

Minutes of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Meeting
Metropolitan State University of Denver
October 4, 2012

Chairman Kaufman called the meeting to order at 1:20pm.

Chairman Dick Kaufman, Commissioners Jeanette Garcia, Happy Haynes, Monte Moses, Hereford Percy, Jim Polsfut, Regina Rodriguez and BJ Scott attended. Also in attendance were CCHE Advisory Committee members Senator Evie Hudak, Frank Novotny, Mark Superka and Keith Owen. Advisors Ruth Annette Carter and Michael Mincic attended via conference call.

Commissioner Percy moved to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2012 CCHE meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott and passed unanimously.

Dr. Erin Trapp, Vice President of Metropolitan State University of Denver, welcomed the Commission to the campus. She talked about their new facilities—the MSU-Denver Student Success building and the new Hotel and Hospitality Learning Center, adjacent to the Marriott Spring Hills Suites, which is operated by one of the MSU-Denver trustees. MSU-Denver is also building a new athletic complex.

She also brought the Commissioner's attention to the diversity of the student population. The overall student population of color is 33 percent, up from 23.8 percent in 2007 and Latino enrollments have increased from 13 percent to 19.5 percent during that same time period. Their goal is to be designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution by 2018.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Lt. Governor Joe Garcia, Executive Director of the Department of Higher Education, referenced a letter from Paul Lingenfelter, CEO of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), emphasizing the need to work more effectively with the State's K-12 system, the need for clearer standards and the need to be very focused on attainment, not just enrollment. He noted a written pledge of completion from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities that many institutions throughout the country have signed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Frank Waterous, Senior Policy Analyst for the Bell Policy Center, spoke in strong opposition to any policies that would limit financial aid only to students who are enrolled full time. The Policy Center thinks these policies would have negative consequences for both the student success and achievement part of the master plan's goals. Low income, working age adults are least likely to be enrolled full time and financial aid is a significant component of their decision making process of whether to enroll or not, let alone be able to complete.

George Walker, of Denver, asked to have support sending a friend of the Court to the Supreme Court which is reviewing Bakke and Grutter v. Bollinger regarding “racial preferences.” Mr. Walker also commented on the Denver Post and the Colorado Statesman articles regarding state funding.

CONSENT ITEMS

New and Continuing State-Funded Capital Projects and Priority List, Fiscal Year 2013-14

Proposal to Offer a Master’s of Arts in Education at Fort Lewis College

Proposal to Offer Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Endorsement at Adams State University

Proposed Modification to the Colorado Mesa University College Admission Index

Proposal to offer a Bachelor of Science in Software Engineering at the University of Northern Colorado

Two-Year Cash Funded Capital Program List – Auraria Higher Education Center

Commissioner Garcia moved to approve the consent items. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott and unanimously passed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Update on Linking Teachers to Preparation Programs and Outcomes-Based Program Evaluation: Reporting Requirements of S.B. 10-036 – Dr. Ian Macgillivray, Assistant Deputy Director for Academic Affairs, was joined by Dr. Jennie Whitcomb, University of Colorado-Boulder, Dr. Carolyn Haug, University of Colorado-Denver, Dr. Derek Briggs, University of Colorado-Boulder, Dr. Kristin Klopfenstein, University of Northern Colorado and Dr. Jami Goetz, Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Dr. Macgillivray also introduced Dr. Brittany Lane, DHE’s new teacher educator preparation staff member. He explained that this item is the first attempt at linking data files between CDE and DHE in compliance with Senate Bill 10-036. The research was done by Drs Whitcomb, Haug, Briggs and Klopfenstein.

Senate Bill 10-036 requires the use of an educator’s first three years of data to look at placement retention and mobility. The educator evaluation system rates whether teachers are effective or partially effective. That data will be then given to the educator preparation programs that prepared those educators to see how well they are doing and to make program improvements. This is the first move from an input based review system to an outcome based system. By linking the human resources file from CDE and DHE’s Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS) database with the educator preparation file, they were able to look at the demographic characteristics of where teachers teach, their placement rates, which K-12 schools they were placed, in terms of the K-12 demographics, and the differences in recent completers of the

programs who earned initial licenses versus those who added on endorsements in linguistically diverse education and special education generalist.

