



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

Policy Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes

August 11, 2014
1:30pm – 3:30pm

Members present:

- Sonia Brandon, CMU
- John Marshall, CMU
- Perry Sailor, CU-Boulder
- Robert Stubbs, CU-Boulder
- Kevin MacLennan, CU-Boulder
- Bitsy Cohn, CCCS
- Vaughn Toland, MSU-Denver
- Karen Lemke, ASU
- Robyn Marschke, UCCS
- Timalyn O’Neill, CSU
- Paul Sharp, UNC
- Kay Schneider, CSM
- Dale Gaubatz, WSU
- Jamie Fouty, CCCS

DHE Staff present: Rhonda Epper, Beth Bean, Brenda Bautsch, Lauren Victor

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	Window will stay in policy until further study can determine its usefulness.
April 3, 2014	How will institutions define rigor?	complete	HEAR will be added as an option in policy
April 24, 2014	How should selectivity be defined without the index?	complete	DAG working group developed guidelines using Mid-50 that correspond with current selectivity definitions.
June 26, 2014	How should institutions calculate the mid-50% ranges for their	complete	Will be based on admitted students. DHE will do calculation.

	Admission Standards?		
July 17, 2014	What criteria will CCHE use to evaluate institutions' admission standards?	complete	Draft criteria are included in draft policy.
August 11, 2014	Review selectivity band change criteria. IHEs bring draft admission standards.	complete	Change criteria were reviewed and agreed upon.

Discussion notes:

TOPIC #1 – High School Graduation Guidelines and PARCC Assessment

- Rebecca Holmes, Jill Hawley, and Misti Ruthven from the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) presented an overview of the new high school graduation guidelines, and the rationale behind the inclusion of PARCC in the admissions policy that was approved last December. Reasons included:
 - It is in alignment with the CAP4K statute, which says that the commission shall align the admission standards with the guidelines for high school graduation requirements.
 - It is there as a placeholder, pending validation studies.
 - It is optional for institutions to use once the test has been validated.
 - It sends a powerful message to K-12 (teachers, students, parents) that they should have some “skin in the game” with the PARCC assessments.
 - It sends a negative message to K-12 if we take it out.
 - Higher education governing boards have already approved the PWR Endorsed Diploma for guaranteed admissions at the moderately selective level and below, and priority consideration at selective and highly selective institutions. PARCC is an indicator for the PWR, so in effect the boards have already said it will be used/considered for admissions.
- John Marshall (CMU) presented a slide from a presentation and a letter from Allison Jones of PARCC that said the PARCC assessment is not intended to be used as an admissions tool, but only for placement. He suggested the PARCC placeholder be removed from policy, and there was active discussion in the group on this topic.
- Rhonda Epper indicated that the policy will go forward to the CCHE at the September 4 meeting with the addition of the HEAR requirements and other changes discussed, and with the PARCC included as an optional indicator.
- As a point of clarification, the discussion regarding the use of the term “will” versus “may” was in regard to the section of policy regarding “college readiness,” not admissions. The language in this section was taken directly from the remedial policy language, and the cut scores establish the minimum level for students to be placed in college-level courses. See below.

4.01.01 College-Readiness Requirement

Students admitted to four-year institutions must be college-ready as defined by the state’s Remedial Education Policy (Commission Policy section I Academic Affairs Statewide Remedial Education Policy part E).



Institutions may admit students scoring below the cut score and place them in college-level courses with Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) based on the institution’s secondary evaluation process (Commission Policy section I Academic Affairs Policy And Procedures For Authorization Of A State Institution Of Higher Education To Provide Supplemental Academic Instruction part W). Institutions must select one or more of the following nationally normed and validated assessments of college-readiness in English and mathematics:

Assessment Test	English Subscore	Math Subscore
ACT	18	19
SAT	430	460
Accuplacer*		
Compass	63	79
PARCC**	TBD	TBD
SBAC**	TBD	TBD

* Department of Higher Education staff is completing research on corresponding Accuplacer subscores. Department staff will inform the Commission and add these scores when confirmed by research staff.

** Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and Smarter Balanced (SBAC) instruments are currently being deployed and field-tested nationally and by the Colorado Department of Education in an effort to implement and assess statewide college and career readiness standards for students. The research and validation studies will be available by 2016-17, at which point Colorado institutions of higher education will begin to utilize the approved college readiness scores.

- The section of policy that is applicable to our discussion regarding the PARCC assessment is in the “performance indicator” section for institutional admissions, where the term “may” is used.

4.01.01.01 **Assessment Scores**

Institutions will set a performance indicator using an assessment score. Institutions may use either SAT or ACT; or PARCC or Smarter Balanced when validated. Institutions may also choose to use a supplemental assessment including Accuplacer and Compass.

TOPIC #2 – Other Policy Changes Discussed

- The HEAR course list was added into the definition of rigor, with language to help guide students who are preparing under a traditional seat-time high school program of study or competency-based program.
- The approved PWR Endorsed Diploma language was added.
- The new GED scores were added. A suggestion was made to streamline the wording.

- A clarification that transfer students can be offered SAI at an approved IHE.
- An attempt to clear up the confusion between “transfer student” vs. “transfer student admission standard.” A suggestion was made to further clarify the wording.
- The “Guaranteed Transfer Admission” section was recommended for removal because it is out of alignment with the transfer policy.
- Criteria were added that CCHE will use to review IHE admissions standards that will be submitted by December 1, 2014.

TOPIC #3 – Selectivity Change Criteria

- The group discussed proposed cut scores that would be used as criteria for institutional movement among selectivity bands. The cut scores that were presented were not agreed upon. DHE will modify the cut scores to reflect the current minimum scores of each selectivity band as was suggested by the group.
- The language regarding how to move selectivity categories was agreed upon. That language is as follows:
 - For an institution to be eligible to move between selectivity bands they must meet or exceed the next selectivity level's cut scores for two variables based on the institution's prior three year average of their 25th percentile admitted. The institution will use one variable from the student academic performance field and one variable from the student assessment field to demonstrate said eligibility. The academic performance field includes high school GPA and high school rank; the assessment field includes ACT and SAT scores.

TOPIC # 4 – Next Steps

- Rhonda asked the group to send draft admissions policies as soon as you have them developed. PIC representatives should feel free to share your drafts with the group. Thus far, only CMU has shared a draft, and it would be useful to see what others are working on.
- A reminder that the policy requires all institutions to include language regarding the PWR Endorsed Diploma as part of the admissions policy. (See pp. I-F-10, I-F-11.)
- Final version of each institution’s admission policy is due on October 15, 2014. The timeline for CCHE approval requires the policies to be presented as a discussion item at the November 6 meeting, and as a consent/action item at the December 4 meeting.