

**College Transition Programs
Main Conference Room
April 22, 2015
10:00 am – 12:00 pm**

Institutional Representatives

Dr. Jennifer Cease-Cook, Winthrop University
Ms. Michelle Hare, Winthrop University
Ms. Samantha Kite, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Tony Plotner, USC Columbia
Ms. Ashley Taylor, USC Columbia
Mr. Zann Wiggins, Coastal Carolina University

CHE Staff

Ms. Elizabeth Caulder
Ms. Lorinda Copeland
Mr. Gary Glenn
Ms. Leslie Williams
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

Guests

Mr. Donald Bailey

I. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Elizabeth Caulder welcomed everyone in attendance and introductions were made.

II. Discussion of Current Practices

a. Update on Status of Policy Guidelines

Ms. Caulder reported that the College Transition Programs (CTP) guidelines were presented to the Access & Equity and Student Services Committee on March 11, 2015, for approval. The Inter Departmental Transfer (IDT) procedure referenced in the guidelines is no longer a statewide process to request the reimbursement of funds. The full Commission approved the guidelines on April 2, 2015, and the guidelines are the official guidelines in place for eligibility, awarding, and disbursement. If the need arises, the guidelines are subject to change. There are tentative plans to place the guidelines on CHE's website for interested parties to have access and as a way to promote the program. However, the guidelines may not be placed on CHE's website because the program is a proviso and can change at any time.

Ms. Caulder stated the current proviso is still in place and the assumption is that the program will be included in the FY 2015-2016 budget. The budget for FY 2015-2016 remains at \$179,178. Ms. Caulder provided an overview of the guidelines for the new participating institutions. Ms. Michelle Hare asked who should the student submit a SAP appeal to and Ms. Caulder responded the institution's financial aid office.

b. Necessitate Program Changes

Ms. Caulder provided an update of the awards and expenditures for FY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Ms. Caulder stated it was wonderful Winthrop University was participating because their participation helped demonstrate funds are being used. There was concern the \$179,178 would not be used and the amount would be reduced. Ms. Caulder stated that the College of Charleston currently has no students and only have

had 1 participant and Clemson University currently has 2 students which is their highest number of participants.

III. CTP Enrollment

a. Future Enrollment Projections

Ms. Caulder provided an overview of awards and expenditures for the current fiscal year and of future enrollment projections. If all institutions continue to award the maximum award for FY 2015-2016, discussions will have to occur moving forward because the budget is only \$179,178. Ms. Michelle Hare asked what happens to the unused funds. Ms. Caulder responded she thinks the unused funds will carryover and the program would have \$36,000. Dr. Karen Woodfaulk responded there is no carryover provision but she will verify.

The institutional representatives stated their projected enrollment for FY 2015-2016 which totaled 47 students. Dr. Woodfaulk stated projections have to be estimated and will continue for two or three years until trend line data is available. Ms. Hare asked what would happen if the \$179,178 is divided by 47 students because a \$3,700 award will not allow some students to attend and Winthrop University would not have their projected enrollment of 15 students.

Ms. Caulder presented projections using award amounts of \$6,000 and \$6,500 and stated the award may have to be lower. Mr. Zann Wiggins stated an award between \$6,000 and \$7,000 will not affect enrollment but an award less than \$5,500 would. Ms. Caulder stated a determination needed to be made regarding an award because it needs to be demonstrated that the program is viable, there is a need, the program is working, and enrollment is increasing. Dr. Woodfaulk stated an argument for additional funds might be if students have a need after receiving the \$7,000 award and a Pell Grant. Ms. Caulder asked the institutional representatives when they could have information regarding need available so the amount can be maximized as soon as possible. Ms. Caulder is hesitant to provide an estimate to a student because the award could change.

