



Academic Council

November 8, 2011

1:00-3:00pm

Department of Higher Education

1560 Broadway -Suite 1600 - Denver, CO 80202

Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; Access code: 215368#

Minutes

1. Greetings and Introductions

Frank Novotny (ASC); Geri Anderson (CCCS); Diane Hegeman (ACC); Carol Futhey (CMU); Steve Werman (CMU); Rick Miranda (CSU-FC); George Dennison (CSU System); Barbara Morris (FLC); Donna Souther (AIMS); Vicki Golich (MSCD); Peg Bacon (UCCS); Kathleen Bollard (CU System); Robbyn Wacker (UNC); Jessica Young (WSC); Sandy Veltri (FRCC); DHE – Ian Macgillivray, Margot Plotz, Heather DeLange, Tamara White Johnson, Beth Bean, Kim Poast, Maia Blom

2. Corrections/Discussion of October Meeting Summary Notes [see handout of DRAFT MINUTES]

Requested that AC reps follow up with GEC reps when deemed appropriate.
October summary notes approved with changes mentioned to attendance list.

3. Budget update

- Governor had very few options. For HE, the Governor looked at financial accountability plans (FAPs) that were made in good faith by IHEs. The budget tries to maintain FAPs as closely as possible. It takes half the reduction from operations; the other half from financial aid. Financial aid from the state is 5%; IHEs provide 5x that amount. A third of need-based financial aid will have to be reduced next year. The reductions were not taken solely from operations because that would be too much burden on IHEs and could ultimately negatively affect students.
- On Nov 21, the CFOs/Financial Aid Directors are meeting to start a conversation on how the financial aid reduction could least affect students. The General Assembly may not like this budget at all. It has a one-year requirement; it is not intended to be a long-term strategy.

4. Master Planning update and implications for Performance Contract renegotiation

- a. Socio-economic status and geography more accurate as indicators of risk than race & ethnicity: ideas for “place bound” students.

The idea behind this indicator is to reach out to “place bound” students to get them into and through HE. This indicator is one of the lenses to look through when renegotiating performance contracts. “First generation students” need to be added to this statement.

b. What might a performance based approach look like? [see November 3, 2011 CCHE agenda item V, A at

http://higher.colorado.gov/CCHE/Meetings/2011/nov/nov11_va.pdf]

- This agenda item is to get CCHE thinking about how to incent IHEs to get students through HE with meaningful degrees or certificates. P.1 discusses what performance-based funding could look like in CO focusing on completion v. enrollment, keeping in mind the role and mission of each IHE. P.2 highlights incentives for graduating at-risk students (first gen) acknowledging that one size does not fit all IHEs; collaboration between IHEs and workplace is highlighted. P.3 – examples from different states:
 - Indiana shifted from enrollment to outcomes, awarding a fee for additional Bachelor’s degrees and Associate’s degrees.
 - WA awarded Momentum Points as students went through the system. It is important to note that the WA fund was never funded, so the credits are in escrow waiting to be paid up. WA owes a lot of money to the IHEs.
 - TN data show there is not a big difference between enrollment model and outcomes model. This result is probably due to the fact that the model has only been in operation for one year. The implementation would not allow the model to change the IHEs budgets regardless of the formula. So if a school is underperforming there is a limit to how low its budget could go. [There is a minimal level in CO – so performance-based funding will be bonus money.]
 - PA reduces inter-institutional competition and supports collaboration.
 - Contrast between TN and PA: TN started their entire system all over – they will only fund outcomes. PA (CCHE seemed to like this) – made their changes within the system without legislation. The state picked 3 priorities, the IHEs picked 3 priorities. It is not contentious.
- Dec 2 is a meeting to discuss Performance Contracts with governing boards and CEOs. After the December conversation, then we will take next summer to discuss the next steps. All different areas of an IHE need to look at how the Performance Contract/Master Plan would affect them.
- COF has not provided true market-like incentives.
- What if we paid an incremental amount for increased retention each year?– this encourages transfer also.
- How could financial aid incent certain outcomes? How can it be used?

c. Peer institutions: some submissions are in.

Inta Morris will be sending out an email soon. DHE would like to know who are your peer IHEs? DHE doesn't know if these will be used as direct comparisons. Please send in any changes.

d. Performance Contract timeline. S.B. 11-052/§23-5-129(2)(a.5): "...the performance contracts in effect as of July 1, 2010 shall remain in effect until renegotiated as provided in section 23-1-108(1.5) no later than December 1, 2012."

5. Legislative and policy update

a. Admissions policy.

i. Should we possibly modify the index and use subscores? [see Index at:

<http://higher.colorado.gov/Publications/Policies/Current/i-partf-index.pdf>]

- The index is currently based on 50% test scores, 50% GPA. Is this the correct split? Is there a better way to do it based on a student's success on your campuses? The index is based upon a cumulative GPA, so students can play the system by taking easier courses. Are there ways to improve a student's outcome once on campus? Do we just use subscores (reading and math) for placement on campus or also include writing?
- Nov 17 – Tamara White Johnson will be meeting with admissions officers to start the conversation regarding how we approach admission policy overall. By 2014 we want to have a policy that works best for students. K12 will respond to these admissions policies.
- Is the index a static assumption for all students? Could we include some element of rigor? What about placement from test scores?
- Static remedial policies don't work well – too much emphasis is placed on scores and not enough on whether a student has the wherewithal to succeed. Remedial placements should depend on what course of study a student has chosen.
- CSU doesn't use index for admission – they have a more holistic review – they look at the courses taken. This approach is more time consuming.
- The admission policy needs to place emphasis on the things that matter.

