

**Council of Chief Academic Officers
Meeting Minutes
July 16, 2014**

In Attendance

Brent Bates	State Fair Community College
Glenn Coltharp	Crowder College
Deborah Curtis	University of Central Missouri
Arlen Dykstra	Missouri Baptist University
Don Weiss	Devry University
Mindy Selsor	Jefferson College
David Russell	MDHE
Rusty Monhollon	MDHE
Elizabeth Valentine	MDHE
Jennifer Plemons	MDHE
Dwyane Smith	Harris-Stowe State University
Richard Pemberton	State Technical College of Missouri
Bill Eddleman	Southeast Missouri State University
Douglas Dunham	Rockhurst University

Absent

Wes Payne	Three Rivers Community
Steven Graham	University of Missouri System
Vicki Schwinke	Linn State Technical College

I. Call to Order

A. Welcome

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

II. Updates and Reports

A. Minutes: April 2014 Meeting

There were no additional comments or corrections to the April minutes, and so they were considered approved.

B. COTA Introductions

Rusty Monhollon introduced Amy Werner, program specialist for academic affairs, who is now the MDHE liaison to the Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA). Amy introduced COTA and encouraged COTA members to introduce themselves to the CCAO. Melissa Hatman, Director of Community College Relations at University of Missouri-St. Louis, discussed the recent happenings of COTA as well as what COTA expects to be part of their responsibility in the future. She discussed the annual COTA conference while mentioning that the next conference will take place in February 2015 in Jefferson City. This conference is typically a one day event; however, the 2015 conference will be a two day event. COTA is currently in the process of organizing this conference.

Melissa also discussed that COTA will be in charge of reviewing several CBHE academic affairs policies, such as the transfer and articulation policy and recent policies that have been born out of HB 1042, which was passed in 2013. Rusty echoed this sentiment, and expressed that COTA will not only continue with its work in planning and running the annual COTA conference, but will also play more of an instrumental role in reviewing CBHE legislation.

C. *Educator Preparation Accountability*

Rusty began a discussion of the recent happenings surrounding Educator Prep. He provided the council members with the minutes from the most recent Missouri Advisory Board for Educator Preparation (MABEP) meeting. He mentioned that the next meeting is set to take place on July 24 and it will be a much longer meeting than the previous meeting with more on the agenda to discuss. One item that will definitely be on the agenda and needs further discussion is the MoGEA assessment and its progress to date. The most recent meeting where MoGEA was discussed went well, and it seems that DESE would like to start over with the assessment process as a result of input from the institutions. Participants at the meeting expressed that they would like to move away from discipline specific concepts, and DESE officials were in agreement. All of the Oral Communication and Public Speaking section was deleted and incorporated into the other sections. Literature was deleted and placed into the Reading Comprehension section, retaining only Literary Analysis and Interpretation, Literary Devices and Techniques. In the Mathematics section, Probability and Discrete Mathematics was dropped. Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics sub-sections were dropped and are to be measured in the context of fundamental scientific concepts. Changes to the Social Studies section were to retain only the first three items and measure the other 8 items in context of fundamental history/social science concepts.

It has become apparent that DESE as well as the general public has a lack of understanding about general education and its purpose. It was proposed that this may be a great opportunity for higher ed to get out in front of this issue and be proactive

by further informing DESE and the public about general education and the reasons it has been structured the way it has. This is also an opportunity to provide some rationale as to what higher ed can and cannot do regarding general education. The question was posed as to whether or not it is necessary to completely restructure general education or whether it is simply a matter of better informing DESE and other interested stakeholders. Many council members seemed to be in favor of further informing the public and DESE about general education. Rusty asked the council members if they felt that a formal presentation, perhaps at the July 25 MABEP meeting, would be a way to start the informative process. The council members were in favor of this idea, and felt that a formal presentation that further elucidates general education would provide an excellent starting point for DESE and higher to gain some consistency about general education.

AAT discussion?

Rusty guided the council members to look over the Missouri Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE) letter he included in the agenda packet. He mentioned that MACTE's concerns include the fact that the methods and approach used by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCQT) are controversial. NCQT are not always able to provide an accurate analysis because of insufficient data collection. Rusty asked the council members if they would support some kind of letter that shows the Council's endorsement of MACTE's concerns regarding NCQT review process. Many council members were in favor of drafting such a letter. Dr. Russell expressed concern over the council taking a reactionary position, as has been done in the past. He also expressed concern over the council taking a position one way or another that would, in effect, be on behalf of all CAOs in the state. He cautioned the council that this group may not necessarily be inclusive of all CAOs in the state, and so providing a letter of endorsement that would speak on behalf of all CAOs in the state may not be the best course of action. However, he encouraged council members to have and express their own position regarding NCQT.