The first report helped verify the data. The second report showed that 50 percent of the institutions of higher education (IHEs) used in the study send at least 66 percent of their graduates to only five districts. These districts are usually near the institutions, especially in urban areas. The second report also shows that educator preparation programs located in areas with higher than average minority group citizens were more likely to place graduates in districts with higher enrollment of minority students. These reports emphasize the need for the Department of Higher Education to provide precise instructions and training on data production retention storage reporting, along with other efforts, to help the educator preparation programs build robust data-bases.

Commissioner Garcia asked how teacher effectiveness can be determined. She also asked if the three years of data is a true reflection of the institution or because of additional mentoring once they are placed in a K-12 school. Dr. Briggs responded that one way of determining effectiveness is to ensure teachers are being compared to other teachers in similar contexts, teaching Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for example. He explained that you also have to separate how efficacy is estimated once the teacher is placed from the efficacy of the IHE that trained them. This is a process that is still being determined. Dr. Whitcomb added that one way is for the IHEs to focus more tightly on the five districts mentioned and develop partnerships within these districts. Eventually, as CDE builds out its performance data that will be fed into the data system, there will be actual performance data and rating scores.

Commissioner Moses asked if, as a result of these two reports, any insight was gained into what emerging issues there might be surrounding Senate Bill 10-191 and the teacher evaluation component within that. The response was yes; one of the insights is the need to be more deliberate about collaboration between districts and the IHEs that prepare teachers and understanding what the financial, traditional, cultural and political barriers are, to be able to remove as many barriers as possible.

Commissioner Percy noted that studies have been done that show students perform better when they are educated by people who look like them and asked if Colorado is closing that demographic gap in the teachers the IHEs are training. One of the researchers responded that the teacher force in Colorado mirrors the national teacher force which makes it largely white, middle class, monolingual and female. That holds true for the institutional enrollment, as well. There is currently discussion on how to recruit people into the educator preparation programs so there is a better fit culturally and linguistically.

2012 Report to the General Assembly on the Status of Performance Contracts for Private College and Universities – Dr. Matt Gianneschi, Deputy Executive Director, updated the status of participating private institution's compliance with the requirements of their performance contracts. He explained there are only three private institutions in Colorado that participate in the College Opportunity Fund (COF)—University of Denver, Regis University and Colorado Christian University. At these institutions, COF is only available to Pell eligible students who

are residents of Colorado. Because this is a fairly small group overall, the contracts are tailored to fit that population.

The institutions have performance contracts that contain three goals: access, retention, and other state needs, such as educator prep, student enrollment, and student completer data. All three institutions met the access goal of increasing the enrollment of Pell eligible (low income) students by three percentage points. Colorado Christian University has until June 30, 2014 to reach the retention goal; Regis University and the University of Denver reached that goal in June of 2010. Colorado Christian University signed their performance contract several years later than the other two private universities. All three universities continue to meet the third overall goal.

Colorado Community College System Developmental Education Taskforce (DETF) – Tamara White and Dr. Geri Anderson, Vice President and Provost of the Colorado Community College System, presented this item. Ms. White explained that she is helping coordinate potential policy revisions for the statewide remedial education policy and is sitting on the Colorado Community College System Development Education Taskforce. The taskforce is looking at the best way to implement developmental education and the statewide Remedial Education Policy Review task force will look at the DETF policy revisions suggested when the taskforce addresses their board in February 2013. Dr. Anderson reminded the Commission that much of the work for this has been supported by a million dollar grant DHE received from Complete College America. Dr. Anderson reported that they have been able to look at several national models and will pick from those models what will be most effective for student success. She explained that the research has shown such things as the more levels of developmental education a student has to go through, the more likely they are not to complete college. In Colorado, the system is set up to have the students in the lowest level go through four levels of developmental education. The belief is there are too many exit points for the student this way. The goal is collaboration between CCA and DHE that move students quickly and effectively through to their first college level course. The ultimate goal is for every student to complete developmental education in two semesters or less, with the majority of students completing in one semester. Some courses will be compressed from 15 weeks to five or eight weeks. Another discovery is that developmental education math students have been placed in STEM pathways when not needed.

