

DRAFT- DRAFT- DRAFT

Remedial Education Policy Review

Task Force Meeting

9:00am-1:00pm

Attendees:

Mary Axelson, Colorado Mountain College
Eric Dunker, Metro State
Peter Fritz, Colorado Dept. of Education
Sandra Gilpin, Fort Lewis College
Heather (Representing Sonia Brandon), Colorado Mesa University
John Lanning, University of Colorado, Denver
Bill Niemi, Western State
Karen Raymond, University of Northern Colorado
Rob Umbaugh, Aims Community College

Staff:

Becky Apter, Colorado Department of Higher Education
Emmy Glancy, Colorado Department of Higher Education
Tamara White, Colorado Department 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

1. Develop a shared understanding of where we are in our process or progress to date so that we can move forward as a team
2. Come to agreement on a decision making model
3. Come to agreement on a draft set of core values that will be used to guide the policy revision process so that work can be anchored over the lifetime of this committee
4. Establish a list of bold ideas and key considerations the task force identified from the expert presentations to ensure that these are integrated into the final product
5. Roadmap of initial concepts and emerging consideration so that we start moving on the actual revision work

Deciding on a Decision Making Model

Values the group expressed they wanted in their decision making process:

1. Lots of feedback- intentional feedback loops
2. Seek consensus, everyone feeling heard through the process
3. Each group member is representing a huge amount a people; seek to be most representative of all in decision-making

The group unanimously 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, the backup plan will be enacted by assigning tasks to a subcommittee to keep the process moving forward. The “backup” committee will not make major decisions, but rather work on tasks such as wordsmithing, research, etc. The whole group will decide when the backup committee will work on tasks.

Potential Backup Committee Structure:

- Community College – 1 representative
- Four Year Institution – 2 representatives
 - Research university
 - Smaller university
- Aims/CNC - 1 representative
- K-12 (with P-20 perspective) - 1 representative

Group reached consensus that they would use a backup committee when necessary. The committee structure outlined above is a potential structure that could be used, but the group did not want to lock themselves into a structure. The group will use the above structure as a draft, but may change the structure based on the task the backup committee is assigned.

Revision of Goals and Values

The group broke up into small groups to discuss the goals of the statewide remedial education policy. Each group discussed what they would add to the goals and how they would change the goals. The group then discussed their findings and drafted revised goals. *-See additional document for draft of revised goals.*

The group then broke into groups to discuss guiding principles (values) that should be reflected in the policy.

-See additional document for draft of guiding principles (values).

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

Task Force Attendees:

Bitsy Cohn, Colorado Community College System
Eric Dunker, Metro State
Peter Fritz, Colorado Dept. of Education
Sandra Gilpin, Fort Lewis College
Heather (Representing Sonia Brandon), Colorado Mesa University
John Lanning, University of Colorado, Denver
Bill Niemi, Western State
Karen Raymond, University of Northern Colorado
Rob Umbaugh, Aims Community College

Staff:

Becky Apter, Colorado Department of Higher Education
Emmy Glancy, Colorado Department of Higher Education
Tamara White, Colorado Department of Higher Education

Advisory Board Attendees:

Sarah Allen, University of Northern Colorado
Jason Clark, University of Colorado, Denver
Mary Fulton, Education Commission of the States
Yolanda Garduno, West High School
Jane Goff, School Board of Education
Keith King, Colorado Springs Early Colleges
Judith Martinez, Colorado Department of Education
Barbara Morris, Fort Lewis College
Kim Poast, Colorado Department of Higher Education
Mary Ann Roe, Colorado Department of Labor and Employment
Matt Smith, Education Commission of the States
Rick Tanski, Academy District 20
Dawn Taylor Owens, College in Colorado

1:00 pm Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, and Updates

Process Update

We are in Phase I of the process, which is hallmarked by task force development and meetings and the development of policy revision recommendations. In February, and March we will work on policy options together. In April, May, June we will start the second phase of the process, which will include vetting with various constituents across Colorado.

Group voted to confirm the consensus model that the task force chose in the morning session.

Aha's! and Policy Implications from presentations

During the summer the task force group listened to presentations from experts in content related to the policy revision work. Task force group members reported to the advisory group on the presentations.