One thing that was agreed upon was the need to endorse and call for better communication between Institutions of Higher Education and DESE, as well as the general public. IHEs should better inform these interested stakeholders about CAEP standards and the fact that higher ed does want to see and is wholly in favor of higher standards. While the council does endorse MACTE's concern over the NCQT review process, perhaps the best way to express and provide support for MACTE is to begin an information campaign whereby IHEs work diligently to better inform DESE and the public about higher ed standards and general education. Rusty felt that this could be a topic that is also discussed at the July 24 MAPEB meeting, and so will ensure

that it is on the agenda for this meeting. Dr. Russell also mentioned that council members could get together to draft some sort of op-ed that discusses many of these aforementioned issues and could serve to further inform the public. Legislators may be interested in reading something like this, and that may help the effort as well.

D. HB 1042 Implementation

Rusty mentioned that all HB 1042 initiatives are moving along well. He started by discussing the core transfer library first. The last of the courses to the library were approved at the June CBHE Board meeting, and so there are currently 26 courses in the core transfer library that are readily transferable among all higher education institutions in the state.

Now the work begins on how to best include other courses into this library and what that process may look like. There are some courses that are proving to be difficult to add to the library, and these courses are simply just not transferable among all institutions. Institutions will need to dialogue about whether or not these courses should or should not be included in the transfer library. What needs to occur is some process whereby institutions discuss these courses and identify reasons why these courses should or should not be included in the library. Institutions need to identify the problems with some of these courses, and why these courses are different. Faculty need to be included in these types of discussions and as the transfer library progresses. The council agreed, however, they felt that a simpler starting place was needed.

Council members expressed to Rusty that some type of charge or document outlining a process to begin this transfer library work provided by MDHE at the October meeting would be helpful. Rusty agreed that this would be helpful, and indicated that he would provide that information at the October meeting.

The next issue was reverse transfer and Rusty provided a brief overview of reverse transfer. There will be a Reverse Transfer conference on September 16, and this will also be the official launch of reverse transfer in Missouri. Several individuals from the Lumina Foundation, the co-sponsors of the reverse transfer legislation as well as the governor have been invited to attend this event. The reverse transfer work up to this point has been going well, and this event will truly be the culmination of the reverse transfer effort to date. Rusty mentioned that he will provide further information about this event as it nears.

Rusty discussed the remedial education initiative and its progress to date. Several institutions are piloting multiple measures for placement for the Fall of 2014, and the Task Force hopes to have some data from these institutions on the success of these

measures by next Spring. The Task Force also has a data subgroup that is working towards providing a model of multiple measures based on data they are collecting and analyzing. This model will include variables such as ACT/COMPASS/Other placement test, GPA, High School End-of-Course Exam. The measures identified as the best measures in which to assess students' readiness for college level work will be shared with institutions, and will serve as a guideline for placing students into or out of remedial education.

Many council members expressed concern over whether the measures that will be identified in the remedial education policy are required for institutions to use or if they will simply be suggested measures to use. Rusty mentioned that the measures that will be identified, and some that already are, i.e. placement scores, will serve as suggestions. These are not required, but we do want to ensure that institutions are using multiple measures when placing student into or out of remedial education. The ultimate goal is to place fewer students into remedial education, and using multiple measures is one way to accomplish this. A few council members expressed concern over the current placement scores that are included in the remedial education policy. They asked if they are currently required to use the scores in the placement section of the policy or if these are just suggestions as well. Rusty mentioned that if institutions are going to use these placement tests for placing students into or out of remedial education, then all institutions should use the same placement scores, which are outlined in the remedial education policy. The goal here is to have consistency across all institutions in the state, and for everyone to use the same placement score so that we send a consistent message to students. Members were also concerned over when this policy goes into effect, as there has been some confusion about this. Rusty mentioned that it is currently in effect as it is in the policy. Jennifer provided more information on this, and expressed to council members that this section of the policy is still currently under review, and will include more measures, not just placement test scores. Once this section is updated and approved by the CBHE it will become effective. The date that has been identified by the Task Force on College and Career Readiness is fall 2015, however, this is subject to change. There was still some concern surrounding this date for implementation of the placement section, and there needs to be further discussion on this topic.

E. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)

Leroy Wade, Deputy Commissioner, came by to provide a brief update on SARA. He told the council that legislation was passed this spring that allows MDHE to be the portal agency for SARA agreements for the state. The department is in the middle of preparing some documentation to outline the process for participating in SARA agreements that will be distributed to IHEs across the state. By the end of the year, a process should be in place whereby the MDHE will approve institutions to participate

in SARA. All institutions in the state will be eligible to participate in SARA agreements. Leroy briefly mentioned the process in that once an institution has applied with the MDHE, they are then able to offer and accept courses from out-of-state institutions, and they will not have to go through the licensure process at the out-of-state school.

