



Academic Council

May 8, 2012

1:00-3:00pm

Department of Higher Education
1560 Broadway - Suite 1600 - Denver, CO 80202

Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; Access code: 215368#

Agenda

1. Greetings and Introductions

In attendance: Steve Werman (for Carol Futhey), Barbara Morris, Peg Bacon, Donna Souther, Brad Tyndall, Robbyn Wacker, Diana Hegeman, Jess Young, Kathleen Bollard, Jon Bellum, Frank Novotny, Rhonda Epper

2. Corrections/Discussion of April Meeting Summary Notes [see handout]

Approved

3. Higher Education Bills in the Legislature

- a. SB 12-45 "Higher Ed Associate Degree Transfer" signed into law. Directs CCHE to work with the state's colleges and universities to develop a process to notify students who satisfy the eligibility requirements to receive an associate's degree. DHE will need to write a rule for this bill's implementation. Who would like to be on a team to help with this?

Volunteers: Jon Bellum. Ian sent out email after meeting asking for nominees.

- b. SB 12-164 update

- c. HB 12-1155 "Improvements in College Completion," if it passes, will require DHE to take action on the issues of flexibility in remediation and writing a rule for CCHE to authorize an IHE to offer supplemental academic instruction. [see HB 12-1155 handout, pg. 6, lines 25-27] – Kevin Nelson nominated by Jessica Young, Kathleen Bollard will also nominate someone.

Volunteers: Kevin Nelson. Ian sent out email after meeting asking for nominees.

4. Master Planning update and implications for Performance Contract renegotiation

- a. May 23, 10:00am – 1:00pm Master Planning meeting to be held at Colorado School of Mines (invitation and logistics will be sent out once confirmed). Focus: We'll look at institution-specific numbers to see what measuring the goals might look at individual campuses.

- b. How can members of AC help DHE and the Commission communicate the outcomes of these discussions to your CEO and your campus at large? Should DHE/CCHE come to your campus and give a presentation? Send out agenda items from CCHE meeting? Other ideas?

AC requested a draft of the master plan. Ian asked Matt if DHE can forward this when it's ready. Ian is checking into forwarding the summary notes from the first two meetings. Once AC has this additional information they may have more ideas about how to get the word out and how

DHE can help. DHE invited to ASC Dept. Chair retreat August 15 and UCB Board meeting in June.

- c. Proposed June Governing Board Summit.
5. Follow-up on gtPathways applying only to LAS degrees.
 - a. At the last meeting AC agreed their new preference would be for DHE to run an amendment to an existing bill this session or next. This amendment was added to HB 12-1155, pg. 18, lines 13-17. [see handout]
 6. NM-CO Tuition Reciprocity Agreement
 - Discuss FTE allocations for academic years 2012-2015 [see CCHE agenda item handout]

Ian went through the allocations for the FTE with each institution. Confirmed CCCS and CSU Pueblo after the meeting.
 7. Follow-up: Issues around Ensuring Seamless Transfer
 - a. DHE collected all cut scores for AP, IB and CLEP tests from the 4-year institutions and delivered them to CCCS. Ian provided cut scores to CCCS and they're being compiled into a spreadsheet that will be shared with AC. Then we can follow up on the bullets below.
 - CCCS, ASC & Aims agreed to go with the highest scores.
 - CMC and WSC want more time to discuss whether they will go with the highest cut scores.
 - CMU wants to know what the highest scores are before agreeing to use them. How to get CMU this information?
 - FLC response to AC's questions? FLC enrollment manager will respond.
 - b. Does your institution use DANTE tests? If so, which ones? What are the cut scores? Response received from CCCS, CMU, CSU-P, FLC, ASC, Aims, WSC. If you have not yet responded, please send to ian.macgillivray@dhe.state.co.us Thanks! Ian will follow up with those institutions that have not yet responded.
 - c. How to ensure consistency across the state for students? Do we need to standardize or create a policy saying institutions will honor one another's admission decisions? Must take into consideration the following points:
 - Competency Testing [C.R.S. 23-1-125(4)]: "...the commission shall, in consultation with each public institution of higher education, define a process for students to test out of core courses..." Do we have this?

Ian sent out follow-up email after meeting asking: What are your campuses test out policies? How is a course that a student tested out of transcribed? Does the student get credit for the course, or is the requirement simply waived, or...?

 - Credit for Prior Learning HB 12-1072 "Higher Ed Prior Learning Assessments" added to C.R.S. 23-1-125(4.5), "BEGINNING IN THE 2013-14 ACADEMIC YEAR, EACH PUBLIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHALL ADOPT AND MAKE PUBLIC A POLICY OR PROGRAM TO DETERMINE ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING."
 - Transferring Credit. Potential issue to work out—when one institution accepts and awards fulfillment of a gtPathways requirement for a course that other institutions do not accept. Ian sent out follow-up email after meeting asking: Are any institutions awarding gtPathways credit for non-gtPathways –approved courses? If not, then the issue is, "What are the implications for institutions applying credit in transfer towards their gen ed requirements when each institution gets to decide what courses they'll accept from other institutions and not everyone agrees on the quality/applicability/?? of those courses?"
 - [C.R.S. 23-1-125(1)(e)]: "Students, upon completion of core general education courses, regardless of the delivery method, should have those courses satisfy the core course requirements of all Colorado public institutions of higher education;" The point here is, the

moment an institution gives core course credit, it's there on the student's transcript and it should satisfy core course requirements at ALL public institutions.

- DHE's recommendation for a policy in response to "c" above: "We all honor one another's decisions." If not this, then what?
- Discussion about reviewing the cut scores sent out with campus admissions folks. Maybe discussion needs to happen about what each institution's decision is first – not just the highest score but what the actual score is that everyone is agreeing to. Maybe it even varies by discipline?

Ian sent out follow-up email after meeting asking: Should Admissions and Registrar folks be brought in on this and when? (maybe run agenda item #7 by some of these folks on your campus just for their initial thoughts/reactions?) and bring that next time or have them send anything to me and I'll compile their comments. If you think this is premature then don't worry about it.

8. Follow up on decision to allow degrees with emphases/concentrations to participate in articulation agreements.

a. Ian will report outcomes from previous day's GE Council meeting

Ian will be the go between for GEC and AC for this and related issues, rather than have a smaller discussion group. GEC will put together a formal process/policy this summer to assist in determining which degrees with emphases/concentrations should be part of articulation agreements. WSC requested that their faculty be able to participate in the CRJ faculty discipline group where their Sociology degree with CRJ emphasis will be reviewed for possible inclusion in the statewide CRJ agreement (which did not happen in the first place—it was the decision of GEC based on recommendation of two GEC members with CRJ expertise). Ian will follow up with GEC.

9. National assessment consortia update. (Emmy Glancy & Scott Stump)

Ian will forward a call for nominees for higher ed faculty to participate in creating/reviewing national K12 English Language Arts assessment items with PARCC. (There's a bill going through the legislature right now that, if it passes, will force Colorado to join PARCC and the state will likely use PARCC's assessments to replace CSAP).

10. Executive Order: Veterans Protection [see handout]

a. USDOE is establishing Principles of Excellence to strengthen oversight, enforcement, and accountability for the GI program. Stems from reports of aggressive and deceptive targeting of service members, veterans, and their families. Principles range from disclosing all information regarding cost of the program to establishing educational plans for all individuals using Federal military and veteran's educational benefits. The term "GI Bill" will be trademarked to help prevent deceptive and fraudulent marketing.

11. Other Business?