Common Assessment Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday August 12, 2014, Draft
Via CCC Confer Conference Call

Opening and Introductions:
Andrew Lamanque opened the meeting at 10:00 am and thanked all attendees for taking time to participate. Roll call was taken, finding the following members present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Patricia Banday</td>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>Assessment Workgroup (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elmer Bugg</td>
<td>Peralta College</td>
<td>CCCIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Burdick</td>
<td>State Center CCD</td>
<td>ASCCC (6): English-Basic Skills (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Andrew Campbell</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sonya Christian</td>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>CEO (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Erik Cooper</td>
<td>Sierra College</td>
<td>Assessment Directors (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Arleen Elseroad</td>
<td>Irvine Valley College</td>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Lisette Estrella-Henderson</td>
<td>Solano Co. Office of Ed.</td>
<td>K-12 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Stephen Fletcher</td>
<td>Foothill DeAnza</td>
<td>Assessment Directors (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Susanna Gunther</td>
<td>Solano Community College</td>
<td>ASCCC (6): Math-Basic Skills (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Louise Jaffe</td>
<td>Santa Monica College</td>
<td>Trustee(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hasun Khan</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Andrew LaManque</td>
<td>Foothill College</td>
<td>Research and Planning (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Daniel Martinez</td>
<td>College of the Desert</td>
<td>SSMPA (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mojdeh Medizadah</td>
<td>Contra Costa CCD</td>
<td>CISOA (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitty Moriwaki</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco</td>
<td>ASCCC (6): ESL-Noncredit (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Alicia Munoz</td>
<td>Grossmont Cuyamaca CCD</td>
<td>ASCCC (6): ESL (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margery Regalado</td>
<td>Cabrillo College</td>
<td>Student Services Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Victoria Rosario</td>
<td>Los Rios CCD</td>
<td>CSSO (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Craig Rutan</td>
<td>Santiago Canyon College</td>
<td>ASCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Steinkamp</td>
<td>San Joaquin Co. Office of Ed.</td>
<td>K-12 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Vasquez</td>
<td>Cerro Coso College</td>
<td>ASCCC (6): English (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beatrice Zamora-Aguilar</td>
<td>Southwestern College</td>
<td>SSPAC Liaison (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the following non-voting members were present on the call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Caryn Albrecht</td>
<td>Butte College</td>
<td>CAI Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Amanda Avallone</td>
<td>CalPass Plus</td>
<td>CAI Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Amy Beadle</td>
<td>Butte College</td>
<td>CAI Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Gary Bird</td>
<td>CCCCO</td>
<td>CCCCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darla Cooper (RP Group), Tim Nguyen (RP Group) and Becky Roberts (English Workgroup) joined the call as guests.

**Minutes:**
The minutes will be presented at the next meeting for comments and feedback.

**Workgroup Updates:**
Amanda explained that the workgroups have been working on defining the content of the common assessment test and not prescribing a particular curriculum, pedagogy or cut score. They are working with extraordinary diligence to develop descriptions of specific academic knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student should have as a prerequisite for college-level coursework, which can be evaluated using a test. The outcomes from the workgroups will later be reviewed by additional faculty, discipline-based groups, and the CAI Steering Committee.

The work is grounded in the CB21 rubrics and the CCC ESL Test Specifications, but more detailed competency descriptors need to be established to guide the development of testable items. Common Core standards, as well as standards that were developed and validated for noncredit and Adult Ed ESL are being used as a starting place.

**English Workgroup**
Becky provided an overview of the work done by the English workgroup including mechanics and grammar, sentences and vocabulary, and various writing assignments. Further revision is needed in several areas. They are working from four levels below to stack the skills and they are also using the common core, however it only works for one level below. It is a complicated process of pulling through skills that sometimes show up, for example, in third grade, but are refined over the years, although not listed in other grades. One challenge for the workgroup has been that nobody in the group teaches down to four levels below, most of the members have a level that doesn’t have a floor. Another challenge is the lack of alignment between CB21 and common core; which means that the workgroup has to come up with discrete skills for items that are not specified. The workgroup members were wondering if they will have a role in actually choosing the test because
not everything that they have discussed has ended up being captured in the skill descriptors and competencies. Andrew LaManque emphasized the importance of trying to capture those concerns in some way in the work product. Becky and Lisette both noted their appreciation for the hard work of all of the members of the workgroup in persisting to work through the challenges.

A committee member expressed concern about human versus artificial intelligence grading of writing samples. Becky agreed that some elements can only be assessed through a writing sample, but sometimes it seems that computer grading can be gamed. Amanda noted that some of those issues may be able to be addressed as the work moves from the competencies into the blueprint.

**Math Workgroup**

Patricia praised the efforts of the math workgroup with its broad representation of County Office of Education and math faculty working well together with lots of interaction and negotiation were needed. She also found the representation of assessment expertise of student services people on the committee helpful, and thanked Kathy, Amanda and Amy for bringing the group together and providing the background information for their work process. The workgroup was diligent and meticulous in their efforts. They worked through the graph category at their first meeting and at the second meeting worked on defining and manipulating down to three levels below. They also worked on solving competencies to two levels below. The workgroup is concerned about policy issues regarding the length of the test and whether it should assess higher levels of skills. They are working quickly and at the next meeting they will continue their work on applications.

Kitty expressed concern about whether the workgroup would have time to develop test competencies up to Calculus, especially since existing assessments, for example, allow for placement into those higher levels. Amanda confirmed that at a previous meeting the Steering Committee expressed general support for going on to higher level math content. The workgroup is moving quickly, so they may get to it within the four scheduled meetings, or an additional meeting may be scheduled, if needed.