F. Math Summit

Rusty mentioned that the Mathematics Summit will be held Sept 11-12 in Columbia at the Hilton Garden Inn Hotel. This conference will provide a starting place to begin discussing and establishing a means of providing alternate pathways and course redesign in mathematics. It will be important to bring faculty and administrators to the table to discuss these issues. We hope to have teams of 5 from institutions that will include math faculty, arts and sciences faculty, as well as administrators. A grant of \$15,000 that was received will be used to pay for much of the summit and the guest speakers. The summit will be limited to 150 people, and so MDHE will be asking institutions at this time to register teams of no more than five. After the initial deadline, which may be August 15, depending on how many spots are left, we will allow institutions to register more team members.

Rusty mentioned that there was a recent RFP from Complete College America where states will put together a task force to participate in a two-year initiative to dramatically increase the percentage of students who pass gateway math courses and enter programs of study in one academic year by building math pathways. He mentioned that he will put together the proposal, however, would like any recommendations on task force members that the council could provide. This task force should be made up of two-year and four-year math faculty. He will send a message out to all CAOs that will encourage recommendations for this task force.

G. Early College Workgroup

Jennifer Plemons, Research Associate for Academic Affairs, provided the council with a brief overview of the Early College Workgroup and the progress made to date. The workgroup held their first meeting in early June, and it was a very productive meeting. The group discussed definitions of dual credit, and came to a consensus about how Missouri will define and differentiate dual credit from dual enrollment from other early college experiences. The group began discussing the current policy and began going through the various sections of the policy to make revisions. The group felt that there was a need for a separate subgroup to discuss student eligibility, as there will also most likely be a need for other subgroups to discuss faculty qualifications. New language for student eligibility has been drafted and will be discussed at the August 13 Early College Workgroup meeting. Some of the proposed

changes to the student eligibility section include lowering the GPA requirement from 3.0 to 2.5 for juniors and seniors, as well as creating a better multi-tiered system of assessing students' readiness for dual credit courses. Ultimately, the quality of dual credit programs must be maintained if students are to receive full benefit.

The workgroup will also discuss a process whereby institutions are held accountable for the quality of their dual credit programs. If institutions are not NACEP accredited, and do not plan to seek NACEP accreditation, then there needs to be a process to ensure the quality of those programs. Rusty mentioned the creation of some kind of dual credit advisory board that will be made up of institutional representatives. This board could do reviews of dual credit programs and sign off on the quality of the programs that are not NACEP accredited. There will also need to be further discussion regarding tuition and fees. Rusty mentioned the idea of having a flat fee, e.g. \$50 for all dual credit courses, as often fees are one way institutions compete for students. One council member mentioned that perhaps fees for dual credit courses could be based on some percentage of the institution's tuition. This topic will be further explored with the Early College Workgroup. The policy and the guidelines provided to institutions need to be stricter and the quality has to be assured. Jennifer will provide this feedback to the Early College Workgroup in August, and will then provide the recent revisions to the dual credit policy to the council members at the October meeting where this will be discussed further.

III. Old Business

A. Mission Review

Rusty provided a brief overview of the progress to date regarding mission review. He mentioned that mission review will be a primary topic of discussion at the CBHE retreat July 30-31. They have also decided to add a year on to the review process, as it was discussed that a more thorough review will be produced with more time as opposed to just four or five months. This will ensure that the review is done correctly and effectively. One primary topic in mission review will be that of institutional selectivity.

Rusty also mentioned that there are a few institutions who have missions in statute, and that they may need to call upon the legislature to clarify and update these missions.

IV. New Business

A. Competency-Based Education

Rusty expressed to the council members that there was not enough time to fully discuss competency-based education at this meeting, and that it would be tabled for

the October meeting. However, he did mention that the department received a call for a proposal from the Council on Advanced and Experiential Learning. The department submitted the proposal and subsequently received the award from CAEL. On November 5, there will be a meeting where several experts from the CAEL community will discuss issues surrounding competency-based education. Competency-based education will most likely be part of the upcoming legislative session, and so we need to be prepared for that and have an understanding of the issues surrounding competency-based education.

V. Big Issues

None

VI. Announcements

A. Next CCAO Meeting

The next CCAO meeting will be on October 15, 2014 in Jefferson City at the Governor's Office Building, Room 460.

B. Other Meetings of interest/note

Other meetings of interest include:

CCA – July 15

MABEP – July 24

Joint CBHE-SBE Meeting – July 29

CBHE Retreat – July 30-31

Early College Workgroup – August 13

CBHE – September 3-4

Completion Academy Follow-up – September 10

Math Summit – Sept 11-12

VII. Adjournment