



Admission Council Meeting *NOTES*

Thursday, June 8 2017, 2:00-4:00pm
Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway, Suite 1600 (16th Floor), Denver, CO 80202, Emily Griffith Room

Carl Einhaus	DHE	Timalyn O'Neill	CSU
Kevin MacLennan	CU Boulder	Ian Macgillivray	DHE
Lauren Shondeck	Western	Catherine Wilson	CU Denver
Mathew Cox	UCCS	Morgan Raleigh	MSU Denver
Melissa Trifiletti	CSU	Spencer Ellis	DHE
Shane Larson	CMC	Kim Hunter Reed	DHE

1. Greetings and Introductions

2. Introduce Kim Hunter Reed, new Executive Director of Higher Education

Dr. Reed visited with the group at 2:45 – she gave a brief introduction as to her background, and shared that she is looking to the Admission Council along with other groups to assist in informing our department on how to best serve students and how to decrease and erase equity gaps. It was asked what Dr. Reed will be focusing on. She explained that currently the update to the CCHE Master Plan is top priority, and increasing credentials while erasing attainment gaps will be of primary importance.

3. Continuation of discussion on First Generation question on Admission Applications

Chris Ammons from the DHE Data Team had discussion with DAG at their last meeting regarding how the “First Generation” question should be asked and reported in SURDS. They all came to an agreement to use the definition from 1965 Higher Education Act (see below). Chris and DAG wanted feedback on the choice, and how parent should be defined. As the First Gen question is asked differently by all IHEs, the Admission Council asked if we could solicit a comprehensive list of how the question is asked, and determine what is the most frequently used question and perhaps go with that. Carl will work with Chris to collect the questions and will reconnect with the Admission Council with their findings. The Common Application does use the HEA definition as the basis for their questions.

HEA Definition:

41 129 First Generation Definition: A flag that indicates whether the student is a First Generation as defined in the Higher Education Act of 1965 which is defined as:

(A) an individual both of whose parents did not complete a baccalaureate degree; or

(B) in the case of any individual who regularly resided with and received support from only one parent, an individual who's only such parent did not complete a baccalaureate degree.

4. Recalculating GPAs based on Honors, AP and similar

The Admission Policy is silent on whether IHEs can recalculate the student’s high school GPA. Some colleges will “bump up” a course grade for such designations as Honors, AP, etc. Some institutions do not, for reasons including they are not able to operationally due to high numbers of transcripts received (as shared by Kevin from CU Boulder). Also, the index does not allow for computations above a 4.0 GPA on a 4.0 scale. Admission decisions are typically made with keeping the rigor of the high school



attended in mind anyways. Concerns were expressed with including mention of if IHE's can bump up GPAs or not in policy as there are so many variances in transcripts, perceived grade inflation, etc. No significant concerns have been expressed in the field about not including mention of bumping up grades, so it was agreed by all to not change policy and leave as is. Further, there was concern that more issues could arise by including mention of this practice in policy.

In regards to a student complaint, Dr. Macgillivray asked why institutions will not recalculate a student's institutional GPA if they transfer in a course with a higher GPA, especially if it is a course they retook at another institution (i.e. student receives a "D" in Calculus at home institution, retakes Calculus at another institution and receives a "B" and transfers it back to home institution). The responses focused on this: 1) it's common practice nationally not to; and 2) as it is an institutional GPA, including grades from another institution would not make sense. While the class will transfer in, the institution's GPA will remain unchanged (unless the institution has a repeat/delete policy that would remove the grade from the repeated class). No one was interested in creating a statewide policy in regards to this topic.

5. Updated admission standards one-pager

Carl shared the updated draft of the admission standards one-pager which will replace the index chart (as the index is being retired with the new policy which begins fall 2019). The mid 50% GPA and test score ranges are reflected in the chart for each institution for their admitted students. These ranges will be collected from SURDS as requested by the Admission Council. Institutions will have an opportunity to review these ranges before they are made public. Most in attendance were fine with the one-pager. Timalyn (CSU) did ask if the mid ranges could somehow be visually represented while remaining ADA compliant. Carl will investigate – will likely need to consult with an ADA expert.

6. Additional Items?

7. Follow up from last meeting and reminders:

8. Topics for next meeting?

Possible idea: Concurrent Enrollment and its impact on admission and campus culture.

9. Next meeting: **Thursday, October 12th (August meeting was cancelled via Outlook)**