rules effective July 31.

*Conclusion – The Board members discussed ways to engage the public in the rulemaking process. The group specifically considered the idea of using time at the Board meetings in January or February to allow for public comment.*

## **2) Discussion of Cooperative Agreement Template**

Led by Cliff Richardson, CEAB Chair

The group reviewed the Cooperative Agreement MOU Template, dated 07-06-2009. The key area of discussion focused on “Exhibit A – Tuition and Fees” which is the last page of the document and allows districts and colleges to amend the fees before entering into an agreement.

Cliff stated that it was an exhibit rather than a contract to accommodate the different financial situations across the state and to allow the uniqueness of the college and school district relationships to exist. The exhibit includes similar parameters (as a contract) but allows the amount to change depending on certain relationships. Among the many priorities, the Board agreed that this providing that flexibility is very high on the list.

*Conclusion: The CEAB is going to review the document, recommend a cooperative agreement template and adopt the use of the agreed upon document. The discussion will continue at the January meeting and the group will review a refined version of the cooperative agreement.*

## **3) Discussion of ASCENT Program, State Guidelines**

Led by Scott Springer and Geri Anderson, CEAB members

The committee chairs presented a draft of the ASCENT guidelines for the group’s review and discussion. Board members, CDE staff and audience members also considered key questions based on discussions from the Colorado Council on High School and College Relations Annual

Conference meetings. These questions and other frequently asked questions will be answered as the work of the Board moves forward. Accordingly, accurate and precise responses to these questions will be published and disseminated as soon as possible.

**4) Guest presentation – GEAR UP perspective on Issues and Needs for CE**

Scott Mendelsberg, Executive Director of GEAR UP

“Colorado GEAR UP is the state's program to prepare low-income students for college. Now entering the fourth year of its second cycle, 2005-11, the program is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. It is managed by the Colorado Department of Higher Education on behalf of the Governor's Office. The mission is to close the Colorado Achievement Gap, as it relates to college admissions and graduation, to prepare all students to meet rigorous expectations and to level the playing field for Colorado's low-income students. I commend you, this is the kind of conversation the state needs to be having.”

**Mr. Mendelsberg outlined the potential problems/ key issues:**

- a. Can districts choose not to participate? Can't fathom why districts should have the opportunity to say no.
- b. Need this to budget neutral for everyone, there is a way.
- c. Can we use AP/IB, if those things were working we wouldn't be sitting here. Aren't automatic.
- d. This is another way to get other kids involved. I would really caution anyone to allow districts to opt out.

**Mr. Mendelsberg discussed the following desirable outcomes:**

- a. Love the idea of creating world for multiple agreements, need to figure out the best thing for kids. Need the opportunity to have access to all programs. The whole idea, especially online you don't have to be in traditional side.
- b. Figure out how to take advantage of current climate to think big.
- c. Piece about demonstrating college level proficiencies to get into ASCENT – argue against the idea that no remediation is needed. This will prohibit the largest group of students from getting in the program (only 10% students proficient in math in country), all know many kids aren't ready for college math as juniors or seniors.
- d. These conversations will force conversation between CDE and DHE, if we get it right, state will save money on remediation, must need to be taken care of in high school. By definition, 75% students who need remediation will not get their bachelors. If the state is really serious we need to address.

**Q&A with Mr. Mendelsberg:**

Q: Bigger issue is how schools are ranked and what will go into the school report card.

A: Exactly, school have traditional easy of being measured as a “great school” needs to redefine how we assess school achievement. (Measure how many students pass AP class, not how many are enrolled in an AP class.) This needs revamping.

Q: One other factor as a board member for charter school. What implications and considerations should be around the value of teacher and teaching AP level course should be.

A: Huge piece, there is a status assigned to teachers. But from my experience there is a similar rub that comes from teaching at college courses. Exact way to do it? Don't know. This helps community colleges get professors in the door too.

Q: The student pathway seems important here. Need it quicker than senior year. If we wait for kids to sign up until senior year, isn't it too late?

A: Maybe recommendation is that legislative clean-up, make sure districts are doing remediation. Do better on ACT and Accuplacer perhaps. Level the playing field. There are language issues too – a matter of merging these together. Way to mitigate some of this stuff. We can get students ready in the high school. If basic skills needs is handled in high school able to test into intro. level classes. We need to redefine where we can best address this. We have the ability to do it earlier, need to do it earlier than senior year.

- Chelsy – In the ASCENT draft guidelines we put Sept. 1 senior year on purpose. Maybe note when a sophomore. Didn't want to eliminate the option so that if students come in late, can still have this option. Encouraged to be managed with the academic plan of study, and no later than Sept. 1<sup>st</sup>, senior year.
- The last piece includes recommendations to the districts – can we recommend that there?
- Conversation more meaningful, shows students what scores mean for college. Rather than CSAP. More relevant than partially proficient and proficient, how do you address this is instruction.

