



Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Board Meeting

December 16, 2010

2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Minutes

Attendees

Richard Bond
Renie Del Ponte
Chahnuh Fritz
Chelsy Harris
Dan Jorgensen
Mark Rangel
Deborah Schmitt
Scott Springer
Scott Stump
Charles Dukes, CDE

1. Introduction

2. Changes to CDHE Policy

Led by Matt McKeever

The CEAB has the authority to recommend policy changes to the CCHE. Most of these have been technical in nature. Matt went through 4 policies that the Board will be recommending changes to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). The technical policy changes have been reviewed at previous meetings and will be presented in January to the CCHE. The two to be discussed today are the Remedial education policy and Admissions policy.

Remedial Policy

Exempts students from remedial assessments and the policy used to exempt any concurrently enrolled student, but new legislation is requiring student to be prepared for the course. This policy change is providing flexibility. Any concurrently enrolled student that will take a course that requires placement must be assessed in order to do so.

Admissions Policy

An ASCENT student has to meet all eligibility requirements in the legislation and rules. Another requirement in legislation is that a student must be admitted to a degree program in order to participate in ASCENT. This causes a conflict because CCHE policy says that a student must have completed high school in order to be accepted into a 4 year institution.

In order to understand the stance of various groups on this policy issue, Matt talked to academic council, data advisory group, admissions officers, and legislation writers to try to understand intent. After hearing from these people, it sounds like the legislative intent was not to exclude 4-

year institutions from participating. The intent of saying that a student had to be in degree or certificate program was to make sure that students participating in the 5th year are on track to something. The rules link this student's outcomes to ICAP. Based on that intent and some of the practices going on right now at 4-year institutions, Matt put a paragraph in policy that allows for provisional admittance to 4-year institutions. CDHE has no definition of provisional admittance, so they will give the 4-year institution flexibility to define that through practice. In order to make sure we're meeting intent of legislation, we are going to require that the student meet the freshman standard. That includes coursework and index. To clarify, this is for ASCENT students only.

4-year schools do not report these students as applicants. Their enrollment will be tracked through the enrollment report. As far as that student is concerned, they are still in high school. The state will consider them high school students and that aligns with the federal definition of first-time freshmen. These ASCENT students in the 5th year will not be counted with the same cohort.

For the year after ASCENT – If they've taken it at 2-year or 4-year institution, that student will be considered the applicant. That student will have to meet the requirements that are currently in policy. If they have 12 credit hours or less, they'll have to meet the index requirements. If they have 13-29 credits, they'll have to meet the transfer standard of college GPA and coursework requirements. If they have 30 or more credits, they have to meet transfer standard. These students would be reported as first-time freshmen. That fits the federal definition and also helps with financial aid.

The Board will recommend changes to CCHE during the formal meeting.

3. Report Updates

Led by Charles Dukes

Charles distributed copies of the report that was submitted to the State Board of Education, CCHE and education committees.

4. Prioritization of Funds Committee Update

Led by Cliff Richardson

This committee met today. They are looking at 3 or 4 different factors to help potentially prioritize districts. These are by no means at approval stage. Some of the possibilities include school district's free and reduced lunch, completion rate, possibly CTE component, possibly distance demographics. This year, we'll have more ASCENT applicants than slots available. We're looking at how to prioritize those districts and then looking at ways of distributing slots in increments of pools. Hopefully in January, we'll come to the Board with recommendations for improvement. Next meeting, we'll have a lengthy discussion on the impact of this.

5. Communications Committee Update

Led by Charles Dukes

Information on Concurrent Enrollment and ASCENT has been presented at many conferences across the state. We'll be thinking about the next phase in the coming months. We think it'll be a transition from policy overview to implementation. We don't know what that looks like yet.

6. Joint Budget Committee Update

Led by Cliff Richardson

The JBC is naturally nervous about the amount of funds requested for ASCENT based on the number of slots identified in September. That number is kind of alarming to them. They spent a lot of time on the ASCENT program and different ways to fund the ASCENT program during their recent hearing. Out of that conversation, two concerning issues were brought up: (1) the JBC would like a better number in Sept than the one that we've been working with; (2) They want to create legislation which moves the 12/13 date that no longer allows for PSEO. We've looked at data, but although numbers aren't huge, I'm concerned about opening legislation about that.

