

DRAFT

Department of Higher Education- Admission and Transfer Policy Review
September 14, 2012 9:00am - 5:00 pm

1

Admission and Transfer Policy Review

Task Force Meeting

9:00am-1:00pm

Attendees:

Eric Carpio, Adams State University
Doug Driver, Western State (joined by phone)
Carl Einhaus, Colorado Community College System
Lori Kester, Community College of Denver
Jo O'Brien, Colorado Dept. of Education
Renee Orlick, Colorado State University
Vaughn Toland, Metropolitan State University of Denver
Paula Yanish, Aims Community College
Tamara White Johnson, Colorado Dept. of Higher Education

Facilitator: Ana Soler- Civic Canopy **Note taker:** Meghan Ables- Civic Canopy

9:00 am Welcome, Introductions, Agenda & Outcomes, Review of Ground Rules

Meeting Goals:

- Develop a shared understanding of where we are in our process and progress to date so that we can move forward as a team
- Come to agreement on a decision making model
- Come to agreement on a draft set of core values that will be used to guide the policy revision process so that the work can be anchored
- Establish a list of bold ideas and emerging considerations

9:40 am Discuss and Decide on a Decision Making Model that will guide group through the decision making process.

The group decided on a Consensus Decision Making Model, which involves a high level of ownership and involvement from each member. In the consensus model not everyone has to agree 100%; but everyone has to be able to live with the decision. Using a scale of 1-5 for voting (1 is "Don't like it", 3 is "I can live with it", 5 is "I love it"), every member of the group must vote a 3 or higher so that the group can reach a "live with it" consensus.

If consensus cannot be reached or tasks cannot be completed during the meeting because of time constraints or other factors a fall back plan will be used. This fallback plan will be enacted by assigning tasks to a subcommittee to keep the process moving forward. The fallback committee will not make major decisions, but rather work on tasks such as wordsmithing, research, etc. The whole group will decide when the fallback committee will

DRAFT

Department of Higher Education- Admission and Transfer Policy Review
September 14, 2012 9:00am - 5:00 pm

2

work on tasks. Members of the fallback committee should represent not only the interests of their institution but also the interests of the entire group.

-Fallback plan committee should include CDHE staff and institution representatives

- One (1) four-year institution representative
- One (1) community college representative
- One (1) CDHE staff member

It is important to note that the group discussed the following structure for the fallback committee but decided that this group would be too large to effectively and efficiently accomplish the work that maybe required of a fallback group.

- Three (3) 4-year representatives (1 selective rep, 1 moderately selective rep; 1 modified open rep)
- One (1) Community College
- One (1) Ext to CCCS
- Two (2) CDHE

See word additional documents for goals revision and values.

Advisory Board and Task Force Meeting 1:00pm- 5:00pm

Attendees:

Task Force:

Renee Orlick, Colorado State University
Tamara White Johnson, Colorado Dept. of Higher Education
Carl Einhaus, Colorado Community College System
Eric Carpio, Adams State University
Vaughn Toland, Metropolitan State University of Denver
Lori Kester, Community College of Denver
Doug Driver, Western State (joined by phone)
Paula Yanish, Aims Community College
Jo O'Brien, Colorado Dept. of Education

Advisory Board

Amy Anderson, Colorado Department of Education
Wayne Artis, General Education Council
Nate Easley, Denver Scholarship Foundation
Tracy Lovett, Daniels Fund
Richard Miller, Fort Lewis College
Matt Nehring, Adams State University
Tracy Adams Peters, University of Denver
Dawn Taylor Owens, College in Colorado
Rana Tankerton, Denver Scholarship Foundation
Andrew Tucker, Boulder Valley School District
Mike Womochil, Colorado Community College System

1:00 pm Welcome, Introductions

This is the first time since May that the task force and advisory board is together in a joint meeting. The task force has been meeting consistently since that meeting in May.

Aha's! and Policy Implications from presentations

Carl- Recalibration of the Index (link on the website to study and research below)

- GPA's coming out of high schools are inflated
- The more math courses a student takes the more likely they are to succeed in college. Just getting to trigonometry classes (not necessarily passing them) greatly increases student's probability of success in college
- Questions if the index will even exist after future study
- Suggests that high schools should include weighted and un-weighted GPA

- There is an increased need for remediation in the past few years. In 2011 there was a 38% remediation.
- Consensus among 4-year colleges that they don't see the index as a predictor of success anymore. Better predictors of success tend to be students leadership, trend in grades, etc.

