

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)  
Meeting Minutes  
November 21, 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
Mike Grelle	University of Central Missouri
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Jeremy Kintzel	Missouri Department of Higher Education
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

**Absent**

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College
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
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College

**1. Review of Last Meeting; Updates & Reports**

Rusty called the meeting to order and asked if anyone had any questions regarding the previous meetings minutes. There were no corrections or changes to the September meeting, and these minutes were approved.

Jennifer discussed the recent SBAC meeting in Chicago. This meeting was held so that the higher education chiefs at SBAC would vote on the achievement levels and cut-scores, especially regarding the 11<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC assessment. There was no vote at this meeting; however, SBAC has since voted and approved the 3rd grade, 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and 11<sup>th</sup> grade cut-scores. It is still important to remember that Missouri did away with the SBAC 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. DESE has

mentioned that they very well may be adopting the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment in the near future, so it was important for DESE and Higher Ed to agree on the 11<sup>th</sup> grade cut-scores at this particular meeting.

The reason for decided not to go with the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment stems from the fact that districts, teacher groups, and unions were all opposed to more testing, and they fought the state board of education on adopting and implementing the SBAC 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. There has also long been a push for the state to fund the ACT for students in the state. The SBAC 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment really had no value to students, but the ACT does. We would need more data before we would know how truly valuable the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment would be for higher ed. So, since the ACT has more value to students, it was chosen to replace the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. ACT, however, has very limited predictability, especially with regard to college completion and in subsequent semesters after their first semester. It is not necessarily designed to be an assessment of learning outcomes.

## **2. Assessment and Placement**

Rusty discussed the policy on basic skills assessment and placement with the taskforce members. He mentioned the changes that were made to the document since the September meeting, and no members had any other corrections or revisions to the document. Rusty mentioned that he will be sending this document to CAOs for review and approval, and will likely not have to submit this to the CBHE for approval. This document should reflect the fact that institutions can use multiple measures to assess and place students into college-level coursework.

## **3. TCCR Communications**

Jennifer discussed the recent steps taken regarding the TCCR communication strategy, and showed the TCCR the website that the department put together. This website will feature all things related to college and career readiness, and will link students, parents, guidance counselors and other interested parties to other sites where they can find more information about college and career readiness. It was also discussed that we should have a section for the TCCR that would include meeting agendas, minutes and any other important materials. Over the next several months, Jennifer will work with the communication staff at the department on various publications that will include college and career readiness information.

## **3. Threshold Scores**

Jeremy discussed the recent data that he and several other IR staff at various institutions in the state collected concerning placement scores. He discussed doing a similar analysis to the one this group completed previously, except for this time they would be looking at the remedial education course. For example, how successful would a student be completing the developmental course given a certain amount of time? One advantage to this is that we already have much of this data on hand, since these IR representatives helped with the placement data analysis. The

department also has some other data concerning success in the developmental education courses, at least in math and reading. The advantage would be that it really will not require any additional data, so Jeremy can use the data institutions have already provided. We may, however, want to ask for more years of data, or a different cohort.

Rita mentioned that it is important to keep in mind that as we look at this data, we examine students' ability to benefit at a certain level in these remedial education courses. And for example, how are we measuring success? And at what level do you say these students are successful? When we analyzed the placement data, we did look to success in subsequent courses. But for the developmental data analysis, are we looking at success for them to be college ready or simply just success in a developmental class? Rusty mentioned that we can't use the same approach as we do with the students at the upper margin for these who we are in effect saying may not be ready, even for a developmental class.

Jeremy mentioned that he needs to dig into the data a bit more, and will know soon enough whether or not he needs to look at a wider range of students and needs more data. He mentioned that he could have some analysis by January or early February at the latest.

Rusty mentioned Work Ready Communities and the Department of Economic Development, and that we may need to begin collaborating with them more on this issue of preparing students. What are some other options that students have if in fact they are not college prepared?

