

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)
Meeting Minutes
January 28, 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 Clanten	Linn State Technical College
Chris McGowan	Southeast Missouri State University
Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Janet Gooch	Truman State University
Kristy Bishop	Metropolitan Community College
Kelli Burns	St. Louis Community College
Beth Nolte	Lincoln University
Meaghan Effan	Harris-Stowe State University
Steve Saffell	Missouri Western State University
John Clayton	Ozarks Technical Community College
Bob Adebayo	Missouri Southern State University
Shelly Hale	Southeast Missouri State University
Holly Andress-Martin	Culver-Stockton College
Kim Fitzgerald	St. Louis Community College
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri

Absent

Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College
Chris Breitmeyer	St. Charles Community College
Kelli Reed	Missouri Department of Higher Education
Barbara Dougherty	University of Missouri – Columbia
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Cynthia Heider	Missouri Western State University
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Paul Long	Metropolitan Community College
Sherry McCarthy	William Woods University
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College

1. Call to Order

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

2. Welcome and Introductions

Rusty welcomed members from the TCCR as well as the data subgroup to the meeting. He then guided the task force and the data subgroup into introductions. Rusty discussed the current status of the TCCR, and mentioned that two individuals from the task force would have to step down this year. Those individuals are Mike Grelle from University of Central Missouri and Sister Marie Harris from Avila University.

3. Old Business

a. Review of Last Meeting

Rusty asked the task force if they had any changes or additions to the minutes from the November meeting. There were no changes or additions, and so the minutes were approved as currently written.

4. New Business

4a. Data subgroup charge

The Task Force on College and Career Readiness (TCCR) was created as a result of the state's involvement in the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) standards that would measure college and career readiness. Also, the passage of HB 1042, which directed all public institutions to replicate best practices in remedial education, influenced the creation of this task force. The MDHE along with the task force then responded to this legislation by crafting a policy that addressed best practices in remedial education. This policy was brought before the Coordinating Board for Higher Education and was passed in September 2013.

The principles in the policy are not meant to be prescriptive, but are instead meant to guide and direct the institutions in their efforts to implement best practices in remedial education on their campuses.

The TCCR is assuming the role of the implementation group going forward. It was quickly realized that the TCCR would need the guidance of a data subgroup so as to ensure that the implementation of this important policy is done accurately and in a timely manner. Rusty guided the data subgroup and the TCCR into a discussion about the data subgroup's charge. Questions about the charge were discussed. Kelli Burns' first concern was that the language of the charge

was somewhat confusing in that it seems as though the TCCR is asking the data subgroup to pool institutional data and then analyze said data. Beth Nolte mentioned that institutions already submit a good majority of remedial education data through EMSAS, and it may be something that we need to just sit down and go through to figure out what would and would not be helpful. Many data members agreed that it would be difficult to get institutions to submit data to this group. Many institutions are not going to be persuaded to send data to a workgroup who is charged with analyzing the data. Kelli wanted clarity as to whether this was what the charge was asking the data group to do, or whether it is a matter of the data group simply recommending what data the state should collect or already does collect? Rusty mentioned to the group that their charge is not to pool institutional data and then analyze it. Rather, is it for them to guide the task force on what data elements would be helpful, while identifying those we already collect and what we may need to collect, in terms of tracking remedial education and its effectiveness on campuses in Missouri. Going forward, the charge may need to be restructured so that there is no ambiguity. ***Jennifer will work with the data group on this and see that the charge is restructured so that it is clear.***

4b. Remedial Education Policy

Rusty guided the data group through a discussion of the remedial education policy focusing on several sections that are most pertinent to the work of the data subgroup, sections 9-11. He mentioned that first and foremost, the policy needed to provide a clear definition of remedial education and what that looks like at our institutions. It's important to understand the difference between college ready and college-content ready, so we made that distinction in the policy as well.

