

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)
Meeting Minutes
February 21, 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
Janet Gooch	Truman State University
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College
Chris Breitmeyer	St. Charles Community College
Barbara Dougherty	University of Missouri – Columbia
Cynthia Heider	Missouri Western State University
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Paul Long	Metropolitan Community College
Sherry McCarthy	William Woods University
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College

Absent

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools

1. Call to Order

Rusty Monhollon called the meeting to order and thanked 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

Michael Meunks began a conversation regarding the SBAC decision by DESE. He mentioned that the Commissioner of Education has a long-term goal of bringing the SBAC assessment back. They received a lot of push back from the school district level curriculum folks as there was a perceived disconnect between the instruction and the content areas. The EOC exams are going to be aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Sharon added that the content measures are going to continue to be the EOCs. In light of DESE's decision regarding the eleventh grade assessment, what we would like to see eventually is for the EOC exam scores to be reflected on a student's transcript. There needs to be pressure on the district to get these EOC's on the transcripts. If higher ed says that this is what they need in order to accurately place students- then the districts will have to do it. We are not sure whether students are going to get penalized for not taking the ACT. Accommodations can only be provided if ACT approves and is willing to provide that accommodation. These scores will be considered a valid ACT score. The implementation of the ACT at the state level is going to be difficult for DESE. They are going to be given at the school district – sometime in early March, late March or early April is when the tests will be given to the students, and it will be given at their schools.

Rusty then discussed the letter that he has proposed sending to DESE. We need to draft a letter to DESE that this is not good for the state, and is in opposition to the remedial education policy. It was to identify those students who are and are not ready for college-level work. Now that opportunity is gone. There is maybe something we could do with the ACT, but it does not measure that content-ready component. On behalf of the higher ed reps on the TCCR – excluding Sharon, Michael and Dana – we need to send a letter to DESE on this matter. The task force agreed to submit a letter to DESE concerning the 11th grade assessments, and also to request that EOC exams be a part of students' transcripts. We are encouraging all institutions to request from students who are seeking to enroll at their institution that their EOC exam, GPA be part of their application. We also need to notify institutions very soon so that they may begin to put that request on their application. So then for this year it will be optional, and then for 2015-2016 it would be required that that information be included. We need to ask Commissioner Nicastro directly to begin to inform and urge districts to find ways to make this information available. This letter would put the districts on alert that higher ed is going to want this information, as it will be important for gauging readiness for certain college content. Rusty will draft this letter and share it with the TCCR before it is sent to DESE. He will also share this with the CCAO, and will send that out electronically to get their response.

3. Old Business

a. Mathematics Summit

The department is now in charge for putting together a mathematics summit to explore alternate pathways in mathematics. We need to discuss who we want to be involved in this process. These alternate pathways, courses need to be identified first, and then we need to explore ways to deliver these types of courses. The focus of this first summit should be on designing alternate mathematic pathways. Rusty could go to the MOMADEC conference and recruit some individuals from that conference to join the math summit. Sometime in September is looking like

an ideal date. What exactly is college-level math? Could there be some kind of addition to what was done back in the August Complete College America workshop? Dr. Russell wanted to have some kind of conference call with those individuals who attended and see how it may have helped them. We could potentially reach out to them and ask if they could participate in the summit. We may also be able to reach out to Uri Treisman who is considered an expert in this area, and is also a faculty member. He could be an asset to this type of summit. It is important to provide some background before we bring people together, however. Perhaps we could pay someone to come in and be a speaker so that everyone can understand what these pathways look like and how to do it correctly. What are the employers demanding and are we meeting their needs? If a student were to take an appropriate math for their given field – it may meet the needs of employers and students alike.

Rusty and the TCCR agreed that the TCCR will be the steering committee with moving this summit along. We will contact Complete College America in terms of bringing someone in to help with this endeavor. Treisman is well respected among mathematicians, and he may be a good person to reach out to in order to see if he would like to attend. But we should also consider looking within the state as well; there may be several individuals here that may be a good resource. David Bressoud (MN) may be another potential candidate. Rusty mentioned that we received a \$15,000 grant, so it has been earmarked for this summit. Jefferson City or Columbia would be the best place to hold the summit. Institutions could send teams of people from various departments, arts & sciences, mathematics, etc. We are looking at potentially 250+ people and it would most likely be a full day event. The Hilton Garden Inn in Columbia may be a good location. We need to put together a draft agenda.

4. New Business

a. A+ Scholarship Threshold Score

Rusty guided the task force into a discussion regarding the recent board item that revised the A+ Scholarship Program administrative rule. Students who do not score proficient or advanced on the Algebra I, or a higher level math, end-of-course exam must achieve a qualifying score on the mathematics sub-test of the ACT or COMPASS exam to be A+ eligible. Rusty wanted to inform the task force that in a way, a threshold score had already been established since many students utilize A+ for college. Melody mentioned that the scores that were used for the A+ cut-off were incorrect. Discussion of this item was brief as Rusty mentioned the need to possibly reach out to MDHE staff responsible to discuss any corrections that need to be made regarding the cut-scores.

b. TCCR Research Questions/ DATA SUBGROUP CONVERSATION.

Chris Breitmeyer and Melody mentioned what was discussed in the morning data subgroup meeting. Chris told the task force that the data group will begin by working on the threshold scores and will have some data for the task force to look at by the April 25th meeting. Chris also mentioned that the data group discussed multiple measures and the need for us to put together

some type of inventory of multiple measures based on national research. Jennifer briefly mentioned all the measures that the data group discussed to the task force for their input. The task force believed these to be sound measures that we need to further examine before we put them together in any sort of model for institutions to use. One other thing that we also need to start discussing is the idea of what constitutes success or how are we going to define success? This may be something we can begin to discuss once we have some data to examine. The data subgroup meeting minutes may shed further light on what was discussed, and so task force members may refer to those minutes should they have any questions.

c. TCCR Communications Subgroup

Rusty discussed the communications charge with the task force and asked if there was anything not listed that we may want to include. We will need to find a replacement for Sister Marie Harris. Do we need/want to target the legislature to inform them of remedial education issues? That is something that we may need to seriously consider. There are certain committees that we want to relay some of this information to, and we also need to share certain information with appropriations if it is good news. Rusty may need to discuss including the legislature with Dr. Russell and Leroy Wade, MDHE's deputy commissioner. We also need to include high school guidance counselors as points of contact for remedial education information. As it stands now, the communications team is made up of Yvette Sweeny, Paula Glover, Jennifer Plemons, Liz Coleman. We may want to include Sarah Potter from DESE as things get moving. The next steps for this group will be to get together (perhaps via teleconference) and discuss what items on the charge may be most important and to see how the MDHE can begin this process.

5. Announcements

a. Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next meeting is scheduled for April 25 at the MACC campus in Columbia, room 132 from 9am – 3pm. This will be a joint meeting between the data subgroup and the task force, with the data subgroup presenting information to the task force in the first half of the meeting.