b. Your institution's ideas for legislation?

c. Educational Success Task Force approved these proposed bills:

The task force is comprised of legislators, business leaders, K12 leaders, HE reps, CDE, DHE. There are six legislators on the task force and they are the only ones who can make any decisions; they can run up to 8 pieces of legislation which they want to do in addition to their previous 5. The task force is intended to look at transition points for all students from early childhood to middle school.

i. Require CCHE to develop a system for awarding college credit to adult students for such things as military and professional experience. [see handout Awarding College Credit for Experience]

One thing to keep in mind is these credits must be able to transfer. This bill would take time to implement – at least 3 years? Please bring any suggestions or proposed changes to next meeting.

ii. Allow students to earn associate degrees with credits earned at four-year schools.

Reverse Transfer legislation. Might be better to have it be a pilot program. Will need to be coordinated systemwide through DHE.

- iii. Require districts to consider remedial programs for middle-schoolers.
There is a fiscal note attached to this legislation. Districts *may* consider remediation program – it's not really "remediation" as much as it is "intervention" for at-risk students.
- iv. Require school districts to administer the Accuplacer test to all students at least once in high school.
To be done in 10th, 11th, or 12th grade – grade level is not specified. This bill will have a large fiscal note. There's discussion about removing TCAP to get funding for this bill.
- d. Update on CCHE policy scrub. Subcommittee of AC to consider revisions?
To be discussed at next meeting. Draft CCHE agenda item to be discussed regarding the policies to be changed. Ian will send today for next meeting.

6. Update on DOD Memorandum of Understanding [see handout MOU draft]
 - a. This is voluntary but if your institution signs it you get financial incentives for DOD employees and military personnel. Beware the indemnification clauses.
This MOU has a strict clause requiring the participating IHE to keep all courses within a field of study available for the next 5 years when a military student is admitted, i.e., the curriculum cannot evolve – there is no flexibility. CCCS has been working directly with DOD. DOD will probably be backing off the curriculum requirement clause; CCCS has verbal agreement that this change will be made.
7. Please recommend someone from your campus to be part of a group to consider if we should use these assessments and what the cut scores should be. Please send recommendations to Ian by Monday, November 14, 2011:
 - a. COMPASS – currently used just for placement—recommend a cut score?
 - b. ACT and SAT writing – not currently used for placement? Should we? Cut score?
 - c. Colorado specific (something similar to what Kentucky did?)
 - Should we set cut scores for those tests for which we don't currently have cut scores, i.e. COMPASS? Will these tests be used for admissions purposes or placement?
 - State developmental task force is working on this issue (it is peopled by CCCS, the local district community colleges, and CMU/ASC).
 - There is a subgroup of the State Developmental Task Force that is looking at placement scores for developmental courses and college-level courses – Ian will follow up and ask them to look at COMPASS and ACT and SAT writing.
 - If AC takes this on, UCD recommended John Lanning and AIMS Rob Umbaugh, Associate Dean.
8. DHE research update. Expect to see results on:
We are in the early stages with these studies so changes can be made. RFPs were put out in October.
 - a. Student Price Sensitivity: how financial aid packages influence enrollment but also first year retention and degree completion.
Awarded to APA (Augenblich, Palaich & Associates) – report due Jan 15, 2012. The study needs to be informed by the price that is being paid for tuition and family income level.
 - b. Educator Preparation and Effectiveness: placement context, mobility, persistence, compensation, educator's academic performance and employment, and preparation.

Two proposals are collaborating – UCB/UCD (doing pilot project already) are collaborating with UNC. December 11 and May 12 reporting dates.

c. Student Retention and Transfer Study: historical trend analysis of retention, transfer, and multiple transfers.

Awarded to NCHEMS; due by March 2012. It's a 10-yr analysis that will consider income as well as demographic factors.

d. Admissions Standards Policy Impact Study: what admissions factors influence postsecondary success?

APA is working with CEPA (UCD). Sonia Brandon from Mesa will look at cut scores/index and work with APA. Due in April 2012.

e. Comprehensive Remedial Analysis: are the state's cut scores reliable and appropriate or should the state should consider recalibrating the cut scores or introducing broader or more holistic reviews of student preparation/readiness or both?

Awarded to APA; they will work closely with CCCS and CCA grant. It will include a qualitative piece. Due in May 2012.

Ian will send the RFP to AC. Feedback can be sent to Beth Bean

(beth.bean@dhe.state.co.us). We're hoping that the studies will inform proposed legislation.

There is concern that the data will be available to inform the legislation coming forward in the legislature. Suggestion for Tamara to make a presentation to the Student Success Task Force about what's being done.

9. Statewide Extended Studies Transition Team update [see November 3, 2011 CCHE agenda item IV, A at http://higher.ed.colorado.gov/CCHE/Meetings/2011/nov/nov11_iva.pdf]

DHE not statutorily obligated to provide services to Statewide Extended Studies [SES] programs that we were previously providing. Transition Team is looking at how SES can be more self-sufficient. New, proposed SES programs will go through same process they go through now (via Margot).

10. Other Business?