September Enrollment Report

Last year, 600 students were reported for ASCENT eligibility in September and they funded 277 students in May or June. We ended up being earmarked for \$1.7M in the CDE budget. We're not going to spend all of that this year. As a result of this, the JBC and CDE fiscal staffs are requesting a more realistic number to earmark funds when we're doing budget allocation. This year, we had 2,500 students identified for ASCENT eligibility in September. At the JBC hearing, the staff questioned whether it's possible to shore up the September slot count to be more realistic. As they're allocating funds, they really want more realistic numbers. In the past, the board has shored up those numbers in Feb, but we're feeling the pressure that they want to shore it up in Sept. The Board opened up the conversation to address this issue:

- RDP – In the future, it'll be much easier to give numbers in Sept, because formalized programs will be in place and we'll have a more realistic grasp on who will really participate in the program.
- CF – I agree. We'll better know how to have conversations with kids. However, popularity of the program will grow, so we don't really know how many families will want to take advantage of this opportunity.
- Don Keely – Wouldn't mind putting names. Problem with Sept 1 is that we won't know where dual enrollment kids are at that point. We have roughly 700 kids taking classes in our high school. With that, there's no way I could tell you exactly who would qualify. I actually have about 2,000 duplicated kids who would qualify. I would know by October, though. If we just had another two or three weeks, it would be accurate. If we had names, it would certainly cut it down.
- Mimi Lenard - Last time, you were talking about putting criteria to ASCENT program, so in order to try to choose who would be eligible to participate; I think you said you would try to come up with something. If that was in place, I would know better who to select by September, but Oct would be better. It would be easier than it is now. Had lots of calls who are treating ASCENT as a scholarship. I'm not sure that's exactly the intent of the program, because these kids would have gone otherwise. If it's made more specific, it would be easier for a district to select. Could be academic. Numbers are based on eligibility, not interest in the program.
- CD – In the ideal situation, counselors talk to the students about their ICAP, but that might be another year out.

- MR – In migrant education, they have to do a priority for service. Districts could do that internally.
- CH – Even with ICAPs, students may change their minds.
- Audience – I do treat it as a scholarship. It's a merit-based thing. I'm worried that at our school, kids will be left out if you add these. The law is pretty clear about requirements. It's not fair to schools that you'll leave out. I've got kids who weren't considering college, but because of credit programs at school, they're looking at college. I hope you take that into consideration, because this is another discussion. I inflated number our because we had to. I wanted to make sure we didn't have anybody that didn't qualify. It's merit-based, and I would like to leave it merit-based. I'm not sure it's going to be equitable to take that away. We've gone into this program with every intention that you earn your way. I think we could make juniors, at the end of their junior year, commit. We could then give real numbers and names. We could do that because we start school in August and do all registration up front. It's been pretty vague, so we all inflated because we're playing that game. I don't want to leave anybody out who had a chance to qualify. We'll have more kids as this goes along because we're trying to provide those credit opportunities for them in high school.
 - CD – If we made Sept 1 the deadline, would it make the planning process more important to the districts? By the end of the junior year, you'd have to have a solid idea of ASCENT participants.
 - CF – Planning is necessary, but we still have some unanswered questions by Sept 1 that play into the numbers. It's also a marketing issue of who we're going after. I've been looking for the kid that otherwise wouldn't have the opportunities.
 - Audience – The law is merit-based. I want to say that this is for all kids.
- GC - With regard to DPS, we did have all students fill out an intent to participant. We had very clear numbers and names by Sept 1. Is that too early or too late? It comes down to the qualifiers. This year, we lost numbers because students qualified for more aid, so we encouraged them to go with the aid, because it did better than ASCENT. That goes with the student who really needs it vs. the student who may not. I like the idea of giving a general number at the end of the junior year. Then, maybe roll it into the October count. We're submitting concurrent enrollment numbers on Oct 1. That would be a good indication of who's out there and participating. I don't want to lose this. We're talking about putting qualifiers on it. It's not about any of that. It's clear that it's there for the students. We just need to figure out a process to give to the state. They're asking for something that doesn't go into effect until 2012.
- CR – Right now, we're focused on a request from JBC to change submission to Sept 1.
- DK – If I used an intent letter, I would have a larger number than what I have now.
- CF – We have to be careful not to get hopes up and then crush them.
- CD – If we were to ask for transcripts Sept 1 of eligible students based on law, would you be able to provide transcripts? We would look at the transcripts and make sure they're enrolled in classes during senior year.
- CF – It would have to be a transcript and schedule.

- Seems like you have two somewhat incongruent timelines. For students, they don't make that decision by Sept. 1. You can't get accurate numbers, because they can't accurately say that they've committed to what they're doing for college.
- CD – If students are taking 12 credit hours, they have to determine that prior to their senior year.
- There's a difference between eligible and intent to participate
- CR – We're just looking for a little better reporting of numbers. We just want it to be a little more realistic.
- CH – Would it be helpful for schools to provide running documentation of the reasons why students chose not to continue with ASCENT, for those numbers that have already been reported? That might help JBC see why there are changes.
- CR – There are too many reasons.
- GC - Would like to avoid submitting high school transcripts for verification. If you want names, you're asking for verification of transcripts. There are confidentiality issues. So how can we verify, then, that students are actually on track? We need to eliminate as much paperwork as possible. If there's an electronic way of creating a confirmation process...it goes along with the marketing piece. This year, we asked for verification of accurate numbers. Now, we're hearing that it's not the case.