Students will take an Accuplacer placement test, which they have studied for, to determine whether they are college level or non-college level. Also, students coming out of high school and those who are re-entering their educational process will have different strategies for developmental education.

Update on the Process to Consider Modification to Admission and Remedial Education Policies – The Commission asked Tamara White, at the May 2012 CCHE meeting, to update them on the make-up of the Admission and Transfer Policy Review Advisory Board and Task Force and the Remediation Policy Review Advisory Board and Task Force. These committees are charged with reviewing, revising and aligning Colorado academic admission standards and remedial education standards by December 15, 2013, in order to meet statute requirements for CCHE. The task forces meet monthly and are made up of mostly public institution practitioners.

The advisory boards meet every three to four months and is made up of a more diverse group, including a CCHE Commissioner, a state board representative, a faculty member of an IHE, a K-12 representative, a career and technical education representative, a work force representative and a member of DHE, an academic council representative and a general education representative. Commissioner Haynes is on the Admissions advisory board and Commissioner Moses is on the Remedial Education advisory board.

Both groups have been in a discovery phase and have been receiving various informative presentations from experts. They have learned about the new Colorado academic standards, graduation guidelines, post-secondary workforce endorsed diplomas from the Colorado Department of Education. They are looking at how the Colorado assessments and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments play into the new policy revisions. Prior to getting deeply into the policies both the task forces and advisory boards had a joint meeting to establish guiding principles to help ground their work and to look at the current policy goals.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Master Plan Update - Dr. Matt Gianneschi, presented this item to update the Commissioners on the Master plan and the performance contracts. On August 26th 2012, then Chairman Percy sent a letter to each CEO and governing board asking for feedback on the CCHE Master Plan. By September 26, 2010 the Colorado Community College System, the University of Colorado, the University of Northern Colorado and Western State Colorado University had responded that were strongly supportive of the Commission's decision to remove specific metrics from the Master Plan and including them in each institution's performance contract. They were also appreciative of the collaborative nature of this process.

On September 27th, Chairman Kaufman and Vice Chair Pacey sent letters, along with performance contract templates, to the governing boards containing an overview of a proposed performance contract process and asking for feedback by October 26th. DHE did not develop the contract; the Office of the Attorney General did so in consultation with DHE. The assignments of two Commissioners and one DHE staff member to each governing board were presented, so the boards and institutions have liaisons during the performance contract process.

Statute dictates that, although the institutions have flexibility to negotiate some of the commission's administrative rules or for any of the statutes in Article 1 of Title 23, there is no flexibility in the admissions policy. The letter from Chairman Kaufman and Vice Chair Pacey expressed an interest in maintaining the remedial and transfer policies as well, since these policies are intrinsically and interdependently tied to the admissions policy.

Financial Aid Allocation Discussion – Celina Duran, Financial Aid Administrator, led the ongoing discussion related to changing the financial allocation method for Fiscal Year 2014 and beyond. This discussion was to give the Commissioners a sense of what would change given the existing amount of financial aid if different decisions were made within different categories of students. The pre-recession number of Level I students was 71,000. Once the EFC was checked and the buying power was at the same level now, it would raise the amount to \$808 per student.

The total population of Pell Eligible students increased from 71,186 to approximately 77,000 students, making the amount per student around \$750.

If instead there was a flat rate award, not looking at the price of attending the institution but used like a Pell grant, it would raise the amount of the base award slightly. It is up to the Commission how they identify the needy students to be targeted.

