

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)  
Meeting Minutes  
April 17, 2015**

**In Attendance**

Rusty Monhollon	Department of Higher Education
Jennifer Plemons	Department of Higher Education
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College
Chris Breitmeyer	St. Charles Community College
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College

**Absent**

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Jeff Cawlfeld	Missouri University of Science & Technology
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Cynthia Heider	Missouri Western State University
Jeremy Kintzel	Missouri Department of Higher Education
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Janet Gooch	Truman State University

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Updates & Reports**

**2a. Review of Last Meeting**

Rusty asked if there were any corrections or additions to the January meeting minutes. Taskforce members had no corrections or additions, and thus the November meeting minutes were approved.

**2b. SBAC Higher Education Meetings**

Rusty mentioned that there was not much to discuss regarding SBAC. He did mention that we cannot be part of SBAC anymore because of the lawsuit. The group opposed to the common core received a judgment that said that by entering into the SBAC consortium it was an illegal interstate compact, and they were not authorized to do that. There was supposed to be a meeting in Seattle soon, but DESE is not going because they are prohibited and neither will MDHE.

## **2c. Missouri Mathematics Pathways Taskforce (MMPT)**

The taskforce met last month in Rolla. The end product of the meetings up until this point will be a final report full of recommendations from Missouri to CCA and the Dana Center. That phase will be wrapped up in May, and we are in the process of planning the second mathematics summit. This summit will hopefully be open to more faculty not just mathematics faculty, but geared towards bringing other faculty on board so as to implement this initiative successfully and appropriately.

Melody asked about the CBHE requirement with the pre-requisite, and whether we see that changing in the near future? Rusty does not feel that that would be a problem. But we do not want to piecemeal go to the CBHE and ask for things to be changed. We need to develop a plan to take the CBHE. Jennifer guided the taskforce through that language written in the CBHE policy. Several taskforce members wondered whether intermediate algebra is the same at every institution.

Vickie asked what other courses have they identified, such as statistics, etc. to be alternative courses to college algebra? Rusty mentioned that the DANA center has offered up courses such as quantitative literacy, modern mathematics, survey mathematics, for example (because of the MoGEA).

Vicki mentioned that they've offered these alternative courses, but that they don't see much traction in them because of the transfer issue. Rusty mentioned that the real sticking point here is the University of Missouri. The University of Missouri, however, is the fourth largest transfer receiving institution in the state. The transfer issue is especially important for Moberly Area. We should not say that because University of Missouri has this issue we aren't going to move forward with this work. Rita mentioned that with regard to the independent sector, they will take the college level course that the student took at their original institution. To be on the safe side, though, students take the college algebra course so that they can rest assured that they will be able to transfer.

Rusty expressed to the taskforce that we would welcome any ideas in terms of whom to invite to the second mathematics summit. Melody mentioned that we need to invite the people that are in the other schools to come in to talk to us and tell us why they believe college algebra is that important. Now may also be the time to bring in the independent institutions.

Rita mentioned that she went through the students who had below a 22 math sub-score, half of them had taken dual credit, and many of them had an 18 or 17 ACT mathematics sub-score. The concern that she has is that the student who has taken college algebra then tries to take stats or another math course for their discipline, and they are not successful. We need to work hard to bring in the independents, because when they go to transfer somewhere else they are not ready for the courses in the discipline. Many of these students, when you look back on them and look at various measures, had no business taking dual credit courses. Vicki mentioned that they are implementing the threshold score, and some students are coming in with courses but yet are not meeting their reading threshold.

Rita mentioned that maybe the math folks in the MMPT can talk about exit competencies for these alternative courses or mathematics courses that lead to and are to be expected in some field or discipline.

This seems to be the same conversation that was had with MoGEA. What should these students know when they enter these other disciplines? What do they need to know, what should they be able to demonstrate? On the MoGEA, 50% of the test is numbers and algebra. Is it very, very basic algebra, however. 25% is geometry, 25% is statistics. That's kind of the conversation we are having now....how do we put them all together? We want them to know the concepts, why does this work, etc.

