

**Committee on Curriculum and Assessment
Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2011**

Attendance

Mike Grelle, Chair	University of Central Missouri (UCM)
Jeff Lashley, Vice-Chair	Moberly Area Community College (MACC)
Tim Farmer	University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL)
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University (CMU)
Delores Honey	Missouri Southern State University (MSSU)
Joyce Ryerson	Morgan County School District (MCSD)
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College (LSTC)
Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College (NCMC)
Carter Ward	Missouri School Boards' Association (MSBA)
Candy Young	Truman State University (TSU)
Rusty Monhollon	Department of Higher Education (DHE)
Angelette Prichett	Department of Higher Education (DHE)
Crystal Kroner	Department of Higher Education (DHE)

Welcome and Introductions

Mike Grelle called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and thanked members for their attendance. Members went around the table and introduced themselves and made general announcements to the group. Rusty Monhollon introduced Crystal Kroner as the new Research Associate at the Department of Higher Education (DHE). Joyce Ryerson announced that the Missouri School Improvement Plan 5 is now in revision stage. Rusty Monhollon announced that Heather MacCleoud, Research Associate with DHE is co-chair of MOSTEP Revision process as DHE has statutory authority to oversee the quality of the process. It was also announced that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) will be moving forward with its Early Childhood Race-to-the-Top Challenge Grant submission.

Review of the Minutes

Minutes from the July 22, 2011 CCA Meeting and the September 1, 2011 Ad-hoc Group 3 Meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Ad-Hoc Group Reports and Recommendations

Group 3 Report: Implementation of Exit-Level Competencies

Mike Grelle, Jeff Lashley, Rita Gulstad, Sharon Hoge, Kathy Perkins, Vicki Schwinke, Rusty Monholton and Angelette Prichett were in attendance at the meeting on September 1, 2011 to examine the implementation of the exit-level competencies and to determine the next steps for this group.

Assessment Update

The meeting began by Sharon Hoge and Rusty Monholton providing a brief overview of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium (SBC) meeting they attended in Chicago earlier in the month. Missouri's continued involvement in the process is in question right now, as the assessments cost is quite expensive. Current Missouri assessment costs are \$12 per child (lowest state is \$7 per child and highest \$112 per child). The SBC cost for summative assessments only is \$19 per child. Current SBC plans for implementation include:

- making assessments operational by the 2014-2015 school year
- plan to have benchmark assessments throughout the year and prior to the end of the year
- plan to have a summative assessment on English and mathematics and a performance assessment piece
- summative assessment is to be computer adaptive vertically and laterally to either word the question differently or make the item easier or harder depending on how the student is scoring
- the purpose is to pinpoint strengths and areas of concern for the student

If the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) decides not to participate in SBC, the State Board of Education would like for them to have three end-of-course exams; English 3 would be added at the end of a student's junior year.

There are plans for an SBC pilot project in 2013-2014 and Missouri has indicated they would like to be part of the pilot.

Issues regarding SBC:

- If MO stays involved in SBC but higher education discussions are tabled due to not knowing about future plans, will higher education lose its opportunity to engage and have a voice in the process?
- Higher education does not want to start on SBC and MO as a state end up pulling out of the project and going a different direction. Is there something higher ed can be doing with existing summative assessments that will advance the state and be beneficial to higher education?

Transfer

Rusty Monhollon reported that transfer was noted as an issue, but there was not much supporting documentation (research or anecdotal) that could be located supporting that transfer was an issue. Comments and concerns related to transfer included:

- Use of terminology regarding terminal degree versus transferable degree; associate of applied science degrees are “torn apart” because they are not seen as transferable degrees
- Transfer of courses absent the 42-hour block are evaluated individually
- Four-year institutions do not feel that two-year transfer students are prepared for collegiate coursework when they transfer to four-year
- AAS are not advertised as terminal degrees; need to find a way to identify embedded general education in the coursework

Questions:

- Is the transfer issue at a significant level that something needs to be implemented to show that competencies were met?
 - Is that “something a formal assessment, syllabi?
- What is the determining factor for how courses are accepted in transfer absent an assessment or evaluation?
- Is the argument at issue assessment or development of competencies?
- What are institutions required to do in relation to the exit competencies?
 - Competencies were developed fast and without faculty buy-in; may have issues with adoption
 - May need to pick exit level competencies and develop a plan for implementation and have 42-hour block crosswalks ready
- What is the purpose of the competencies? Were they developed to meet the letter of the law or to impact actionable student learning?
- What must happen now to ensure courses are accepted in transfer?
 - Students continue to lose credits and incur greater costs

Next Steps:

- Develop a briefing paper for the Committee on Curriculum and Assessment (MDHE staff will develop before next CCA meeting)
- Choose pilot courses and institutions (math and English Comp I)
- Have 42-hour block crosswalks ready in math and English Comp I
- Other group facilitators will relay results of this meeting with Groups 1 and 2
- Work with higher education institutions and the Missouri Assessment Consortium (MAC) to determine how math and English are being assessed.

- Charge MAC with identifying how (or if) institutions are assessing and data collection in English and Math, specifically College Algebra and the Freshman Composition Sequence.
 - Find out how many institutions have incorporated the exit-level competencies into their syllabi.
- Mike Grelle, Jeff Lashley, and Rita Gulstad will speak to the 4-year CAO group, 2-year CAO group, and independent CAO group respectively regarding strategies for implementation of the exit competencies.
 - Prior to meeting with the CAO groups the following CCA members will meet via conference call to develop a unified message: Vicki Schwinke, Jeff Lashley, Delores Honey, Mike Grelle, and Rita Gulstad.

Group 2 Report: Higher Education Participation in the Smarter-Balanced Consortium

This group's main concern is the issue that Missouri may not participate in the Smarter Balanced Consortium because of the cost involved. At this time, discussion regarding higher education participation is tabled until it is determined that Missouri will remain involved in the consortium.

Group 1 Report: Common Core, the Curriculum Alignment Initiative and Implementation

Because many of the same people were on this group and many of the same issues were addressed at the Group 3 meeting, this group did not report.

College Readiness Partnership Update

Rusty Monhollon provided an update on the College Readiness Partnership (CRP). The CRP is an agreement between SHEEO, NGO, CCSSI, and the AACU to implement the common core standards. Rusty has been working with Sharon Hoge, Carolyn Mahoney, and Chris Nicastro on this effort. State teams will be developed and the group is working to clarify its role and scope. Missouri is one of seven leading states in this partnership. The Missouri team will spearhead best practices on implementing the Common Core. Rusty Monhollon indicated there is a meeting in Memphis in a few weeks and he will continue to keep the CCA apprised of the group's activities.

Next Steps

The CCA decided that the next steps for the group included:

- Meeting with the 2-year, 4-year and independent CAO group to discuss implementation of the exit competencies
 - First, having a conference call to develop a unified message
- Meeting with the Missouri Assessment Consortium to review general education (specifically College Algebra and Freshman English Composition)

- Speaking with the Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA) regarding whether general education is a transfer problem
 - Mike Grelle and Rusty Monhollon will confer to come up with a research question for COTA in this regard

The next CCA meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 18, 2011 in Jefferson City, Missouri. The meeting was adjourned at 2:03pm.