Rusty discussed section 9 with the taskforce and guided them into a conversation about the multiple measures. We would like to have the End of Course Exams (EOC) as part of these multiple measures and want those to be included on students' high school transcripts. We need to work with DESE on this issue. Is there a good combination of measures that might hold some very strong predictive value and help us place students more accurately? Are these placement scores accurate? Rusty felt that the data subgroup could help the task force in answering these questions. It is important to keep in mind that institutions should still be able to utilize their own measures that they deem best for their institution; however, in years to come we may all converge and use the same measures.

Melody guided the group into a conversation about the ACT crosswalk. MCCA institutions are using that crosswalk for placement scores, but we need to ensure that all institutions are using these scores and that they are accurate in the policy. Melody would like to know if the placement scores that are currently being used are successful. Kelli Burns mentioned that there might have been a negative decline with regard to the placement score at St. Louis Community College. John Clayton is not certain whether Ozarks Technical Community College can attribute any change in student success to the cut score. Hopefully what these scores will do is send a clear,

consistent message to students regarding what higher education deems is college ready and what college ready means. The data group could provide recommendations in terms of whether these scores are correct, if they need to be higher or lower, and what effect they may have on student success and retention. Rusty mentioned that we do need to get these ACT numbers correct in the policy and send it before the Coordinating Board for approval. We hope to have these numbers corrected by this time next year at the latest. One issue is that many students do not send in their ACT, so it is hard to know any predictive validity based on these scores. However, with more students taking the ACT, since DESE will be requiring it, it may be more useful now more than ever. Since we want to ensure that the ACT numbers in our policy are correct, Melody asked the group if they would check this at their institutions.

Melody then asked whether the data subgroup was familiar with a floor score, section 10, and most of the members were in agreement and felt that they understood what this floor score was and how it was being utilized on their campuses. John Clayton mentioned that Ozarks Tech currently has a floor score, however, he did not know what that score actually was but said that he would get that information and share it with the group.

Melody mentioned that this was a really important section and issue for the folks at the Missouri Developmental Education Consortium (MoDEC). It is unfair to hold institutions accountable for those students who have no chance of succeeding in remedial courses. Their deficiency needs to be targeted in a different way. It is unfair to take their money and enroll them in courses that they are not going to be successful in. Initially we had included some scores to go along with this section, however, after some negative feedback, those scores were deleted from the section. The task force ended up pulling out those numbers and instead established the principle without the numbers. Much of the opposition for this section came from the Community Colleges, as it is often in direct conflict with their missions.

John Clayton discussed that Ozarks Tech is, in effect, putting admission standards on students. He said that if they do not qualify to get into the developmental education courses, they are directed into the Adult Education Literacy program. They are still students on the campus, but they do not qualify for financial aid. However, it is free to the student. But the question then is how many students can the AEL program take in since it is free to the student? There are not enough funds to handle all the students that need to go to the AEL program. Melody mentioned that North Central pulled their grade books and took out the students who entered at the very lowest level, and who were not successful, and there were only about 2%. Kristy Bishop's problem is that they have that 2% on 5 different campuses and how are they going to deal with these students on all of those different campuses? Some of the developmental education programs are teaching very low ability, such as 3 or 4th grade math.

Cut scores may be a hard sell for some of the four-year institutions as well. The cut score seems to be a problem, still. Rusty mentioned that he is happy to come to any institution and speak about the policy, the cut scores and how it may affect the institution.

Melody guided the group into a discussion about the document she brought to share with the group. This document included numbers on remedial education students and their success rate at North Central. It serves as an example of what they are currently doing at North Central and what other institutions could quickly put together as well. Institutions can show that their developmental education students who are placed in math, reading, or English, may not only go on to complete these courses and earn a college degree, but may do so at a higher rate.

Rusty then guided the group to section 11 of the policy regarding accountability and reporting. The policy requires institutions to pool and submit remediation data to the MDHE so that we may track success and progress of students without putting more of a burden on the institutions. He mentioned again that one charge for this data group will be to be the experts on this, to guide the task force on what data is already collected, data that needs to be collected and how best to analyze the data. MDHE will be responsible for analyzing the data and compiling it into an annual report, but the data group will guide us so we better know what to collect so that we may accurately track and report on developmental education in the state.