### **3. Old Business**

#### **3a. TCCR Communications**

Jennifer discussed recent communications efforts and asked if anyone had any input or any questions regarding the placement process. Several taskforce members agreed that the more admissions folks and advisors participating in the webinar the better. We should share the developmental education policy and placement guidelines with CAOs, especially independent sector. Newsletter, we will set up a subscription process for the newsletter. We will send it to CAOs at first, but also our distribution lists that we have at the department. There are also some other K-12 conferences that we will continue to participate in.

#### **3b. Placement Guidelines**

The taskforce discussed the SAT mathematics score issue. The issue being that the current SAT score listed in the policy was incorrect as that score is used for admissions rather than placement. The taskforce agreed that the original score should have been specific to mathematics and not combined with the reading component. The taskforce agreed that 510 for the SAT was a reasonable score and should have been the SAT mathematics score reflected in the policy from the beginning.

Paula's institution used multiple measures this past semester and had some preliminary data to share. If they didn't meet the score, then they were able to take a different test. So they were able to do a writing exercise as opposed to their compass reading score. They only had 7 students, and 6 of the 7 got a C or better. Their final grade in college algebra was comparable to those students who entered directly into college algebra. The writing appeal showed very successful results of the students who went on to do really well in Comp 1. Promise enough to show that they are headed in the right direction. Rusty mentioned that the Southeast Missouri State went to co-requisite model, and the results they've seen from the first semester are staggering. They've seen a lot of improvement. They are piloting two comp 1 co-requisite classes, and the students are doing well. 100% of students are showing up for the extra help. Rusty is going to ask Southeast and Moberly to provide some info for the Sept CBHE board meeting. Also, MCCA is planning a panel session again at their administrative conference.

### **3c. Remedial Education in the High School**

Melody gave an update regarding offering remedial education in the high school. She talked with several course providers, and some of them are all-in. The issue is becoming making the connection course-wise. How can we within our system do a dual enrollment situation, what do we charge, etc? We have to get DESE to recognize it as a dual enrollment course.

What is the course outcome? We cannot say they are going to be ready for college level math because we aren't sure how they will do. Melody asked for some data from Jeremy regarding the number of students who took the ACT and what their scores were. 50% of the seniors who took the ACT scored below our college ready score of 22. We have 10,000 more people who are going to take this, and they are probably not all going to score a 22 or above. We need to understand how many high school kids could pass intermediate algebra and enter straight into the college algebra course.

We want to get the students ready for gateway courses. The problem is figuring out how to partner this. We need a math bridge course so that it counts as a senior level math course, but will DESE be on board with this? How will this partnering go? DESE needs to come up with a course that is called math bridge, and if we can come up with a substantial plan then DESE may embrace it. Are we viewing this as the responsibility of the higher education institution or secondary? It's everyone's responsibility. The colleges want this partnership. One of the problems we will run in to is the individuality of the school districts. Unless DESE can come up with some uniform way to provide this, it likely will be a problem with individual school districts.

Melody discussed the differences between Aleks, Mymathlab, and WorkKeys. Aleks only aligns to the institutions that are using it. It aligns to the course objectives of the institution. Workkeys mathematics level is extremely low. For those going into the workforce WorkKeys is fine, but would not be the level we want for entering into a college-credit mathematics course. The

learning objectives you want from these dual enrollment math courses should be aligned with the entrance competencies for college ready mathematics at institutions. If students do not master those, then they've failed. But we aren't giving a grade, we are setting up a placement database, but then by doing that it's not a course. It's a preparatory course. A course in the high school called college prep algebra. Rusty's sense is that DESE will participate, especially if we do a pilot first and it shows positive results.

Why can't the scores in the class be put on the transcript so that we could use those in terms of placement? Melody mentioned that it can't be scores, it's more placement into or not into.

We need to figure out the college connection piece, because we need to begin engaging high schools sooner rather than later. Moberly has already had these discussions with the high schools, but who is going to pay for the Mymathlab license? This is one reason they did not get very far. One advantage to using Aleks is that we would have the free licenses. Would Mymathlab give Moberly the free licenses? OTC has been taking compass into their partner high schools, but we aren't remediating anything at that point. We need this remedial course in the high school so that they can enter college college ready. The diagnostic software will help do that. We need confirmation from DESE that this could meet a math unit. Competency wise, is it a high school math course? It seems likely that it is going to be a repeat of a high school math course. The fear here is that DESE will say that a student already took that math course, and so this course will not be high school credit.