It sounds like October would be better, but the numbers may not change.

Charles will check with Vody on this. It sounds like schools could have a more solid number.

At one time, we talked about validating your numbers in Feb with students you know will be eligible if they complete their spring semester. At that time, we'll require proof of transcript.

- RDP – On JeffCO transcripts, nothing indicates that it's a CE course. Nowhere will it say that it's dual enrollment.
- CR – It's going to be a real challenge to get college transcripts for that submittal. We'll have to figure out a way to get that. It doesn't do a lot of good at the February meeting to not have total eligible students on your list.
- RDP – Transcripts won't prove that to anyone right now.
- GC – Doesn't concurrent enrollment legislation require that they show dual enrollment? So it would have to appear on both transcripts.
- RDP – We're working on that, but for this year, we don't have that.
- CH – Can colleges assist in the process?
- CR – Wouldn't be well received by registrars.
- CH – So they're just submitting numbers in Feb?
- CR – We need an update on whether students are still on track. I think you need the student high school transcript. Someone will need to certify CE classes.

You need to be prepared for February to verify.

Recommendation to move PSEO ending

The JBC staff recommended statutory changes that would require the ASCENT program to start earlier and prohibit PPOR being used for PSEO 5th year programs at an earlier date than originally in legislation. It would essentially eliminate current PSEO 5th year programs. What is the feeling of the group?

- GC – There are two schools that have been authorized to have PSEO. Sheridan and Lincoln.
- ASCENT would begin this fall, 2011, rather than 2012.
- The impact would be that a district that has held on to students past their senior year wouldn't be able to do it anymore and they're too late to do the ASCENT program.
- CH – It doesn't allow planning to implement this change. 5th year programs for 2nd year seniors that don't meet ASCENT eligibility will continue, so this wouldn't change much.
- CD – students who are held back for instructional reasons, they're capped. If there was a limit on ASCENT program next year,
- CR – It's not duplicating costs, it's just making districts count it in a different way.
- MM – I have a concern with changing the rules of the game in the middle. We've been doing the outreach in our presentations with multiple groups; we tell them that they can continue to do what they're doing until 2012. I'd have a real problem with changing that. If we were talking about changing it last legislative session, I'd be okay with it.
- CD – We did a mini survey about the impact of this statutory change if it were to happen. It showed that it would have a minimal impact for 2 reasons: larger districts that previously used PSEO have already transitioned to CE and ASCENT and other districts have never even used PSEO.
- MM – Will Sheridan and Lincoln be impacted?
- GC – Lincoln will not. They are ready for ASCENT.
- CH – for schools who aren't officially doing this, we're talking about impacting at least 40 students.
- RB – Did staff indicate how much it would save by doing that? If we could show that it doesn't save anything, that's the best argument to give to the staff.
- CR – Part of savings would be having a lower PPOR count, but I don't know what the numbers would be. With Chelsy's students, they wouldn't be eligible for ASCENT because they wouldn't meet the requirements of ASCENT. They'd have one more year to fix it. On the other hand, it's only a year.
- GC – They'd only get partial PPOR, then.
- CH – If we're encouraging ICAPs and planning, we're changing the rules in the middle of the game. I don't recommend this.
- CR – Does the board want to take action, wait or make a recommendation to CDE and JBC. What's the comfort of the board?
- CH – I'm afraid if we don't have a recommendation, they'll just make the decision to go forward. If this board has a voice, maybe that will help.
- Will impact Sheridan.
- This would be introduced in January.

7. Formal meeting

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

- a. Absent: Jhon Penn, Geri Anderson, Scott Springer, Vaughn Toland
- b. Minutes approved by R. Bond, seconded by S. Stump

b. Public Input

- a. No public Input.

c. Action items

- a. Recommendation of this board to CDHE for the policy changes to be in compliance with legislation, per recommended by Matt, moved by R. Bond, seconded by D. Schmitt, passed.
- b. Recommendation to JBC and CDE that no changes be made at this time for fifth year students under PSEO made by C. Harris, seconded by M. Rangel, 6 passed, 1 no

d. Next meeting, January 27, 1:00-5:00

- a. Will forward committee recommendation for review and public comment on prioritization process.

e. Meeting adjourned

Addendum: *Following this meeting, the CEAB discussed the possible statutory change with JBC staff. This discussion helped them better understand the intent of this statutory change; therefore, they voted via email, 10-3 to recall their original resolution to oppose the statutory change.*