

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)
Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2015**

In Attendance

Rusty Monhollon	Department of Higher Education
Jeff Cawlfeld	Missouri University of Science & Technology
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College
Jennifer Plemons	Department of Higher Education
Rita Gulstad	Central Methodist University
Skip Crooker	University of Central Missouri
Melody Shipley	North Central Missouri College
Jayne Blandford	St. Charles Community College
Anthony Barbis	University of Missouri

Absent

Carla Wheeler	Sedalia Public Schools
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Elaine Bryan	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Sharon Helwig	Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Tabatha Crites	Mineral Area Community College
Dana Ferguson	Columbia Public Schools
Richard Pemberton	Linn State Technical College
Janet Gooch	Truman State University
Michael Muenks	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Jeremy Kintzel	Missouri Department of Higher Education
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College

1. Call to Order

Rusty called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for their attendance. He introduced the taskforce's newest members, Jayme Blandford, Anthony Barbis, and Elaine Bryan (who was absent). He also mentioned that there are several individuals that have indicated they would like to participate on the Curriculum and Assessment Workgroup, but he will ask some of those individuals to instead serve on the taskforce. Jennifer will be contacting these individuals within the next week.

2. Updates & Reports

2a. Review of Last Meeting

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

2b. Missouri Mathematics Pathways Taskforce (MMPT)

Rusty discussed the math pathways project and mentioned that the MMPT report was brought before the CBHE on Wednesday for review and endorsement. Several taskforce members asked what the goal(s) for the next summit would be? Rusty mentioned that this second summit will largely be geared towards bringing in other faculty in an effort to generate buy-in from other academic disciplines as the taskforce moves forward with implementing alternative mathematics pathways. Rita mentioned that there are no independent institutions listed on the Math Pathways Taskforce, and she would like to see more independent institutions being brought into this initiative. Rusty mentioned that when we initially began this effort, he tried to bring on some individuals from St. Louis University. However, these individuals did not continue to participate and were unable to provide any guidance or input during the planning of the first mathematics summit. He did agree that now is the time to begin engaging independent institutions.

Other institutions, such as MS&T, UMSL, and UMKC currently have some alternate pathways for students to take instead of the college algebra path. Rusty mentioned that there is a willingness to discuss this issue with University of Missouri, and we have to continue to explore opportunities for conversation with UM. One central issue is that these courses are not readily transferable. Rusty mentioned that it is not too early to think that by this time next year we could have in place a stem and non-stem pathway at institutions where the coursework could hopefully be transferable among institutions. This may not be the case at the University of Missouri, but it is important to remember that they are the fourth largest transfer institution in the state. We cannot let the University of Missouri be the thing that slows this initiative down; we have too many students that could benefit from this work.

With respect to developing alternative pathways and STEM vs. Non-STEM majors, Anthony mentioned that the idea of stem came from stem careers. The central idea surrounding this movement is based upon the premise that so much of our science and math is taught with a theoretical base and not an applied base. Stem is teaching science and mathematics to those who will apply it in industry. Stem has been commandeered by science and mathematics folks at institutions, and has largely gotten away from its original purpose. It is too theoretical, and the students do not necessarily need all of the theory to perform well in their careers. It's important to identify exactly what these industries need and what they are looking for. Often times they do not necessarily know what they need, and so higher education is often unable to meet them at their needs.

Several other taskforce members agreed, and felt that the idea of STEM may mean something different for each of our institutions in the state. STEM could indicate career and technical

education, or engineering and mathematics. Saying STEM vs. NON-STEM may be a simplistic way of looking at things; It may be key to break these each down further.

We also need to include key stakeholders from the K-12 sector at the second mathematics summit. Its important to also remember that students are taking the ACT in their junior year of high school, and they need to understand a lot of college algebra, geometry, etc. to do well on the ACT. We have to keep this in mind when we think about these alternative pathways for students.

