



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

Policy Implementation Meeting Minutes

July 17, 2014
1:30pm – 3:30pm

Members present:

- Sonia Brandon, CMU
- John Marshall, CMU
- Perry Sailor, CU-Boulder
- Robert Stubbs, CU-Boulder
- Bitsy Cohn, CCCS
- Vaughn Toland, MSU-Denver
- Karen Lemke, ASU
- Andy Burns, FLC
- Robyn Marschke, UCCS
- 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 | 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 | In-progress | DAG working group will |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------|--|
| | be defined without the index? | | 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 CCHE 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. | | |

Discussion notes:

- The text around the decision made on Jan. 23rd in regards to the question “How will the new policy impact institutions’ enrollment?” will be changed from “Unknown” to “The Department of Higher Education will conduct an impact study in 2015 after the institutions have had their admission standards approved.”
- Discussion was held on the question: “Is the window still needed in policy?” If the mid-50% range is used, there is not a need for the window—but there is a need for some accountability. This could be done by having DHE monitor admissions data and ensure that institutions remain in their mid-50s ranges within reason. The level of acceptable variation from the range would have to be determined. The performance contracts can also be used as an accountability tool.
- The DAG working group presented options for defining selectivity without the index.
 - Thresholds will be determined for each selectivity category using 3 years of data
 - The 25th percentile for 4 indicators (ACT, SAT, HS Rank and GPA) will be used.
 - It was discussed that SAT should not be used due to the small number of Colorado students who take the SAT, but others noted that out-of-state students used the SAT, so it should remain an option
 - It was noted that HS Rank has become increasingly unreliable. It could remain an optional indicator for students who do not have a GPA
 - The working group will continue to refine the guidelines for how an institution would change its selectivity level and will present a proposal at the next meeting.
- IHEs requested language regarding HEAR coursework requirements be added back into the admission standards policy under section 4.01.02.03(A)
- CMU presented a working draft of their proposed admissions criteria

- It was suggested that another word besides index be used in documents that are public-facing
- Institutions can continue using whatever methods they choose to admit and place students, including using the old index
- CMU's example materials were helpful for others to see what they should be working on
- The group decided to schedule a Policy Implementation Committee meeting for **August 11th at 1:00pm**
 - Institutions are encouraged to bring drafts of their proposed admissions standards
 - The group will continue discussing Andy's questions, included below.

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.
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.”



COLORADO

Department of
Higher Education

Next meeting information:

August 11, 2014

1:30 – 3:30 pm

Emily Griffith Conference Room

DHE, 1560 Broadway, Suite 1600

Denver, CO 80202

Call-in information:

1-877-820-7831

Participant code: 215368#