Looking at data going back to 2006 shows there are approximately 5,500 students still receiving financial aid in their sixth year of continuous enrollment, equaling \$3.8 million. Regarding limiting financial aid to full time students (at least 30 credit hours per year) only, a West Virginia study suggests that tying state aid to full-time status increased on-time graduation in the state by seven percent. Research also shows that a student receiving state grant aid were retained at higher rates than students not receiving the aid and that students receiving state grant aid were retained in their second year more than students who just received Pell Grants

The effects of limiting aid to full-time students result in research universities and most four-year schools receiving more state based aid that the community colleges and lower cost non-profit private institutions do. One option is to find a way to break up the awards into first year awards, second year awards, etc., thus looking at different segments of students rather than one monolithic group. Research also shows that at the current EFC level, restricting financial aid to full-time students would not result in dramatic changes to graduate aid allocations.

Commissioner Scott asked if the Commission was going to employ a five year strategy or a year to year strategy. Dr. Gianneschi replied that this is the Commission's preference but the institutions say that predictability is important to them.

Chairman Polsfut suggested that, since the Commission has complete control over financial aid allocation, there are a lot of decision points to consider. Commissioner Moses agreed that the way to go is look at all proposals and their potential drawbacks; he asked the staff to be very thorough in laying out every drawback that exists with every decision point.

Commissioner Garcia wondered what state grant aid would do if there was an opportunity to give all citizens the information up front from all the institutions that analyze, side-by-side, all fee, tuitions, opportunities and programs.

Commissioner Percy asked if, in trying to incentivize success, we could incent completion by rewarding the students at certain levels, such as credit accumulation. He also asked if the six year limit hinders those close to obtaining a two or four year degree. Ms. Duran replied that research shows that students who are full time are more likely to complete than part time students, as there is less opportunity to drop out. But there are students who cannot attend full time, especially at the community college level, so it is a balance.

Commissioner Polsfut asked if the Commission chooses to make allocations to students based on certain formulas, does the decision on who gets financial aid still remain with the institution. The answer is yes but the Commission can make suggestions to the institutions as to where the dollars go.

Revised Degree Authorization Act Policy – Heather DeLange, Academic Policy Officer, presented the Commission with a revamping of the CCHE policy for private colleges and universities. This item provides the institutions the ability to come and address the Commission about fees that have been set for them. Legislation dictates that any new fee or fee change will begin a 30-day period to receive public comments prior to formal action being taken.

House Bill 12-1155 contains several significant revisions to the statutes organized under the Degree Authorization Act of 1981. The revisions require a policy revision for the operations of the private, degree granting colleges and universities in Colorado and charge the Commission with the creation of procedures. There are specific additions to the law that have resulted in policy changes for the renewal, maintenance and revocation of authorization. For data collection, schools will be required to submit student unit record data (SURDS) specific to enrollments and completion. In addition, the DHE will be the repository of student records and transcripts if the institution closes. In the event of an unexpected closure, there will be a process in ensuring financial integrity that will assist in providing students with indemnification and/or alternative enrollment options. Regarding the fees, Mrs. DeLange explained that there are different types of fees; initial application fees, educator preparation site visit fees and gtPathways review fees. An institution with fewer programs will have fees less than those with multiples of programs.

Dr. Jesse Arman, Vice President of the College for Financial Planning, a for-profit institution authorized to operate in Colorado and affiliated with the Apollo Group, testified in favor of the proposed rules. He stated the Department staff should be commended for creating a thoughtful and collaborative process, and that theirs was a model for how regulations can be developed with colleges. No other members of the public testified on the proposed policies, though Ms. DeLange read an e-mail from one of the affected colleges through which a school official recommended that the Commission consider adding an additional tier to its proposed fee structure, one for very small institutions.

The final edits to the Degree Authorization Act policy will be presented to the Commission at its November 1, 2012 meeting.

Commissioner Percy moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Moses. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.