

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)
Meeting Minutes
September 26, 2014**

In Attendance

Rusty Monhollon	Department of Higher Education
Jeff Cawlfeld	Missouri University of Science & Technology
Jennifer Plemons	Department of Higher Education
Paul Long	Metropolitan Community College
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College
Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Jeremy Kintzel	Missouri Department of Higher Education

Absent

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Cynthia Heider	Missouri Western State University
Chris Breitmeyer	St. Charles Community College
Janet Gooch	Truman State University

1. Call to Order

2. Updates and Reports

a. Review of Last Meeting

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

b. SBAC Higher Education Meetings

Rusty mentioned that there was not much to update regarding SBAC. Today is the last day to volunteer for the 11th grade assessments. We currently only have 7 or 8 institutions participating. SBAC is now transitioning to UCLA. It is going to be housed there, and will no longer be funded by a federal grant.

There will be a period of transition that the organization will go through. It may have some impact on us should DESE decide at some point to use the 11th grade assessment.

Rusty discussed HB 1490, which directed DESE to convene a workgroup to review and create new assessments for English, Reading and Mathematics. There was a very concerted effort by the anti-common core folks to take over the meeting. Missouri cannot use any of the common core standards. HB 1490 says the new standards cannot incorporate any of the common core standards since they are copyrighted. Higher Ed appointed 8 people to each of the working groups. They were all in attendance at the first meeting. The work groups will make recommendations to the state board and the state board will continue to have authority over setting the curriculum.

Rusty briefly mentioned “higher education for higher standards.” Recently, a campaign was started to get IHE’s to sign on in support of the common core standards. To date, the MDHE and one university in MO are the only MO institutions that have publicly committed to supporting the common core. It is understandable that many institutions, given their location and legislators, hate the common core. It would be nice to see more institutions signing on to this and supporting the common core in a more public way.

3. Old Business

a. Mathematics Summit

The MDHE has formed a college mathematics pathways task force. Rusty and the other members attended a recent meeting in Dallas about this initiative. This is with support of the Charles A. Dana center, and with the help of work from Dr. Uri Treisman. Mary Shepherd, math chair from Northwest Missouri State University, is chairing the workgroup.

Rusty mentioned that much of this work may need to be involved with the curriculum alignment initiative. We need to align these courses as much as we can. Statistics is in the core transfer library, but it is not in the curriculum alignment initiative. That could be a good place to start, but we have to get MU on board. If MU says no, we have to respect institutional autonomy. Institutions would still have a significant problem if MU does not get on board. Many of their students transfer into MU. We are going to start down this path, but we aren’t sure where we will end up. It’s our intention to engage all institutions and MU in this, and see how far we can get with it. This would benefit many students, and developing an agreed upon curriculum with assessments might be an appropriate way to begin.

4. New Business

a. Data Workgroup Progress

Jeremy Kintzel, director of research services at MDHE, charged the data subgroup members to look into data at their institutions, specifically into their data and placement scores. A single institution did not have enough numbers and could not come to any significant point on what placement data would be most helpful and significant.

It was at that time decided to pool their data. They pooled data from formerly submitted EMSAS, and also filled out new forms data. They decided to look at a two-year period. This also included COMPASS scores, ACT, demographic variables, but could not include high school gpa. They were able to have some additional data beyond what was reported by participating institutions, however. It was then decided to eventually settle on the probability of passing a gateway course without having enrolled in a dev ed course for the first-term, first semester. If a trend emerged, then that could start the discussion of how many students could succeed without the dev ed course. One limitation is that the student could have taken a dev ed course in the subsequent semesters.

The data group looked into the probability of a student having passed a gateway course in those two years without having taken a dev ed course based on the student's ACT score. They used a regression model with adjusted odds ratio which allowed them to isolate all of the variables. There does not appear to be much difference between 20 and 21, and 22 and 23. This was for ACT math subscore. Students who scored 17/18 on ACT reading subscore passed the 60% probability mark. The data do seem to show that ACT is a fairly good predictor of student success.

b. Assessment and Placement

Rusty guided the task force into a discussion regarding assessment and placement of students. One issue of particular concern is the Compass algebra score. We have it set at 66, but could we go lower, say high 50's or low 60's? Mike Grelle had UCM at a 21 ACT. This validates the argument that the default should be the credit-bearing course. Rusty asked what percent is this group comfortable with? Are we comfortable with a 50% success rate? The data that was shown today may not really be in agreement with ACT's benchmarks, because the data we saw could have meant passing was a D.

It seems that the COMPASS data does not have any real trend, and that ACT, still, is all over the place. The Compass math algebra score is currently incorrect in the policy; it should not be at a 50, but rather maybe lower 60's.

We have agreed to correct the Compass algebra score to a 66 and report that to the CBHE in December that there was a typo in the policy.

Rusty then guided the workgroup into a discussion about the placement policy document. Do we want to spell out that any student coming in to take any course should be assessed? The practice is that institutions try to catch all students but the reality is that some smaller percentage get in without having been assessed. From a policy perspective, we are saying that what college and career ready means is that you are ready for college-level coursework. Should we say degree-seeking students have to be assessed? We need to say before a student enrolls or during their first semester enrollment.

Paul discussed some of MCC's data, and many of those students who are placed into dev ed sequences do not continue on, many of them drop out. We have to have some kind of policy or requirement to push for this. We need to continue working with DESE to have these variables standardized on their transcripts. That would make it much easier for institutions to better assess and would take some of the heavy lifting off of institutions. They would better be able to do all of this extra work and provide the support needed if they had that support from DESE.

Prior to enrollment, does that increase the likelihood that more students will be adding classes or not be able to take classes in that first week? You may have students enrolling later than they normally would and that does not bode well for student success either.

There was a recent discussion about a 24 ACT, and there is a conflict with MCCA and also MDHE policy. Some are using that 24 for students to go right into college algebra. If the student has a lower score, say 22, then they use other measures. That is in conflict with the policy. What we are saying is that if a student has a 21 or even 20, then look at some other measures, and schools can set up their own procedures to assess and hopefully place the student in college level coursework.

The task force agreed to take out the last sentence on the rationale part of the placement policy.

Rusty then guided the task force into a discussion about the show-me college mathematics placement process chart. Paul mentioned that for them, there is no yes or no at the end, the student is placed into a co-requisite course. They are combined with other students so it is credit-bearing course. Rusty mentioned that the first default should be the credit-bearing course, let's give them a chance, but we need to have some basis on making that judgment.

c. TCCR Communications

Jennifer mentioned that she is working with others at the department to set up a website devoted to college and career readiness. These individuals will also work on designing brochures and fact sheets that will be made available to students, parents and high school guidance counselors. These fact sheets will include information on the placement process, and what higher ed has determined to be college ready. We need to follow up with DESE on the GPA and EOC exam scores being on the transcript, and also need to communicate that fourth year of mathematics to the high schools. We also need to provide some documents from MDHE to the institutions that relay the college readiness and content readiness.

d. Next Steps

Rusty mentioned next steps and that the group needs to discuss threshold scores. Jennifer will correct the numbers in the placement policy and get that information out and reapproved by CBHE. We need to get with CCA on the math pathways piece, and also discuss with them the need to communicate the 4th year of math, which is part of that curriculum alignment between K12 and Higher Ed.

5. Announcements

a. Upcoming Meeting Dates

The next meeting is scheduled for Nov 21 at the MACC campus in Columbia, room 132 from 9am – 4pm. It was discussed that this would be a joint meeting between the CCA and TCCR in order to discuss various curricular issues that are part of the TCCR implementation plan.