Mr. Donald Bailey asked what the enrollment projections were for FY 2016-2017 and whether the current enrollment will be maintained or increased because planning needs to begin. Dr. Tony Plotner responded his enrollment will be maintained but couldn't say regarding his in-state students because these students receive points for their in-state status. Dr. Woodfaulk stated possibly there could be an addition to the proviso that would allow the use of the previous year's projection. This will allow confidence that students will be secure and awarded. However, if the number of students increases, some students may not be funded. If there are carry forward funds, these students may receive some funding.

Mr. Bailey asked who makes the decision regarding carry forward funds. Mr. Plotner stated if they had known the remaining funds would not carry forward, the \$7,000 award could have increased. Mr. Wiggins asked if returning students could be awarded first then the new students. Ms. Caulder suggested the returning students awards adjust to \$5,500 or \$6,000. Mr. Wiggins responded the award could be reduced to \$5,500 but not lower. Dr. Woodfaulk stated the dilemma is finding an additional \$150,000 for 47 students for the next fiscal year. Ms. Hare asked if the \$7,000 maximum in the proviso or an internal amount. Ms. Caulder responded an internal amount. Ms. Hare also asked

if the remaining funds should be expended before the end of the fiscal year or would the funds be lost. Dr. Woodfaulk responded if we are, we may want to make commitments before June 30th. Ms. Caulder responded at the moment the funds would be lost.

Dr. Woodfaulk asked Mr. Gary Glenn if he had any suggestions regarding the dilemma of needing an additional \$150,000 for 47 students. Mr. Glen stated \$36,600 is available for additional students and will decrease the need to 120,000 for additional students. Mr. Bailey asked whether the \$36,600 was considered carry forward. Mr. Glenn responded that any remaining funds would be dedicated to the program as carry forward for the next fiscal year. With the carry forward funds, an additional \$114,000 is needed for the next fiscal year for the projected 47 students. Mr. Glenn asked if the projected enrollment of 47 students assumed maximum capacity for the participating institutions. Dr. Plotner stated a few of his students will not receive the full award. Ms. Hare and Mr. Wiggins responded they may have one or two students that will not receive the full award.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Glenn if it was too late to request additional funding for the next fiscal year. Mr. Glenn responded it was almost too late and that the additional need was not anticipated when the current budget request was submitted. Mr. Bailey stated he had already received support in the House and Senate for an increase. Mr. Bailey spoke with Julie Carullo of CHE and learned CHE had already submitted their budget. Mr. Bailey did not know what was included in the CHE budget. Senator Lourie communicated to Mr. Bailey that the CHE budget was going to be considered and asked what amount was needed and did not know if Senator Lourie would take it upon himself to change the budget. Mr. Glenn responded that it was not impossible to get additional funding included in the budget but at this point it would have to be introduced on the floor.

Dr. Woodfaulk stated this year's enrollment could be used for next year's request. Mr. Wiggins responded the big kicker is Winthrop University. Ms. Caulder responded Winthrop University's participation was anticipated but the turnout was not anticipated. Dr. Woodfaulk would like a methodology to fully fund students knowing there may be late awards that may not be fully funded or may not receive funding. The other methodology is to decrease the award to the \$3,800 level. Ms. Caulder responded it had already been decided the award could not decrease to \$3,800. Ms. Caulder stated a decision needed to be made how to keep the award around \$5,500 because it would be detrimental to all the programs if the award was lower.

Mr. Gary Glenn stated the proviso reads CHE College Transitions Need-based Grant which is a misnomer because the programs are separate funds but the proviso treats them as the same and the language creates the cap. Mr. Glenn stated an alternative to requesting additional funds and possibly not receiving the additional funds is to remove the language that establishes the cap. However, removing this language would redirect existing Need-based Grants from needy students to financially needy students. Dr. Woodfaulk asked if additional funds were requested for Need-based Grants. Mr. Glenn responded yes but the additional funding was not received. Dr. Woodfaulk stated the \$179,000 would be lost if included with Need-based Grants. Mr. Glenn would rather keep the line separate in the budget because it has support in the legislature and removal has never been discussed. Mr. Glenn stated receiving an increase is the better solution. Dr. Woodfaulk stated the argument on the other side is

that there are already more needy degree seeking students than available funding and she would rather request \$300,000. Mr. Glenn stated the best answer is to ask for \$149,848 and see rather the Senate will include the additional funds in the budget. Mr. Bailey left the meeting to go over to the General Assembly to see if he could request the additional funds.

