

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)
Meeting Minutes
April 25, 2014**

In Attendance

Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University
Rusty Monhollon	Department of Higher Education
Jeff Cawlfeld	Missouri University of Science & Technology
Jennifer Plemons	Department of Higher Education
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Kristy Bishop	Metropolitan Community College
Beth Nolte	Lincoln University
Steve Saffell	Missouri Western State University
John Clayton	Ozarks Technical Community College
Kelli Burns	St. Louis Community College
Meaghan Effan	Harris-Stowe State University

Absent

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Janet Gooch	Truman State University
Chris Breitmeyer	St. Charles Community College
Barbara Dougherty	University of Missouri – Columbia
Paul Long	Metropolitan Community College
Cynthia Heider	Missouri Western State University

1. Call to Order

Rusty Monhollon called the meeting to order and thanked all members for their attendance.

2. Updates and Reports

a. Review of Last Meeting

There were no changes or additions to the minutes from the last meeting in January. The minutes were considered approved.

b. SBAC Higher Education Meetings

Rusty guided the task force into a discussion regarding the most recent activity by the Smarter Balanced Consortium. He mentioned that he and Michael Meunks from the task force were set to attend the Smarter Balanced Collaboration Conference on April 29-May 2 in Minneapolis. He mentioned that whatever is discussed at this upcoming conference will be relayed to the TCCR at the May meeting.

Jennifer proceeded to also remind TCCR members about the email that was sent out previously regarding the 11th grade assessments in-person panel workshop, Oct 13-15. She mentioned that several institutional faculty have expressed interest in being nominated, but that if anyone else should feel that someone from their campus should be nominated, to contact her with that information so that they can be placed on the nominee list that will be sent to SBAC at the end of May. SBAC will then contact those individuals who will serve on the in-person panel by June.

c. TCCR communications

Jennifer discussed some of the recent happenings regarding the TCCR communications plan. She mentioned that she, along with MDHE's director of communication, Liz Coleman, has been working together to have a separate website for college and career readiness approved. This website would ideally contain content pertinent to college and career readiness issues, as well as some detailed information regarding several components of the remedial education policy. She hopes that by June or July, the website will be up and running with an outlook that is appealing to students and parents, and with some important content regarding students' readiness for college and career. Further updates will be provided at the May TCCR meeting.

3. Old Business

a. Mathematics Summit

Rusty guided the TCCR into a discussion about the Math Summit. Alternate pathways and course redesign in mathematics will be the focus of this Summit. There are some issues that have come up, and will need to be dealt with, however, regarding the alternate pathways. For some institutions, college algebra will still be the introductory math, especially at universities such as Missouri S&T. Complete College America will be involved, but we do not want the Math Summit to be perceived as a CCA initiative. We want this to be a state lead effort with experts from other states as well as experts from Missouri to be involved. We would like some of the folks who work on behalf of CCA to be involved, but we want this to be a state effort, and to be perceived as a state effort. AMATYC and MoMATYC have mentioned that they would be part

of the planning committee. MoDEC has also mentioned that they would like to be involved. Should we include folks from the Teacher Ed Prep Committee? We need to find volunteers to do the detail work and to draft an agenda. Rusty mentioned that we will tap a few folks from MoDEC, MoMATYC, AMATYC, and Teacher Prep. Paul Long, Melody Shipley, Jennifer Plemons, Jeff Cawfield, and Rusty will begin to reach out to others in the aforementioned associations to join the planning committee. We also need a four-year institution representative on the group as well.

This Math Summit should really get at what will benefit students most. We may reach out to Uri Treisman, David Connelly, or Thomas Bailey in terms of being guest speakers at this Summit, as they are well known with regard to remediation efforts. We will also reach out to the folks that will be on the planning committee to see who they may have in mind for guest speakers. Overall, the TCCR supports and endorses the Math Summit and realizes the need to begin discussion and action on alternate math pathways and course redesign for students in Missouri.

Logistics: We will ideally have a guest speaker for the morning, with a breakout morning session, then lunch, then an afternoon speaker with a breakout afternoon session. Perhaps the morning speaker will discuss alternate pathways and the afternoon speaker will discuss course redesign. The TCCR should look to design the day where we have smaller group breakouts to really delve into the material to see where institutions are leaning. If we have 200+ attendees, how many breakout sessions could we have, realistically? We could have multiple people facilitating workshops in different rooms. We need to reach out to faculty who are doing some of these things and have them come and facilitate some workshops. This will definitely work to generate faculty buy-in. Faculty should lead/direct the smaller breakout sessions. Should there be a cap on the number of folks that an institution can bring? Some debriefing time among the faculty at institutions to discuss what they learned, how they could apply that at their campus could be helpful at the end of the Summit. Rusty and Jennifer will begin pulling together the planning committee and will report back to the TCCR. The best case scenario coming out of this is that we build some enthusiasm and/or interest in pursuing this as a state.

