



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

Policy Implementation Meeting

August 11, 2014
1:30pm – 3:30pm
Emily Griffith
DHE, 1560 Broadway
Denver, CO 80202

Call in information:
1-877-820-7831
Participant code: 215368#

Meeting Objectives:

- Finalize proposed changes to admissions policy (including selectivity change criteria);
Review draft IHE admission standards

1:30 pm Committee Progress Rhonda

Committee Charge is to review admissions, enrollment and academic range data from the institutions to help

1. Determine the impact that this new policy and the minimum admissions standards will have on enrollment decisions;
2. Determine whether the window serves as a useful tool for institutions admission procedures;
3. Answer the key data questions the Department received during the review process;
4. Provide guidance on whether institutions should work within their selectivity groups to develop minimum standards that align with one another; and
5. Guide the process of institutions in developing minimum standards.

Date	Topic	Progress	Decision made
January 23, 2014	How will the new policy impact institutions enrollment?	complete	DHE will conduct an impact study in 2015.
February 27, 2014	Is the window Useful? Do we need it in the policy?	complete	If we use mid-50 no window, if we use minimum standards use window.
April 3, 2014	How will institutions define rigor?	complete	IHE's want to use the HEAR language in policy
April 24, 2014	How should selectivity be defined without the index?	In-progress	DAG working group will develop guidelines using Mid-50 that correspond with current selectivity definitions. Will also develop guidelines for how an institution could request a change in selectivity.

June 26, 2014	How should institutions calculate the mid-50% ranges for their Admission Standards?	complete	Will be based on admitted students. DHE will do calculation.
July 17, 2014	What criteria will CCE use to evaluate institutions' admission standards?	In-progress	Draft criteria were distributed and will be included in draft policy for next meeting.
August 11, 2014	Review selectivity band change criteria. IHEs bring draft admission standards.	In-progress	

- 1:35 pm High school graduation guidelines alignment & PARCC assessment in policy
Guests: Rebecca Holmes & Jill Hawley, CDE
- 2:00 pm Update from DAG working group on selectivity change criteria Beth
- 2:15 pm Discussion of proposed policy changes Rhonda
- 2:45 pm Finish discussion of questions raised by Andy Burns (FLC) Andy
(See questions below, with Vaughn's responses included)
- 3:00 pm IHEs present draft admission standards Rhonda
- 3:25 pm Next steps, update on Director of Student Affairs Rhonda
- Standards due to DHE by December 2014

Andy's questions:

1. With regard to January 23 discussion item (How will the new policy impact institutions enrollment?), I think it would be prudent to look at the transfer enrollment process. Now that students must have 24 credits in order to transfer, will four-year colleges see a decrease (perhaps a short-term decrease) in transfer applicants? Granted, the policy allows for institutions to use the freshmen admission standards for students with less than 24 credits, but students, parents and community college advisors may interpret the 24 credit clause strictly and delay the application process for students until they reach that threshold. If so, four-year colleges may see a negative impact on their transfer enrollment numbers and related tuition revenue. – I think Andy makes a good point here and I feel that we have mostly neglected transfer students in our discussions in the committee up to this point. My take is that to prevent this from occurring, we will have to make sure our communication with students and our communication tool regarding our new requirements are crystal clear so transfer student realize they can still apply before earning 24 credits.



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

2. The transfer standards state that “Students admitted to four-year institutions as transfer students must have completed all remedial coursework.” Can four-year colleges admit transfer students who haven’t completed their remediation but are eligible for SAI? It seems appropriate to offer an SAI option for transfer students, but the policy is silent on that topic. If I read the policy strictly, I don’t think it would be allowable (unless that student is a window admit. See below for “window” question) – I was on the subcommittee who worked on this piece, and I from what I recall, SAI was still being worked out while we were writing this, which may explain why it’s not reflected in the policy. However, I think transfers should be given the SAI option, so we may need to tweak the policy to reflect this.
3. Per the 50% range conversation, I assume we are going to present the mid 50% range for GPA and ACT composite; that makes sense; however, the policy only concerns itself with the ACT/SAT English and Math sections. The ACT’s Reading and Science sections are rendered somewhat useless. I think we want to set a baseline composite score, by statutory selectivity band levels, for the ACT in particular. Otherwise, some students could game the system and study exclusively for the English and Math sections and do well on those sections at the expense of the Reading and Science sections. Granted, this approach wouldn’t work for the more selective schools (Mines, CU, CSU), because these schools will look at the composite score. But it could be a plausible way for students to gain entry to some of the other institutions if there is no credence given to the overall composite ACT score by the moderately selective or lower-tier selective institutions (FLC, Colorado Mesa, UNC).
4. Window or no window? This topic always garners a colorful conversation from the group. I’m confused by these conversations since the window is in the new policy (section 8.0). I don’t necessarily advocate one way or the other. Rather, I’m curious why the topic is continually rehashed since it’s already there. Since it is already included, it suggests to me that we need some level of accountability to measure window usage. I assume this accountability should be based on institutional statutory authority. – I agree that this is a bit confusing and if memory serves me correctly, I think we decided to leave it in for the time being because we hadn’t decided on if institutions would have set minimums or not. That is, if we decided to have minimums, then we would need a window; but if we decided not to have minimums, then no window was necessary.
5. The transfer section of the new policy that’s posted on the DHE website states that the transfer policy goes into effect in 2016. Is that accurate, or is the implementation date 2019 like the rest of the policy? - There was some discussion regarding these dates last fall and we agreed that schools could start implementing the new requirements as early as fall 2016, but didn’t have to implement them until fall 2019. However, it looks like the part of the policy dealing with transfer students wasn’t updated with the fall 2019 date, so I believe this needs to be corrected. Good eye Andy!

“Starting fall of 2016, the transfer student admissions standard will apply to all degree-seeking undergraduate transfer applicants with 24 or more college-level

semester credit hours completed at the point of application who do not meet one of the exemptions listed in this policy.”

6. Per our discussion around defining selectivity, the policy states that we need to define selectivity for transfer students.

“In addition to students having completed all remedial coursework as described above, institutions shall each develop a student’s minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) from all previous college-level coursework, following the institution’s own transfer policy.”

Do we intend to set minimum standards per the various statutory roles, or will individual institutions come up with their own minimums, with or without regard to other institutions in the same selectivity band? It seems like we should strive for continuity per the statutory selectivity categories, but it doesn’t appear that the policy requires that sort of approach. – [Good question, I’m not sure.](#)

7. Can we add the appropriate new GED cut-score to the High School equivalency section of the new policy? – [Yes, I think we should.](#)

“Institutions will accept General Education Development (GED) versions 1988, 2002, and 2014 (once the GED 2014 version is approved by the Colorado Department of Education) and any other state approved exam.”