



Remedial Education Policy Review  
Task Force and Advisory Board meeting  
October 26, 2012  
9am – 3pm  
Colorado School of Mines

**\*\* DRAFT \*\***  
**Minutes**

1. Greetings

- Cindy Somers, Arapahoe Community College
- Karen Lemke, Adams State University
- John Lanning, University of Colorado, Denver
- Bill Niemi, Western State Colorado University
- Frank Zizza, Colorado State University, Pueblo
- Diana Anglin, Colorado School of Mines
- Sandy Gilpin, Fort Lewis College
- Bitsy Cohn, Colorado Community College System
- Rob Umbaugh, Aims Community College
- Eric Dunker, Metro State University of Denver
- Peter Fritz, Colorado Department of Education
- Staff: Tamara White, Emmy Glancy, Becky Apter

2. Remedial Guiding Principles Revised

The task force reached consensus on adopting the following statement as the team's Guiding Principles:

Colorado Statewide Remedial Education policy values clear communication between the primary stakeholder groups, (1) students, (2) K-12 and higher education, (3) the public. The policy is informed by data, best practices and alignment with P-12, high school graduation guidelines, statewide admissions standards, and transfer policy. For each of the stakeholder groups the policy is flexible and actionable to allow multiple pathways to educational success. The policy promotes a shared sense of responsibility and ownership among stakeholders.

3. Goals Revised

The Remedial Education policy is designed:

- 1) To prepare students to be successful in credit bearing (courses, specifically) math and English courses.

- 2) To provide accurate and timely information regarding course, degree and support options for students identified as under-prepared.
- 3) To provide transparency by informing stakeholders, (1) students, (2) K-12 and higher education, (3) the public about outcomes of remediation.

4. Developmental Education Committee Update, Bitsy Cohn

1. Confusion over the different roles of this committee and the Developmental Education Committee was clarified. The responsibility for redesigning developmental education within Colorado sits with the community college system. The current dev ed program and courses are not working so the goal of the committee, which has two representatives from each community college, is to complete the redesign by February 2013 with implementation fall of 2014.
2. They received two grants to develop new models one of which is already being tested by community colleges. The content and rigor will not change but the prerequisites will change.
3. The Remedial Education Policy Review task force will need to consider these changes in the new policy.

5. R-Squared Research Presentation, Robert Reichardt

Was contracted by DHE to perform research using SURDS and 10<sup>th</sup> grade math CSAP scores to determine level of persistence after a student had completed 30 credit hours at a Colorado public institution.

The research results found:

- a higher CSAP score correlates with a greater likelihood of going to 4-year institution
- the CSAP and the Index are moderately correlated
- there was a lower rate of persistence for males, Hispanics and lower income students and the use of the Index varies by institution.

6. Credit for Prior Learning

The DHE Academic Council is currently reviewing but the Task Force's opinion is that it should wait until their work is completed. The primary question/issue is what happens when a student gets a 3 in an AP course at a community college but then the transfer school won't accept it? The three options being reviewed are:

- Accept the school's decision
- Create standard scores across the spectrum
- Leave the policy as it is

It seems to be more of a General Education Council issue because it's around the topic of transfer. The GE Council has already reviewed the policy twice in 10 years:

- It's very complex and to create a matrix would be difficult
- The decision has always been let the school decide
- Maybe DHE should intervene on those occasions when there's an issue
- What do other states do?

Students should have the right to believe that if they meet the requirements stated by the community college, then a four-year school should accept it. But students should also take the responsibility to know and understand the four-year school's requirements. If students were to start receiving the information in high school, it would give them more time to understand the consequences/implications.

The conclusion was there needs to be more discussion by a bigger, different group.

#### 7. APA Remedial Reports

There were different cut scores for math included in this information but were unsure if the ACT info was included.

Action Item: solicit questions for ACT and SAT to share with APA to cover the next time.

#### 8. Supplemental Academic Instruction policy draft

Next step is to take the draft to the Commission. Question remains that if this is good enough for SAI students, then why not for all students?

#### 9. Action Items and Next Meeting

- Action Item: review roles and responsibilities for discussion at next meeting
- There's no meeting in December
- Will need to take a draft of the new policy to the Advisory board in February
- Next meeting: November 30<sup>th</sup> at CCCS Conference Center.