1. Karen Raymond shared data from DHE reports:
 - Remedial Report – approx. 30% remediation rate in CO
 - Math requires the most remediation,
 - Predictor models for remediation
 - Data that is missing: adult learners; free & reduced lunch; non-cognitive predictors
2. Bitsy Cohn presented information (over conference call) on what the Colorado Community College System, Development Education task force is finding as they exam the state of developmental education in Colorado, review current practices, and suggest best practices. *See powerpoint.*
3. Sandy Gilpin reported on Colorado Academic standards:
 - State moving to the common core state standards known as Colorado Academic Standards
 - Mastery standards – each grade level will have skills and knowledge that they MUST master in that grade. This will make it harder for kids not to master skills.
 - Prepared Graduate Competencies- mastery rather than proficiency
 - 21st Century Skills
 - New assessments rolled out during 2013-2014 school year
 - Colorado will use the PARCC assessment
4. John Lanning reported on the work of the Graduation Guidelines Development Council surrounding high school graduation guidelines. John clarified that they are guidelines that each district will use to develop their high school graduation requirements (See handout). One of the guiding principles of the guidelines group is that a student should graduate from high school postsecondary workforce ready.
5. Judith Martinez presented information on PWR Endorsed Diploma Update *See powerpoint*
 - If a student has the endorsed diploma they will be remediation free and will be automatically admitted to an open, modified & moderately selective institution of higher education in Colorado
6. Mary Fulton from Education Commission of the States, overviewed effective remedial education policy revision process (assessment- enrollment- completion)

Policy Revision Work

Group members split into four groups to discuss and make recommendations for four issues pertinent to the policy revision work. Their recommendations on each issue are listed below.

Cut Scores

1. Group wondered if students take the high-stakes nature of the assessments seriously.
2. Agreed that multiple measures are needed to determine college readiness and that there should be a range of cut scores dependent of the pathway of the student.

Assessment

1. Need to have more targeted diagnostic tools/assessment to identify skill and knowledge deficiencies.
 - Accuplacer is a “binary” determination of remediation
2. Need to standardize remedial courses around the state
 - Syllabus, content, expected outcomes
3. Agreed that the institutions- rather than the state- should be able to determine what diagnostics to use and which level of remedial, which pathways
 - But, group did think there should be some guidance from the state for consistency among higher education
4. How will higher ed evaluate and place students without standardized test scores or without the “usual” tests
 - Students who have not taken a state-reported assessment in 2 or more years prior to admission to higher ed
 - myriad of assessment at higher ed level may make it difficult for high schools
5. How do we incorporate mastery into remedial courses?
6. Are there appropriate non-cognitive assessments?

Terminology and Definitions

1. Consolidating some terms:
 - remedial course vs. developmental course
 - worried about funding dependent on language
2. Definition of basic skills- could that include soft skills or does that just mean academic?
3. Words used interchangeably throughout the process/policy
4. Differentiating placements and cut score they may not have been defined before
 - *might run into language issue because of what 4 year colleges are allowed to offer

Differentiated Placement

1. Math- 3 types
 - Math for liberal arts
 - College algebra
 - Statistics

2. Mapping to student goals and major requirements
3. Tracking and Equity Concerns

What the group wanted to see, have clarified:

1. Want to see data about success rates of students on the bubble but with cut scores in different courses
2. What about students who are not necessarily “remedial”, just not ready/prepared for particular degree/course
 - Would this be developmental, rather than remedial?
 - What does remedial mean with respect to basic skills, not necessarily a set of skills for a specific placement

Feedback on Tracking, Common Course Prefix, Technical Support

Group voted and agreed that the policy process is moving in the right direction.

Positives

1. Good facilitation
2. Presentations about work that has already been done- liked that presentations were done by members of committee, not necessarily the people who originally presented the info.
3. Food
4. Binders
5. Copies of presentations
6. Organized – knew the outcomes that we wanted
7. Respectful, kind, positive attitude of members of the group- collegiality

Deltas

1. Needed more time in small groups
2. Need more contextualization about the implications of our decisions and recommendations
3. Break down tough questions, examples of what works
4. Feedback from admissions group