

**Taskforce on College & Career Readiness (TCCR)  
Meeting Minutes  
January 30, 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
Janet Gooch	Truman State University
Jane Greer	University of Missouri – Kansas City
Jann Weitzel	Lindenwood University
Paula Glover	Moberly Area Community College

**Absent**

Tara Noah	North Central Missouri College
Jeff Cawfield	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

**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 November 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 since K-12 decided not to go with the SBAC 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. Sharon Helwig mentioned that the SBAC summative assessments are to be given this spring (grades 3 and 8). The ACT will be given to juniors this spring as well. The test will be given to both public and non-public students. One taskforce member asked how the ACT is being financed. Sharon mentioned that DESE based their estimate on the number of students – and DESE may have to cover some of the costs for students. Sharon mentioned that Commissioner Van Deevan has expressed hope that the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessments will return, however, it is not certain as to when that will happen at this point.

## **3. Old Business**

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

Jennifer discussed the changes made to the MDHE website regarding college and career readiness. She expressed that the remedial education policy will be placed on the website, along with other necessary TCCR information, such as meeting minutes, etc. She expressed that in the coming months the department will be distributing more information regarding college and career readiness to students, parents and guidance counselors. She also mentioned an upcoming conference in April that is geared towards guidance counselors. MDHE will most likely be presenting college and career readiness information at this conference.

Rita mentioned that it would be helpful to add a link to the college and career readiness page from the initiatives link on the main MDHE website. Jennifer agreed, and will make those changes as soon as possible.

### **3b. Missouri Mathematics Pathways Taskforce (MMPT)**

The MMPT met on January 22 in Jefferson City. Rusty mentioned that the taskforce is making good progress where this initiative is concerned. As Rusty mentioned at the November meeting, the real challenge moving forward will be the University of Missouri and their algebra requirement (university wide). In order for MU to be a full participant, they will need to do a certain amount of reorganization, and this will require some campus dialogue. Rusty has reached out to the new Provost at MU, and he is encouraged as she has been part of this type of initiative at University of Georgia.

Rusty discussed the 4 subgroups of the MMPT and what they are currently working on. These four subgroups are: Math courses subgroup, policy obstacles subgroup, communications and outreach subgroup, and alignment subgroup. All of these groups have various tasks that they are working to complete, and by May we should have a better understanding of all of the alternative courses that are being offered at institutions across the state. We will also hopefully have a better understanding of how these courses align with other majors and programs of study.

Sharon wondered whether it was an image problem with the alternative course, such that the image of offering a different math course other than algebra presents a problem. Rusty mentioned that he did not

feel it was as much of an image problem, but rather that MU has simply had the college algebra requirement for quite some time.

Rusty mentioned that this initiative is not only concerned with better alignment of math courses to students' programs of study, but also to improve mathematics at institutions in the state and students' mathematical literacy. We need to better understand the pedagogy; how do these math courses help students? Also, when looking at teacher preparation - these students *need* to understand mathematics, especially when they are responsible for these students in elementary and secondary education. It is disheartening to see the amount of people with very weak mathematics skills in our secondary schools, and we definitely need to work to change that.

At some point in the near future, should we focus on working with DESE's math people? Or some math individuals in the secondary schools? Common core has a different sort of sequence of mathematics through high school, and they also have a different pathway that is more traditional. The state tried integrated math, the objectives were the same, but it never really took off. We should probably be engaging high schools more in these conversations.

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

##### **4a. Placement Guidelines & Threshold Scores**

Rusty guided the taskforce in looking over the placement guidelines document that he drafted. He asked the taskforce to look over this document once more before he sends it out to CAOs across the state for comment and input. Melody mentioned that we should take out the reference to AEL, and just refer to developmental education. The taskforce was in agreement with this, and so we will eliminate the reference to AEL. Melody also mentioned that the ASSET exam scores identified in the placement scores table may be incorrect, and we may need to change these scores. While not many institutions use ASSET, the ASSET exam is given in high schools where they cannot set up COMPASS exams. Rusty might further clarify that these are popular assessments, but not an exhaustive list. MU uses ALEKS, Lincoln or Southern has their own assessment so this is definitely not an exhaustive list.

Regarding the flow chart that was created, Chris Breitmeyer asked if multiple measures could be listed in the first box? Someone on his campus had a question about this, and he expressed to them that this was OK. Rusty agreed and mentioned that there is no problem in using multiple measures for a student from the initial point of contact.

Several taskforce members expressed that a "FAQ" sheet would be extremely helpful, especially regarding the placement process. One question that is frequently asked at institutions is listed below:

##### **FAQ:**

1. If a student has a 22 – do they go straight into the gateway course? That college should not say, "You are going to take the math assessment at our institution and then be placed into the appropriate course." Rusty mentioned that if the student is under the 22, then the institution would look at the additional measures to see if that student should in fact be placed into the credit-bearing course. Some institutions, however, are looking at the 22 in combination with other measures (e.g., GPA, EOC exams) and are deciding that the student should not go into the credit-

bearing course. The TCCR along with the MDHE must send a consistent message on this matter and other matters that have come up on various campuses across the state.

