



Remedial Education Policy Review
Task Force Meeting
January 8th, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Conference Call

**** DRAFT ****
Minutes

1. WELCOME AND GREETINGS

- Frank Zizza, Colorado State University - Pueblo
- Eric Dunker, Metro State University of Denver
- Bitsy Cohn, Colorado Community College System
- Rob Umbaugh, Aims Community College
- Kay Schneider, Colorado School of Mines
- Cindy Somers, Arapahoe Community College
- John Lanning, University of Colorado – Denver (phone)
- Mary Axelson, Colorado Mountain College (phone)
- Sonia Brandon, Colorado Mesa University (phone)
- Bill Niemi, Western State Colorado University
- Sandy Gilpin, Fort Lewis College
- Renee Orlick, Colorado State University – Ft. Collins (Admission liaison)
- Staff: Tamara White Johnson, Emmy Glancy, Becky Apter

2. Subcommittee Reports

Assessment

- Nothing much new to report
- Would like to include a general definition of “college readiness” in the policy because of the differences in each institution:
 - Is it an absolute or more relative definition?
 - It’s not the student, it’s the pathway
 - Use ranges of scores
 - The decision to administer a secondary assessment to determine if a student is or is not college ready is up to the particular institution.
 - Maryland uses language in their policy which may be helpful.
 - The index is one example of including a chart similar such as:
 - 1) Below 19 – you are remedial
 - 2) 19-22 – you might be remedial

3) 22 & above – you are not remedial

But also have a qualifying statement such as “. . . no score guarantees placement in a college course. Secondary assessments and placement criteria are institutional decisions . . .”

- There were some concerns about the use of new assessments such as PARCC without it having been vetted; would like the policy to reflect that any assessment used must have had proper vetting

Cut Scores

- Need data which won't be available until June before any more progress can be made
- “Limited academic deficiency” is not the same thing as remedial
- Need to develop a cross walk

Differentiating Placement

- In section 2.02.01 of the current policy, includes a statement saying a test score would still be valid if it was within five years of the test date; what about changing it to three years; need data to determine when there are diminishing returns

Next meeting:

Friday, February 22nd includes the Advisory Board