Q: Are going to encourage districts to make sure the students have time?

A: What is the ACT or accuplacer? Used for 2 and 4 year institutes, other assessments. Will the new PWR standards and making sure these are all aligned. Will this make it a moot point? Need to make sure the left hand and the right hand – pre-remediation will allow schools to identify those needs right away, prior to high school even.

Q: 47% of our eight graders taking explorer, others taking the Plan, assured in the assessment those are good indicators of success on the ACT.

A: Shouldn't be the only indicator. Need other strategies beyond those.

- University of Phoenix Representative - I could say you don't need any assessment determination to a principal and they could agree. "13<sup>th</sup> year" remedial piece, what is it that we are stuck in is it going to be college-ready.
- Geri – high school determines if the student is ready. It doesn't say they have to be assessed college-ready for all. The remediation is for the pre-req. required by the class. Other than that there isn't requirement. Like art, that would benefit from college sculpture class in college does not need to be ready for college math. ASCENT says degree program, need to fix.

Q: ASCENT guidelines and suggestions

- Dick - Should we move COF and add ("or is on schedule to complete") for students who complete?

- Cliff – “CDE will hold lottery on or before March 15<sup>th</sup>” from state, is the funding pro-rated? Better to eliminate half the students who can participate or only pay for half? Which is less fair?
- Chelsy - Students not eligible for financial aid since they don’t have a high school graduation. How can we tell them sorry, you weren’t accepted and now you are really out of luck.

Conclusion:

*The group moved through a lot of questions and worked out the details as described above. Several implications are meaningful for the ASCENT guidelines writing group. Scott Mendelsberg reminded the group that this legislation was voted on unanimously, that this will be funded. Do believe the state is strategizing ways to truly fund this.*

---

## **Formal Meeting**

**Led by Cliff Richardson, began at 12:45 PM**

- 1) **Role Call Formal** – all present
- 2) **Approval of Agenda**– Dick Bond moved to approve, Second Chelsy Harris
- 3) **Approval of Minutes meeting November 13, 2009** – Scott Stump moved to approve, Second Diana Wenzel
- 4) **Public Input** – n/a
- 5) **P-20 Concurrent Enrollment Sub-subcommittee reports**
  - a. Matt McKeever for Governance
    - i. The CEABoard is a direct outcome of the subcommittee work
    - ii. Asked by P-20 to step back and look at ideal method of governing and creating policies and rule for CE programs in Colorado. Historically, all of the policymaking was in the CDE statutory language. A lot of questions and no coordination among DHE and CDE.
    - iii. Took a look at other states, capstone project on what other states are doing around governing CE programs. Florida and Utah common theme: they had an independent advisory board. Utah, a lot of authority and we knew we couldn’t get away with that but we proposed this advisory board concept to help bring CDE and DHE together and representatives from a diverse group of stakeholders to talk about issues that we knew would not be clear abased on the legislation.
  - b. Geri Anderson for Quality Standards
    - i. See attachment entitled “Concurrent Enrollment Quality Standards”
    - ii. One of the concerns there was no quality standards across CE programs. In some places it was validating the teacher had a master’s degree and other places that were very stringent. There are 7 categories of CE quality.
    - iii. Group wrote an expectation of standards for each of those sub areas.
    - iv. The Committee decided they didn’t want those in the legislation, rather the recommendation was that the CEAB to include the important things to be included in the “Best Practices”

- v. This will be the second wave of work. We don't need to put these in the rules. This will be helpful to put together in a guide for the actual practitioners.

**6) Next Steps**

Action Item	Lead Person Responsible	Support Team	Deadline	Output
Cooperative Agreement	Chelsey	Richard, Sunny, Diana, Chahnuh	Submit edited draft to CDE staff and Cliff to disseminate to CEAB	Review cooperative agreement template (from Geri); make changes and present at next meeting
Rulemaking	Cliff Richardson	CDE Staff	December 7, 2009	Framework, defined road map, examples, how to, based on statutory requirements and timeline, reporting needs, data/auditing needs
ASCENT guidelines	Geri Anderson	Scott Springer, Chelsy Harris, and Chahnuh Fritz	January 5, 2010	Refine Draft of ASCENT rules based on feedback
Communications Plan	Diana Wenzel	Sunny Schmitt, CDE staff, Gully Stanford, College in Colorado	January 5, 2010	Refine the coordinated plan, strategies for sharing information internally and externally, discuss how information dispersed, who needs to be involved?

**7) Next Meeting**

Friday, January 8, 2010

8:30AM -12:00 PM

Colorado Community College Systems at Lowry - Conference Center