Rusty reiterated what the focus of the second mathematics summit will be: To work towards developing alternative pathways that is a non-college algebra path. We are letting the faculty drive this effort, and we really want to do what is best and what will work for Missouri institutions.

3. Old Business

3a. Remedial Education in the High School (*College Preparatory Courses*); Dual Credit and Remedial Education

Rusty mentioned that Moberly Area Community College is piloting this effort to a degree in some high schools. The ACT in the junior year will also be helpful in terms of assessing where students are regarding college readiness.

Jayne had several questions regarding the dual credit policy and the issue of offering developmental education in the high school. She wondered if this idea was so that college faculty and instructors would now be teaching students at the high end (as in dual credit), but also at the low end (as in these remedial courses in the high school). Why are we getting away from high school instructors teaching high school and college instructors teaching college? Rusty mentioned that the idea is to place the burden back in the high school, especially during the student's senior year, so that a student is prepared for college level work when they arrive to college. It is a way to reduce the need for remediation at the college level. Jayme thought that phrasing this initiative differently may make all the difference in terms of perception. The taskforce agreed, and felt that College Preparatory Courses/Program would be better.

Rusty mentioned that this type of college prep program in the high school would give those kids who have the desire and want to go to college the opportunity to rectify the issue while they are still in high school before they graduate. He mentioned that we need to keep in mind that the remedial education policy should reduce the need for remedial education at the college level, and this type of initiative would allow that to happen. It would allow more students to potentially enter college and enroll in a credit-bearing course, or perhaps allow institutions to go more the way of co-requisite models.

Melody wondered that if we cannot launch this type of program through some type of pilot process with funding from the legislature, then could we do it the way dual credit is done? Use a

similar model to dual credit in that parents could pay for the credit hours for these college prep type courses? It's important to keep in mind that these courses would not be for actual college credit, but would instead be used for placement. Rusty mentioned that each college that would like to be a part of this initiative should identify three high schools to partner with. Institutions will need to hire or find those individuals within their institution that are willing to teach these types of courses at the high school. Rusty thought that a meeting between Paula, Vicki, Melody, and Jennifer would be beneficial to get things going. We could work towards creating something that could be implemented in Fall 2016. We could focus on just getting the course identified and pulled together for Fall 2016. Jennifer will work on scheduling a meeting.

4. New Business

4a. Adult Education and Threshold Scores

Rusty mentioned that he attended a conference on Adult Education and Literacy (AEL) several weeks ago. These types of programs and courses do not need any kind of approval, and several institutions in the state currently have AEL programs or have the ability to have them. Rusty mentioned that we still have yet to set a threshold score in the policy, and that we need to begin going down that road. Ozarks and State Tech are piloting their threshold scores this year it year, and hopefully we will have some preliminary data from these institutions. The taskforce agreed that we need some data in order to identify a score that will be politically feasible. (Rusty will check with Steve Bishop before next TCCR meeting). He mentioned that we have some data already, but we need to look into that further in order to figure out how to sell this idea to institutions.

4b. MDHE Coordinated Plan

Rusty mentioned that the department wrapped up the last public hearing for the coordinated plan yesterday in Cape Girardeau. On July 29 and July 30, the coordinated plan steering committee will begin sifting through all of the information gathered from the public hearings and the end result will be a report. Rusty, Leroy Wade and Dr. Russell will begin working on the report starting in July. He mentioned that at the hearing this past week, people continued to worry and express concerns over remediation. He asked the taskforce what should we include regarding college and career readiness as part of the coordinated plan? Rita mentioned that we should include communication as part of the agenda for the coordinated plan. We need to have a way to better communicate all the good work that we do. The taskforce agreed, and Rusty mentioned that he will keep that in mind when writing up the report and participating in the workgroups for implementing the coordinated plan.

5. Announcements

The Taskforce will meet again on July 31, 2015 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the MACC campus in Columbia, MO.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.