

Presenter Talking Points: Postsecondary Session for ADP Leadership Meeting, September 10, 2009:

Allison Jones, California State University:

Key areas I will share in the opening:

1. Background: why did CSU develop the EAP
2. Collaboration with K-12: agreement on college readiness, CSU's alignment of its placement standards with K-12 frameworks in English and mathematics
3. Placement: what do we assess in English and math and why
4. 12th grade interventions, i.e., what can students do if they need additional work in English and mathematics
5. Professional development: how we help strengthen teachers' skill to teach English and mathematics in high school

Paolo DeMaria, Ohio Board of Regents:

1. Context in Ohio -- The Strategic Plan for Higher Education; recent education reform legislation
2. Development of common cutoff for remediation free admission.
3. Use of ACT/SAT as part of new high school graduation requirement
4. Development of end of course exams
5. High School performance assessment project -- Stanford Univ.
6. Involvement by higher education

Karen Nicodemus, Cochise College (AZ):

- Acknowledge good work of California and Ohio around what is a challenging initiative for a number of reasons (from my experience) –
 - Faculty and leaders who may see this as a topic of interest but not one that is outside higher education's priorities – some will see this as a K-12 issue
 - Higher education may be willing to come to the table for discussions but more to “tell” K-12 what is needed as contrasted to stepping back and thinking about what this effort means to all of us within higher education
 - Admissions versus placement
 - Place of CTE – both at K-12 and higher education (AAS and BAS degrees)
- In states that have been involved in ADP work, adoption of college-readiness standards work has led the effort. But, as we all know, adoption of standards, or course outlines at the higher education level, only describes what learning should be happening, not whether it is occurring – so we all know assessment is critical. A college readiness assessment or assessments, if higher education is fully engaged, should be the key connection/linkage (the “weld” that holds the connection between sectors) on the college-readiness pathway. For that weld to hold and the pathway to come alive -
 - college ready assessments, tied to standards work and, ideally anchored in a state's K-12 accountability system, must have meaning and implications for both

- sectors – K-12 and higher education (with higher education defined as 4- and 2-year degree granting institutions.)
- Ask ourselves difficult questions – how does higher education – both community colleges and 4-year degree granting institutions assess college readiness? How are we communicating, without telling, each other how we ensure students graduate high school college-ready. And, equally important, how do a student and his/her parents know if he is college-ready. And, if we say he or she is college-ready – what does that really mean when they come to higher education.
 - The timing of the assessment must make sense to both K-12 and higher education sectors. Ideally, it should drive policy and practice within both sectors including how we treat students who demonstrate college readiness while in high school and is there a role for higher education.
 - How do we motivate/provide incentive for higher education and K-12 folks, including faculty and teachers, to come together around college readiness – determining a meaningful college readiness assessment can be that vehicle.
 - Are we willing to look deep into ourselves to see if there are disconnects between our own existing policies and practices and how we define college readiness assessment for our K-12 partners and, including what a college-ready agenda may mean to our other student population – the adult learner.
- Reinforce role of higher education in college-readiness efforts with K-12 and urgency of agenda

Nevin Brown, Achieve:

Two questions I might ask both for your responses and to stimulate audience discussion:

- 1) What are the incentives that are needed or that can be used to make the issue of college-ready assessments one that is “owned” by higher education as well as by K-12? Are different incentives needed for such “ownership” by state-level higher education policymakers (SHEEOs, state systems), institutions, and/or departments/faculty members? What might such incentives look like? Do you have some incentives in place already?
- 2) Most of the audience members are working at the state higher education policy level, not at the local institutional level. How far can state higher education leaders move the college-ready assessment agenda on their own, and how can state-level leaders help motivate local leadership on the issue? Is it a matter of the “bully-pulpit”, incentives (see the first question), or other levers available to state leaders?