## **5. Next Steps**

The Taskforce will meet again in January 2015. Much of the discussion for this meeting and subsequent meetings for 2015 will be centered around threshold scores, data necessary for tracking and compliance of remedial education as well as communicating to students, parents and guidance counselors college and career readiness issues.

## **6. Welcome and Introductions – Joint CCA/TCCR meeting**

Paul and Rusty welcomed the members to the meeting, and thanked them for their attendance. They then guided the Taskforce and CCA through introductions

## **7. Math Pathways Initiative**

Rusty guided the two committees into a discussion about the recent development of the Mathematics Pathways Taskforce (MMPT). The MMPT is supported by the Dana C. Center at UT-Austin and Complete College America. This taskforce is largely in place because of the best practices in remedial education policy, as the TCCR identified alternative pathways in mathematics as a best practice in developmental education. The MMPT had their first meeting on October 30, and their second meeting on November 20. Dr. Mary Shepherd, math professor at Northwest Missouri State, is chairing this taskforce. The two meetings that have been held thus far have been successful, and there appears to be some consensus from the taskforce on moving

forward with this initiative, with the exception of a few hurdles. One big hurdle at this moment is that these alternate pathways need to be transferable, and MU right now requires college algebra for graduation.

One question presented as why are we not trying or why is the ultimate goal not to increase the math aptitude for students in Missouri? Paul provided a two-year prospective: Some students do not have any interest in transferring and being a part of a bachelors or 4-year plan of study. Certain types of technical mathematics provide more utility for these types of students. It's not always just a transfer issue, especially for those students who have no desire to transfer. With that said, why not explore a different mathematics initiative that supports increasing the math aptitude of students, not just give them a different pathway? In order to do this, we are going to have to completely revamp the way we teach math at the elementary, middle and high school level. Students *should* be taking a 4<sup>th</sup> year of math; that is very important.

One thing that perhaps the MMPT can be responsible for is defining mathematical literacy. In order to be able to offer these alternate pathways and align the curricula with K-12, we need to understand where students stand in high school and as freshman in college, as well as how many students know exactly where they want to go and what course of study they will choose.

### **8. K-12 and Postsecondary Curriculum Alignment**

Rusty expressed that these alternative math pathways will allow us to have more alignment with K-12, thereby better preparing students across the board in mathematics. The steps we are taking now will put us on the path of increasing math aptitude.

One thing that confounds the issue here is some language in the general education policy that indicates that pre-requisites into college algebra should be the same as the pre-requisite into statistics. This could be the ACT (while not a course pre-req), as it is used in placement into college algebra, so could be used in placement of students into statistics.

It is important that K-12 value mathematics in order for the education community to see any real change, especially at the secondary level.

The TCCR's opinion is that we need to figure out what we want and are hoping to do in higher education before we start to really hash out some curriculum alignment efforts. There needs to be better communication and collaboration among K-12 and Higher Ed. How can we go about bolstering that relationship? The 11<sup>th</sup> grade SBAC test would have given and provided us with info on whether a student was really ready. What other options need to be explored, what else can be done to truly assess students' readiness? These are the things that these two committees need to be focused on moving forward.

St. Charles began an initiative with high schools to do what we hoped SBAC would do. They go to the high school and give the Compass test to students. This then lets students know where they

stand academically and if they are ready for college mathematics, for example. It allows them to partner with the high school to provide some type of intervention so that students can enter college at the college algebra level. Chris Breitmeyer may be able to provide a better update on this at a future meeting. Also, by using multiple measures we may be able to have a better understanding and more illumination of where those alignment pieces are.

Still the question begs, what can we do that is concrete to begin to increase this collaboration? Early testing in the high schools? Dual credit could be an option as a way for us to further enhance collaboration with K-12.

### **9. Next steps**

Rusty mentioned that the TCCR will continue to work through these issues and will continue to report information to the CCA. The TCCR will also continue to seek guidance and input from the CCA for any curricular issues, especially as they relate to remedial education.