Dr. Woodfaulk stated if the additional funding was not received were there suggestions as to how funding could be awarded across the board instead of most but not all students. Mr. Glenn stated as he read the proviso further and if the proviso does not change, the proviso establishes the cap at 179,179 and the \$36,625 would not be available and would be folded into Need-based Grants. Dr. Woodfaulk asked if the funds were expended before June 30th would the program be in compliance. Dr. Plotner asked if the proviso states a maximum of \$7,000 per student. Ms. Caulder responded that maximum was determined by CHE and the guidelines state the award cannot be used for more than eight terms. Ms. Caulder stated a determination would need to be made regarding how to apply the remaining funds.

Ms. Hare asked if the remaining funds could be used for late spring awards since the funds could not carry forward. Mr. Glenn asked if any student still had an unmet need after receiving \$7,000 and the response was yes. Ms. Hare stated it would be good if the funds could carry forward to next year because the funds will be needed. Dr. Plotner asked if the language in the proviso could be changed to allow a carry forward. Ms. Caulder responded no for the current proviso because the change would have already had to occur. Mr. Glenn stated if additional funding was not obtained the next best step is changing the proviso. Generally there is not a problem with that type of language because 10% of the appropriation can carry over. The issue is whether the amount can be dedicated to the current line in the budget the way it is written. It was decided that students currently enrolled for spring 2015 with an unmet need would receive the remaining \$36,625 before June 30th. The 18 students who are currently enrolled will receive approximately \$2,000 which can be used to offset current expenses or expenses for fall 2015. Mr. Glenn stated until the details are received regarding what each student is eligible to receive, the specific amount of the award will not be known because some students may not need the full amount.

Dr. Woodfaulk stated the program still needs \$150,000 for next year and wants to hear if Mr. Bailey was successful in receiving additional funds for the program. Dr. Woodfaulk does not want institutions awarding different amounts and wants an agreed upon methodology. Dr. Woodfaulk asked if there was another thought regarding the award amount for next year and asked if everyone was in agreement that the lowest award amount should be \$6,500. Mr. Wiggins stated the ideal would be \$7,000 but not lower than \$5,500. Ms. Caulder stated the goal is to stay close to \$6,000 to maintain more students. Mr. Glenn asked what would happen if additional funds are not received. Ms. Hare stated they would lose their program and Mr. Zann stated they would likely lose students. Mr. Glenn asked would students be served at a smaller amount or not be served. Ms. Hare stated the award would not be large enough for students to make up the difference and their program would diminish. Mr. Zann stated if the award was

reduced to \$3,500 all of the programs would lose students but those students who stay could receive additional funds.

Mr. Wiggins would prefer to award to continuing students and award freshman students a smaller amount or nothing. The next class that starts would be expecting \$3,500. Ms. Caulder stated the cohort is different and does not have the same options. It was decided that existing students will be funded at \$6,000. Once the existing students are awarded, the remaining funds will be divided by the number of new students which is approximately \$2,948. Dr. Woodfaulk stated they should know by the end of the week whether Mr. Bailey was successful in receiving additional funds and if they would be moving forward with the agreed upon methodology. Dr. Woodfaulk stated the methodology would be forwarded with the minutes.

Ms. Caulder asked the institutional representatives to review their students for eligibility and determine the amount of their unmet need. Once the unmet need is determined, invoices should be forwarded as soon as possible. Mr. Glenn will prorate the remaining funds among all the institutions based on their requested need. Ms. Caulder stated the additional funds will not affect the student's terms.

IV. Adjourn