Rusty also mentioned section 14 that deals with funding. Since we were required to replicate best practices in remedial education, we will need more funding in which to do so. We would like to go through a competitive grant process, however, it did not get included in the Governor's budget this year, so we are going to aim for next year and try to get that funded then.

4c. Mathematics Summit

Rusty guided the group into a discussion regarding the upcoming Mathematics Summit. The Mathematics Summit will be a way for institutions of higher education in the state to come together to begin to address finding alternate pathways in math for students. College algebra should not be the only measure of a student's fitness for earning a degree. There are other quantitative courses that can and should gauge students' readiness. The Completion Academy that occurred last summer really helped to push the alternate pathways in mathematics agenda along, however, there is more work to be done. We need to identify and develop these other pathways before we can really bring others into the conversation regarding redesigning math courses and figuring out how they fit into these pathways. The Mathematics Summit will likely take place in the fall of 2014, at the earliest, as there are planning issues currently involved. ***The expectation is that we will want mathematicians involved, but will also want some people from this data subgroup to be involved as well. Rusty mentioned that he will keep the data subgroup in the loop and informed regarding when this Mathematics Summit is to take place.*** Missouri Mathematical Association of Two Year Colleges (MoMATYC) may be a good place for us to reach out to and partner. Meghan Effan mentioned that Harris-Stowe is already beginning this

process of alternate mathematic pathways, and that everything has been through their faculty senate and approved.

4d. SBAC

Rusty guided the group into a discussion about DESE's decision to not use the SBAC eleventh grade assessment, and to instead use the ACT for an eleventh grade assessment. He wanted to know how the task force felt about this, and whether or not the group should send some sort of letter to the State Board of Education expressing our frustration with the change. There is definitely a level of frustration here, as DESE's choosing to use the ACT as an eleventh grade assessment somewhat undermines the remedial education policy we worked very hard to create. Our policy currently states that the SBAC eleventh grade assessment is to be used as a measure of college readiness. Rita mentioned that the process of creating the remedial education policy and working with SBAC has improved dialogue between K-12 and Higher Ed, however, the decision to not use the SBAC eleventh grade assessment has undermined our work and there is disappointment with that. Melody mentioned that there is a positive to this since we are already using the ACT data in terms of college content ready, so this may help to get the implementation of the policy underway more quickly.

Melody also then mentioned that the State Board of Education perhaps fears what the SBAC assessment would reveal in terms of the education system in Missouri. Many superintendents were concerned that it would reflect poorly on Missouri, and that the ACT has been reflecting more positively. Melody was curious as to why SBE is pushing the ACT as opposed to COMPASS? Many task force members agreed that K-12 will be surprised to see these ACT scores that are going to come as a result of using it as an eleventh grade assessment. There was consensus among the group that we should send some sort of letter to SBE expressing our disappointment with their decision. ***Rusty will draft such a letter and ask for feedback from the task force before it is sent out.***

Rusty also mentioned to the group that SBAC has released and asked for comment on its career readiness standards. There is really no need to put any more effort into this, since DESE has decided not to use the standards for college readiness at this point in time. However, ***Rusty will send this out and task force members should feel free to respond if they should feel so compelled.*** They are also doing a digital library project, and they are seeking out individuals to write documents to be put into the library. ***Rusty will send this to the deans of education programs for their input. Rusty will also share this with the task force and those people who are institutional contacts for SBAC.***

5. Announcements

a. Upcoming Meeting Dates

Melody discussed with the data group how they would like to proceed in terms of meeting dates going forward. Many data members agreed that they should have a second meeting in person to further hash out their charge and discuss the research questions and data elements that the task force will need. In the future, setting up a Sharepoint file will be useful so that data members can share documents. The data group also needs to begin to reach out to the developmental education coordinators on their campuses.

The next scheduled TCCR meeting for the taskforce is February 21st at the MACC campus in Columbia, Room 132, from 1pm-4pm. The data subgroup will also meet on this day at the same location from 9am-12pm.