CAI SC Attendees: Andrew LaManque, Arleen Elseroad, Jeff Burdick, Kitty Moriwaki, Alicia Munoz, Erik Cooper, Stephen Fletcher, Patricia Banday, Tim Calhoon, Jennifer Coleman, Ken Sorey, Gary Bird, Caroline Durdella, Debra Sheldon, Sonya Christian, and Amy Beadle.

Opening:
Andrew called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and Amy took roll.

Amy Beadle is the new CAI project manager; handling arrangements and logistics for meetings, getting paperwork through the business office and various items like that.

The main purpose for the meeting today is to review the criteria for selection of pilot colleges and evaluate whether or not all necessary elements have been taken into consideration. Andrew noted that the intent was to focus on the criteria, rather than on why particular colleges were or were not included.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Pilot Colleges:
In general terms, the pilot colleges will be asked to give feedback on what is ultimately designed by the workgroups for the content and rolled out to the vendors.

The specific roles and expectations that pilot colleges will be asked to commit to are:
• Commit to working with coalition partners to implement the common assessment pilot test.
• Identify key leadership who will work with those partners on implementation and feedback.
• Commit to pilot the use of an assessment system that utilizes multiple measures of placement for incoming students.
• Assist in the selection or development of processes, tools, and applications required to support the CAI.
• Attend professional development activities for faculty related to the CAI.
• Identify roadblocks and solutions to issues that could prevent a seamless user experience for faculty, staff, and students as they navigate the common assessment.
• Commit to providing faculty and staff to participate on workgroups, along with the participation in meetings that go along with those workgroups.

Jennifer noted that there are many different understandings of "pilot" and it is important to understand the depth of the roles that will be played by the pilot colleges for the Common Assessment. One element is piloting actual test content and the interface for students in taking the test that is created by the workgroups through the RFI and RFP process. In addition there are a couple of different pieces from the vendors in regards to software. The pilot will include assessment components from a student services standpoint, but will also include IT departments and their expertise in letting the platform work with their SIS, so that it is a seamless activity for students to participate in. Therefore, piloting will include a couple of components depending upon roles within the college. Because the goal is to develop a neutral platform, there could be up to four different types of software that might need to be integrated into the existing college system: there might be one vendor for English, one for math, one for ESL and a fourth for the platform itself. Therefore, there will be a fair amount of work in piloting the software itself and the platform that is chosen. In addition, there will be all of the activity around implementing a new assessment test. Work must be done within the Chancellor’s Office standards for validity testing, feedback on test content, and reliability; and additionally, feedback on the student experience. Multiple components will be happening at the same time, and some will repeat depending upon feedback and necessity. Given all of the multiple component pieces of the pilot, it is essential to have a manageable number of pilots. Experience has shown that with this many components 8-10 pilot
colleges would be manageable with the technology resources available statewide. There is some flexibility built in, but those are the components that pilot colleges are being asked to participate in.

The workgroup membership will have pilot college participation, subject matter experts, representatives from research and assessment, and input from psychometric experts as well. The bulk of the work that the pilot colleges will do comes further later in the process, but it is a significant amount of work.

Kitty mentioned that during piloting or field testing, in determining predictability, an outcome measure will be needed as well. After bad items are weeded out and good ones are kept, it will be important to check some kind of indicator of student performance; perhaps faculty ratings of students’ likelihood to succeed in a class, and maybe final grades. What is created will need to align with classroom outcomes. It will be possible to pull some of that data from the data warehouse.

Debbie asked if pilot colleges would be piloting one test or would be expected to pilot all three. The Chancellor’s Office standards require a certain number of colleges in order to get initial approval status. Some pilot applicants were more interested in one test or another; however, Tim felt strongly that it would be important to have the pilot colleges pilot all three of the tests, otherwise it would add in another layer of complexity to an already complicated process. The colleges should be notified that they should be willing to pilot all three tests, or we will have to ask another college to participate in their place.