In terms of moving forward, Rusty is interested and wants to support a pilot of this. We can get three institutions involved (North Central, State Tech, Moberly, and we can find a fourth), but only if we go with Mymathlab for Moberly. The cost is the only issue for Moberly. Some institutions will use Aleks, and some can use Mymathlab. Aleks meets each student at their need, not at the course objectives.

We need to begin to look towards funding for this. There may be a grant opportunity from CBHE, but we don't want this to go away once the grant goes away. We need something in the college that will house this and fund this. Maybe they could pay for it through their average daily attendance money. Someone is going to have to pick up the cost of this program. The pilot will provide us with the proof of concept, and if we can demonstrate real success with this among institutions and districts, then there would be someone in the general assembly who would support this because it addresses a number of issues that they keep bringing up. If we have x percent increase in student readiness in college ready work, or a large decrease in the need for remediation, then that would be good. Rusty mentioned that we should continue this conversation through email, and figure out how best we can get the pilot moving forward. It might be worthwhile to form a smaller workgroup to talk about this with some superintendents, etc.

#### **4. New Business**

#### **4a. Data Compliance and Reporting**

Rusty and Jeremy began a discussion of data compliance and reporting. What is it we want to know? We want the data collection to be comprehensive enough to answer certain questions, but done in such a way that we do not burden institutions. If much of what we want can be gleaned from EMSAS then that would be great, but there has to be some kind of accountability with this policy.

We send out the annual report in December, about the time that the legislature meets. We definitely want to include what placement process institutions are using, and the # of students placed into remediation. That information we have and we can see that from EMSAS. We also want to know the # of students successful in the remedial course, and in other courses.

Are gateway courses aligned with the appropriate programs of study? There is some confusion with this question, especially for community colleges since they won't know exactly what the program of study would be once the student enters into a bachelors program. As long as they are aligned with the receiving institutions, then people will say yes, even if they don't agree that this is the right course. Should only four-year institutions answer this type of question since they know? AA is not really a program of study. It should be less of an issue with the transfer library.

Should we track whether a student took a fourth year of math? Jeremy mentioned that they had this conversation, and wanted to bring these elements back into EMSAS. DESE is collecting the course completion data from the students (public high school). The response to the conversation was why don't you do it? There may be a possibility that MDHE could begin collecting that. It's possible that we'll be able to look at that data and be able to say what percentage of students took a fourth year of math. This is something that Jeremy believes he may be able to do for the colleges. What do we have now? We didn't have course level data, but we will now. Jeremy might be able to give some kind of aggregate summary to the institutions. Jeremy would be able to demonstrate students who took four years of math, who took fourth year math were able to avoid remediation.

What does your average student pay towards remediation? Ultimately we want to be able to show that since we've implemented these best practices in remedial education, that we are saving students money. We are saving in the college remediation piece.

It will also be important to know who the comparison group is. Will it be those students who do not enter into remedial education courses? We need to define those students for a comparison group.

In regards to section 8 of the remedial education policy, do institutions review their programs? This is more of a narrative piece. Most program review pieces talk about advising practices, student success, etc. The program review process may not be truly in line with what institutions currently look at with their program review.

#### **4b. TCCR Membership**

Rusty discussed adding new members to the taskforce. He mentioned that we would like to get someone on the taskforce from University of Missouri as well as a few other two-year public institutions and independent institutions. He hopes that by the June meeting we will have some new members.

#### **4c. Next Steps**

Jennifer, Rusty and Jeremy will perfect the data template. We will keep the June 5 meeting on the agenda so that we can discuss the remedial high school initiative.

Sharon mentioned that with regards to the anti-common core group, that we may need some Missouri institutions be a part of the ongoing process. If anyone from the taskforce would like to review what these individuals put together regarding language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies to let her know.

#### **5. Announcements**

The Taskforce will meet again on June 5, 2015 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the MACC campus in Columbia, MO.

#### **6. Adjournment**