Several taskforce members also mentioned that it would be helpful to also have a webinar to discuss the placement process. *Rusty mentioned that he and Jennifer would work on setting something like this up in the next several weeks. Rusty also mentioned that he will send out the placement guidelines document to CAOs and will ask them to distribute the document to people on their campuses. Then we'll go from there with the webinar, etc.*

With regard to threshold scores, we have to have some data in which to make an informed decision regarding threshold scores. Jeremy Kintzel at the department is working on some data analysis regarding this issue. We really need good, solid data in order to set a bottom line. Threshold has gone a bit quiet on the NADE side as well – *Melody wants to get some more information at a NADE conference in February or March. She will report back to TCCR after this with more info.*

#### **4b. Remedial Education in the high school**

We need to better align and forge better relationships with K-12 so as to alleviate the remedial education needs of students. Colorado is doing this type of work, Tennessee has their SAILS program, and also some institutions in Florida are providing dual enrollment remedial courses in the high school. Smarter Balanced would have been able to tell those students who are in need of remediation. Melody thinks it would be great to get to those students in their senior year. The question will be: who is going to pay for the course software for these students? Institutions would love to be able to offer these types of courses/models in the high schools, but often there is no funding for this type of thing. We need the legislature to provide some kind of funding for these types of models, much like Tennessee and Colorado.

The ACT does not target students' weaknesses, and Smarter Balanced would have given us more information, but we have to work with what we have. Community colleges would be able to do it well, and we could start by piloting something in community colleges for a year or two. We can then see which models are successful, etc. It would be helpful, though, to have some funding for this. Rusty asked taskforce members how much money they felt it would take to successfully pilot something like this for say, two semesters? Melody mentioned that ALKES and HAWKES compete, and that mymathlab is often higher. Hawkes is usually \$70 per student, but the license is good for 9 months.

Any high school math teacher would be qualified for the college instructor to partner with. This would be much more like a dual enrollment model. Institutions would need to articulate the placement, not the course, since it is a developmental education course.

Most developmental education courses are using software these days. These online courses are mastery based, so it is simply someone there to proctor the students. This time next year, if we were to pilot something starting FALL 2015, we would then know by spring 2016 how these students did. If we base their placement on the ACT, then what is the test they take for the outcome? When they start in the fall, they do a pre-course assessment, and then after they take the course, they do a post-exam. We could use the ACT for pre and post (\$100 per student – if we do it as part of a pilot, then maybe ACT would give us a reduced cost, and even the software might be able to do a reduced cost, too). DESE has those summative tests available if we need pre and post tests. One advantage to using ALEKS is that MU uses

it, and Western also uses it. Why haven't high schools started using more of these online course models? It is mostly about money, most schools cannot afford it. A lot of times the students are paying the fee, but at the high school the district would have to pay for all the students. You aren't going to get a high school student to pay for that. Would \$25,000 per institution work as a pilot? The TCCR agreed. Name for this type of project: Transitional Math? Some kind of clever name will be needed.

We will focus on mathematics for now. *Rusty will share a note with all CAOs regarding what the taskforce has proposed regarding a pilot project.*

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

Rusty expressed that if we are going to have policy guidelines then we need to have some system where we then collect data on these various guidelines.

Some things that we may want to know include: How many enrolled in dev ed, what % passed, of that % who went on to enroll in a gateway course (what happened to that group?) Those that passed that gateway course...C or better and D or better, then of those students who complete the dev ed sequence, how many go on to graduate or earn their certificate?

Legislature is interested in how many students are enrolling in developmental education. Institutions already report students in grades in college algebra by ACT. What do we already have, and is that enough to get at the purposes of the policy. We need to collect basic data for developmental education courses, but we also need to rope in co-requisite model.

Institutions should also submit their placement guidelines to the MDHE so that we can assess their placement policies. To do this, *we need to develop a common reporting template.*

#### **4d. Next Steps**

Jeremy has been having webinars on EMSAS, but the independent institutions do not have the best understanding of EMSAS. *It would be helpful if we could have more of a data summit of sorts to really assist independent institutions in understanding EMSAS better.*

Rusty would like to turn this taskforce into more of a standing committee. We also need to start exploring other college and career readiness issues. For example, we need to begin looking more into the issue of high schools partnering with and promoting career tracks. None of these programs are meant to be instead of a high school diploma, but just to get them out there and seeing what all career options there are and hopefully getting them to do better in their high school curriculum.

This taskforce could consider how to share information about the differences of colleges/universities – how do we explain this to those types of dual credit students for example. How can we discern between and among types of institutions and career pathways?

Sharon mentioned legislation filed by Romine regarding CTE programs– regular diploma and then a CTE diploma. No one Sharon knows of is in favor of this legislation. It's more important for students to get their requirements out of the way and then have something in addition for CTE. DESE wrote something different and provided it to Romine. Community colleges weren't initially included in determining what

career really meant. It is NOT a separate diploma, but more like a CTE stamp or endorsement. CAPS model vs. WORKKEYS - CAPS model seems to be better- DED is in favor of WORKKEYS, however.

Want to know more about Missouri connections – *Sharon mentioned that she could provide an overview of the site at the February meeting.*

### **5. Announcements**

The Taskforce will meet again on Friday, April 17 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the MACC campus in Columbia, MO.

### **6. Adjournment**

DRAFT