Kitty explained that it will be important to find out about ESL population at each school in the pilot; some may have small ESL populations, which would mean additional ESL testing might be needed. Additionally, she noted that it will be important for pilot colleges to understand that they will need to have a group of students pilot the new tests, perhaps in a small window during 4-6 weeks at the beginning of a class, so that they can simulate new student results; it seldom works to have new students take two tests. If new students pilot the new test, they would still need to take the old test for placement. Patty noted that with their current SSSP process, they are envisioning the possibility of having new students take the old English and math test on one day, and then provide some sort of incentive for them to return and pilot the new assessments. They may be able to have that happen before enrollment in their courses. How long it takes for a student to take the English and math test is important, so they should be given together. Committee members agreed, but also emphasized that the old test and new test should be given in separate sittings. Patty thought that they could recruit students for the return visit for pilot testing while they were at their first testing session. The scheduling would be challenging, but she thinks that it can be done.

Kitty explained that measuring item quality and sub test quality as a data collection activity is an iterative process of testing, analysis, revision and retesting that will happen multiple times. It is a lengthy process to come up with a valid, quality product. Andrew noted that the pilot colleges will be investing a significant amount of time and need to have the capacity to deliver on that effort. Colleges will need to be informed of the full details and level of commitment that will be required, perhaps when the letter from the President and approval of Academic Senate is requested.

Having input from psychometric experts early on in the process would be important, both to inform the committee and the project team about some of the layers of detail involved in getting through the Chancellor’s Office standard process. Ken noted that the project team will be meeting with some psychometric consultants next week and would start asking some of those important questions.

How can the project determine how large an ESL population a school has and what the pilot would need in terms of diversity and number of colleges, sample sizes and so on? MIS data
might have some of that information, which CalPASS has already. Kitty noted that the colleges with the largest ESL populations are San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Ana.

Committee members discussed CB21 courses both credit and non-credit as possible indicators of ESL populations. However, course enrollment does not necessarily reflect the size of the ESL population, because there can be native English speakers who are non-literate. There are courses that are coded by TOPS code for ESL specifically. San Diego CCD has the largest non-credit population and they use CASAS for testing. Possibly looking at other schools that use CASAS might be a way to find large ESL population schools. Assessment testing that has been done for non-credit courses at the lower levels tends to be more visual and focused on vocabulary and life skills.

Stephen asked whether the committee should look at differentiating between ESL populations by ethnicity, and Kitty confirmed that would be very important. San Diego serves a large Latino population, City College of San Francisco serves a large Asian population, some of the Central Valley areas serve large populations, while Sacramento has a large Ukrainian population.

**Selection Criteria:**
Ken explained that the group reviewed 37 applications and did not evaluate on the quality of the application (not “better application,” “less thoughtful response,” etc.) instead, they looked at whether or not all of the elements were included. They weeded out applications with no Academic Senate sign-off, but there were a few of those that they went back to because they received AS approval slightly later, so they updated them.

They looked for: demographic diversity, diversity of SIS to cover the major ones, diversity of current placement test (Compass, Accuplacer, homegrown, and at least one from C6), and some from within the project partnership because they have an interest in the success of the project.

During the second wave they looked at: geographic diversity (urban, rural, northern, southern, etc.); Los Angeles, Bay Area and a few more in areas with higher population density; crossover with the multiple measures project; and enrollment size (large, medium and smaller).

After these two sorts, they had 11 colleges that met and had a good spread on all of the diversity factors on the lists. That is how the preliminary list of colleges was generated. They will need to go back and look at ESL and try to finalize that element.

Kitty was concerned about City College of San Francisco and the role their accreditation sorrows might have played in the selection process. They did get an Academic Senate vote it was on the day that the submission was due. They will continue testing students no matter what occurs, and they will reapply for accreditation if that becomes necessary, they do not anticipate needing to halt the matriculation process. She will still participate in CAI, and will offer any kind of useful feedback that she can. She would like to offer to at least include City College data in piloting. They are used to pulling students out of classes and completing surveys and so on. Tim noted that City College was selected for the EPI pilot, and although accreditation was discussed, the committee decided that if it was an issue, it would be resolved early and would not interfere with the pilot, so they wanted to give City College a chance to participate in EPI.

Andrew asked about how to capture the enthusiasm of all 38 colleges that applied, even if they are not in the pilot. Kitty mentioned that when she conducted the field testing for the CCC ESL placement test project, she found that the colleges which volunteered were just thrilled to be part of a larger process; there is not usually much communication between departments and the state Chancellor’s Office. Colleges are excited to participate in the process, and those that commit to the time involvement and effort will follow through.