We also need to ensure that these alternate pathways are transferable among institutions, and in some way the core transfer library will work to ensure this. College algebra is a strong transfer issue. It is rare for students to transfer from and arts and sciences to a science/tech based focus, but still, this may be a source of contention among institutions. But to require that algebra piece, many students aren't getting their AA degree because they aren't completing that algebra coursework. It is risky for some institutions to start this alternate pathway/course redesign, and then it not transfer to other institutions because they don't recognize that math course. We will need to address those sticky points at the Summit.

4. New Business

a. Threshold Score Data

Kristy guided the TCCR and data group members into a discussion regarding some of MCC-KC's data. She noted that males are more represented in the data regarding lower assessment scores, as well as the nonwhite student group. However, the majority of students that are assessed and then placed into developmental education are those in the 18-24 age group, not those over age 25. Kelli Burns' data from SLCC, as well as John Clayton's data from Ozarks Tech, were similar in nature to Kristy's data. It was discussed that just the idea of looking at those placed into developmental education is not going to get to the question at hand. If we are looking at progress and success in developmental education, then we need to have an understanding of how many students were able to complete their developmental education sequence, and in what time frame, etc. Then we need to use those data to then go backwards and really flush out a threshold score, whatever score that might be. It will then be important to look at those data and to note the demographics affected in order to determine the best alternative services that would be needed. The narrative needs to be centered around what other services are we able to provide for those students who are not successful in developmental education.

Kelli shared a handout with the group that provided some analysis of SLCC's remediation data. From those data, she was able to determine the number of remedial education credits and college-level credits a certain amount of students were able to earn; however, it will be important to tease apart how many students out of a certain amount earned credits, not how many credits they earned collectively. Kelli said that she would be able to go back in and provide that number in the future. It will also be important to know where those credits fall? What we need to know and understand is at what point do we see there is lack of progress in developmental education? Once we identify that point for the majority of students placed into remedial education, we will be able to better identify a floor score. The handout Kelli shared would be helpful to share with other institutions and they can then add their data in.

Steve Saffell discussed data from MWSU. MWSU does not use COMPASS or ACCUPLACER, so he created a similar instrument to Kristy's and used ACT scores for students. He noted that once we get down to scores of 11 and below, that the success rate is really low. The demographics are also really telling here as well. It definitely appears that there may be some trend in the data in that students who score 11 or below on the ACT seem to have relatively low rates of success. A comparable score on the COMPASS, being anything below 50-45, seems to also be indicative of being placed into remedial education and also a poor success rate. It also appears in the data that students struggle the most with reading, so it is likely that a threshold score would need to be set with a primary focus on the student's reading score. Beth Nolte's data from Lincoln was similar to Steve's data, in that they use the ACT as well and see many of the same patterns.

The next steps need to involve the data group coming together to decide on clear definitions, main objectives and a common template that all institutions can use. However, this is often difficult in that much of the data that the two-years collect is different from the four-years. We could use the crosswalk of ACT and COMPASS scores so that institutions could easily compare,

etc. For Compass, it should start at a score of 50 and below, and for ACT the focus should be from 11 and below. There may be some value in clumping the Community College data together, and then the four-year institution's data together, and then looking over them to compare. The data need to be divided among degree Seeking/non-degree seeking as well. Kristy and Kelli are also looking into getting more institutions involved and for them to provide their data for this purpose, but this is not exactly the easiest request as many institutions can be hesitant with sharing data. It was decided that for now, the two-years will work on their template and the four-years can work on one that works best for them

It was also decided that the data group will continue to work on the threshold score for now, and then later bring placement score data/analysis into the template.

b. Assessment and Placement

Rusty mentioned the memo from Commissioner Nicastro regarding End-of-Course exams being put on students' high school transcripts. If in fact districts begin to place this information on students' transcripts, then it should be recommended that institutions use this information when assessing and placing students into developmental education. Paula Glover mentioned that it might be nice to have a code much like the one that is used on the North Carolina placement policy (which was included as an attachment with the agenda). Perhaps a request from Higher Ed regarding some kind of code that would indicate what a student's high school program of study included would be helpful on a high school transcript as well. If we as Higher Ed have a better idea of the data elements that we want on students' high school transcripts, then this could help to generate buy-in with the school districts. A common, standard transcript would be extremely helpful, and Sharon mentioned that DESE currently has a mock-up standard transcript for high school students. What would make matters even more helpful is if there was a common application among institutions. Rusty mentioned that the easiest way for us to begin delving further into a multiple measures policy is for us to begin drafting some type of multiple measures policy. Rusty and Jennifer will begin drafting this and will have a draft copy for input at the May TCCR meeting.

c. Next Steps

The data group will continue to work on templates that work best for both the two-year and four-year institutions. They will plan to work on gathering more data and performing more analyses, and will plan on attending the June meeting of the TCCR.

The TCCR will meet again on May 30, 2014 at MACC in Columbia.

5. Announcements

a. Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next meeting is scheduled for May 30 at the MACC campus in Columbia, room 132.