Renee- Admission Selection Process

- Colorado colleges are starting in the same place using the same tools as they shape their classes
- Institutions agree that there is more to a student than a GPA and a test score
- Recognize that there are students who don't present on paper that they are ready for higher education
- Ft. Lewis and Adams use the index more than others, but almost no institution is using the index singularly
- Time of application (how long it is in the pool) is a better predictor than the index (linked to higher motivation)
- Policy should allow for colleges/universities to use criteria they know will reflect the likelihood for success in their particular institution

Vaughn- Colorado Academic Standards

- 4 Key Standards- academic standards represent the standards that students need to meet to be successful post-secondary.
 - o Expectations with greater depth
 - o Design with the end in mind
 - o Requiring application of knowledge
 - Transfer knowledge to other areas shows mastery
 - o Focus on all students and all standards
- Policy Implications:
 - Connect these standards to the new assessments
 - Students must show mastery of these standards- but what happens if they don't??
 - If students show mastery in these standards it should eliminate need for remediation

Jo O'Brien- Assessments

- Standards are pivoting right now- what a 5th grader used to need to know, a 3rd grader now needs to know.
- Standards are not based on a tracking system that is based on either vocational or college track
- CSAP was established 17 years ago- the new tests are updated to the new standards
- The new tests will have a cut point that is more rigorous than in the past, so the result will likely look like we have had a drastic drop-off in IQ
- Social studies will be tested for the first time
- Cut points, rigor, and look & feel of test will change- test will be computerized

- CSAP/TCAP will stay on pen/paper until 2015; CO & 23 other states will go online to administer reading, writing, and math tests; The 24 states will have to agree on a cut point.
- May 2013- CO will have a minimum graduation guideline – guidelines will be more about mastery (not necessarily in a test, but in experience) rather than “seat-time”. This will create a meaningful diploma that should minimize remediation.
- PARCC- national assessment that CO decided on; policy needs to accommodate PARCC and other national tests. Right now policy doesn’t allow colleges to accept CSAP or TCAP, but might be able to use PARCC

Eric- Postsecondary Workforce Ready (PWR) Endorsed Diploma Criteria and Graduation Guidelines

- If a student has the endorsed diploma they will meet the state’s open, modified & moderately selective school’s minimum criteria
- 4 criteria to get endorsed diploma:
 - Student demonstrates that he or she is college ready and remediation free
 - Student must complete ICAP
 - Student must demonstrate mastery of 21st century skills
 - Demonstrate mastery in 3 of 7 content areas

1:45 pm Policy Process Update

See PowerPoint

Contact with Remedial Education Policy Review group

One member from this group will volunteer each month to attend their meeting and then report back to this group. If you are interested, please let Tamara know.

3:00 pm Policy Revision, elements under review

- Consider: Can we use the Post-Secondary Workforce Ready Endorsed Diploma as admissions standards?
- Consider: In the policy does the word “admissions” cover freshman admissions and transfer admissions or does the language in the policy need to make the two distinct.

Group members split into 3 groups to discuss and make recommendations for three pertinent issues.

Group 1: Transfer

* The transfer policy needs to be revised! Current statewide transfer policy is hugely out of date and expiration of transfer credits needs attention

What should the admission policy say for transfers?

- Greater transfer of associate’s degree
- Can we follow pattern of PWR diploma range of indicators?
- Need to allow for program/major specific requirements and/or institution flexibility
- Alignment with CCCS completion metrics

- How does concurrent enrollment fit in (or not) of grade forgiveness
- How to build a path for those who initially struggle then excel
- How to better define what makes a transfer student
- Address college-readiness via remedial policy

Group 2: To Index or not to Index?

- What are the alternatives to indexing?
- The general consensus is that the index is not necessary; we can do without it.
- The index can be really confusing and if we are trying to create a transparent policy, the index is not. This is also true for the window.
- Need to recognize that students are more than a number. BUT, the index is a baseline that provides institutions with a way to navigate a huge pool of students and is helpful for some universities.
- Talked about moving to a minimum GPA and ACT system- but really how is that different than the index?
- Talked about moving to a standard GPA- not a weighted GPA or moving to a core GPA where only core class are included in the GPA- but this may disadvantage some students such as students interested in art.
 - *** Ask other states what happened when they changed their GPA system
- Rather than publicizing the index, create a profile of a successful student at individual institutions (“the sweet spot”).

Next Steps for Index:

- The general consensus is to move away from the index and look for other alternatives.
 - >Look at alternatives to the index
 - Research how other states have created alternatives to weighted GPA's
- Key question: Has the utilization of the index increased attendance of college in Colorado?
How does the index help us achieve our goals?
- Talk to institutions to discover “the sweet spot” of success and retention for students at each institution.

Group 3: Stance on Mastery

- Don't think that seat time equals mastery.
- What is the definition of mastery?
- There should be multiple measures for what mastery is, including a good mix of cognitive and non-cognitive. Keep in mind that mastery is expensive to measure for admissions offices.
- Recommendation to move away from HEAR, which does not equal college success.
- Decisions around measuring mastery are important because recognizing that there are different ways for a student to learn course content in high school to become successful post-secondary opens up the door for education reform.