What needs to be added to the criteria regarding ESL or non-credit assessment or any other areas? Representation of linguistic/cultural diversity and diversity in the range of levels that the
different programs represent is important. Some colleges have an international ESL population, but with high intermediate, and advanced skill level ESL populations, but none at the low levels. The full range needs to be represented. Debbie felt that many areas seemed to be covered, but that she is not sure that the strategy for getting through the Chancellor’s Office approval process has been thought through thoroughly enough. The standards have three approval levels: provisional, probationary and full approval; the project team and committee need to make sure that they are informed about the number of colleges that are needed to provide evidence, and the different levels of evidence that are needed. Kitty thought that the Common Assessment might fall into the Critical Mass criteria, which uses 6 different colleges and 6 different districts spread throughout the state. There also needs to be a broad representation in terms of cultural and linguistic diversity, college size and so on. At a minimum level of approval the test will need to be evaluated for content validity, bias, and justification of cut score setting. She is not sure whether the current list has the necessary diversity for ESL, although she believes that it is probably fine for English, math, ethnic, gender, and age diversity. After preliminary approval, there must be enough data to determine disproportionate impact and cut score validity before final approval can be obtained.

The assessment workgroup and psychometric experts are ones that could be consulted regarding the standards and evaluating the level of pilot college diversity. Debbie noted that they have a contract with psychometric consultants which they might be able to add to if necessary.

Kitty thought it would be beneficial to the CAI SC to have a presentation at an in person meeting on the process of field testing and the approval process for the information of committee and project team members.

Tim was worried about the time involved to get the evaluation done so that the pilot colleges could be approved, and Andrew asked why they needed to be selected now, since they don’t actually have pilot work to complete until later. Tim explained that the content area workgroups and platform workgroup for the RFP are elements that will need pilot college input; they should be involved in the decision making so that they know what they are going to be piloting, and so that they can take ownership and help tell others about the process. Ken suggested that the project team use the preliminary list of pilot colleges to move ahead in looking at Critical Mass criteria and do due diligence; if it was determined that extra ESL college input was needed, those could be pulled in later to do additional testing on ESL items. Tim agreed that a two wave approach could work. Use the first colleges to develop and stand up functioning, and then add others in to validate the work that is done. Perhaps San Francisco City College and San Diego could be pulled into that second phase to help with ESL populations as well. Kitty noted that the committee still had 4 more years to complete the project, and Ken and Jennifer explained that the legislature will be expecting an assessment much sooner than that.

There was also some confusion about Sacramento City College and whether or not their application was in on time, apparently it was actually in on time, but it did not get included on the preliminary pilot list. It would be helpful to include it because of its unique population, in addition to the fact that they have a full implementation of PeopleSoft; which is not yet included in the pilot (LA CCD is just at the stage of moving to implementation). Stephen noted that when the project team contacts the colleges on the pilot list, some may not be willing or able to meet all of the requirements and may need to back out. Therefore, having 12 potential colleges might mean that it is possible to end up with 10 pilots and 2 alternates. Kitty emphasized the importance of getting good representation from the outset, because folks in the field will ask who was involved in the field testing, what kinds of students, and so on.

**Action Items:**
- Look at ESL populations at potential pilot schools (with input from Kitty, assessment and perhaps Mark Samuels) with respect to meeting the standard for Critical Mass.
- Provide full information to colleges regarding the requirements for pilot colleges.
Get confirmation letters back from college Presidents (presumably with approval from their Academic Senates and student services representatives).
Set up content area workgroups (which will be having their first meetings in July) with representatives from the potential pilot colleges, even if a few people from a school that ends up not being in the pilot are included, that is not really a problem. (Tim said that this is fine on the curricular area groups, but not on the technology/platform side.)

Kitty suggested that the team set up an in person presentation for the Steering Committee (from Burrows or someone else) to provide a clear definition of what is involved in field test piloting.

Ken and the team are in the process of cross walking Smarter Balanced with CB21 and other standards, and they will come back with recommendations for the workgroups. Additionally, the RFI is now officially out to vendors.

**Next Meeting:**
The next meeting will be in Sacramento on June 24th.

**Adjournment:**
The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.