**ESL Workgroup**

Kitty noted that the ESL workgroup has been working on synthesizing the CB21 rubrics (which are fairly broad) and the CCC ESL Test Specifications (which are very specific). Both documents rely on excellent resources, CA Pathways for ESL and Adult Education standards. The workgroup is developing competencies in reading, writing, grammar, and listening comprehension at each of eight levels below freshman level composition classes. They are trying to represent both credit and noncredit curriculum in their work which means dealing with the overlap between the two; noncredit tends to be more oriented toward life skills, while credit is oriented toward academic ones.

A member asked about whether the workgroup had thought about some sort of process to brand students into ESL versus English, for example for International students with high level grammar skills, and perhaps having some preliminary questions to help guide that process. Kitty noted that the issue came up when CCCAssess started work several years ago, but ultimately the choice is up to the student; you cannot route them a particular direction, but you can make a clear recommendation. Ken felt that the multiple measures workgroup will ultimately be able to help with
some of those issues. The multiple measures workgroup will be meeting September 12 to review the summary of research on multiple measures; they will synthesize the information and bring it back to the Steering Committee.

**Formation of an Assessment Workgroup:**

Concerns about the Chancellor’s Office assessment approval process has led to a suggestion of the creation of an assessment workgroup. It would be formed of 4-5 CCCCO Assessment Work Group members to provide input on the test development and validation process. This workgroup will provide information to the Steering Committee and help to inform the RFP process with respect to the current and future approval process. There will be a psychometric expert in that group.

*Motion to approve the adoption of the Assessment Workgroup composition as displayed on the powerpoint shown at today’s call:*

Moved: Susanna Gunther  
Seconded: Stephen Fletcher  
Vote: Unanimous  
Abstained: None

The project team will bring back a list of members (names, college, positions / representation) at the next meeting for Action by the Steering Committee.

**RFI Full Report Review:**

Shana provided an overview of the RFI Report and asked the members to consider some issues that will be discussed further at the next meeting. The full 30 page RFI Report is available on Basecamp; if members have any questions or need clarifications, please contact Shana.

The RFI was for information from vendors about what is going on in the marketplace, with regard to whether or not what the project is asking for is reasonable with respect to test curricular content, assessment administration, and the test platform development. The responses indicated that all of the desired features were feasible and available.

There were a number of innovations that were mentioned by vendors:

- the possibility of using pre-registration as a tool to create individual test starting spots (using academic history to hone in on possible skill level)
- pre-tests that direct students to tutorials prior to assessments (that could familiarize students with the test format)
- whiteboards (that could allow students to show their work and could be saved for reference by the local school to help with the most appropriate placement for borderline students)
- proctoring (using webcams, and freezing screens so that students can’t navigate away during the test)
- machine scoring for essays (with increased accuracy and the ability to identify nonsense responses)
- new technology in terms of adaptive testing, innovations with branching or testlets
- potential for tutorials in the middle of the test
Susanna and Kitty expressed concern about tutorials during the test, since placement tests are supposed to be a snapshot of what the student already knows at a moment in time. Louise noted that it might be helpful to accurately elicit what a student actually does know. Patricia also expressed the importance of faculty input and expertise from the field in developing a great test instrument that is better than what currently exists.

There are some potential barrier issues that came up with respect to the vendor responses. None of the respondents offer all of the desired test modalities, assessment structures, and content delivery features and some of the features have significant timelines and cost implications; this means that it may be necessary to prioritize desired features. Additionally, the committee may need to look at whether the benefits associated with separating the platform development from the administration development will outweigh potential unintended consequences such as delays in the timeline, reduced functionality, and increased costs. There may be issues that come up as vendors are pushed into working with each other with respect to compatibility of the technologies of the individual vendors.

Some areas for discussion:

- **Scope of test** – Does the assessment test full scope or does a portion of the test (high or low) become a local school option or multiple measure testlet?
- **Will direct placement without the academic content assessment take place?** Will the use of a pre-test or pre-registration with Multiple Measures be a form of assessment to exempt full testing and offer an immediate placement option? (Policy Question)
- **Constituency groups’ priorities for test components will differ widely; how will those challenges be addressed?**
- **Developing content** (rather than using existing content) will significantly increase time for test implementation, as developing content is a multi-step process

**The project team will summarize the issues relating to framing the RFP in more detail for Action at the next Steering Committee meeting.**

There were 10 vendors who responded to the RFI, representing 14 different groups. Jennifer reminded the committee that the RFI information can be shared with stakeholders in order to get feedback, but it is not posted on the project website as a publically accessible document.

**RFP Process:**
Jennifer provided a complete overview of the RFP process. The RFP is a proposal which eventually becomes a contract. The subject-area workgroups are informing the content which is a critical component. Additionally, the platform workgroup and the new assessment workgroup will provide information that will be incorporated into the RFP template from Butte that is compliance and contract driven. All of the information is important and needs to be pulled together into a single voice representing the desired outcome of the RFP.

When the RFPs are submitted they will be scored in the areas of:

- general qualifications and experience,
- technical experience, and
- cost benefit (which must be greater than 30% of the score).
RFP 365 is software that will both facilitate vendor input of information and creation of scoring reports for the selection committee. Bill Curry, the ethics consultant, is helping to make sure that everything is in line with regard to scoring and ethical considerations.

The project team is suggesting formation of an RFP Selection Committee made up of 19 votes total, but representing a much larger group of individuals providing input from the pilot colleges, the Steering Committee and the CAI SC workgroups, which will finalize the RFP content and provide the final recommendation to Butte. There is overlap between the suggested members for the RFP Selection Committee, and Amy will look at the Steering Committee list to see how individual members overlap with workgroups and pilot colleges. The suggestion is for 12 votes to represent the pilot colleges (one vote per college, but with input from faculty, IT and assessment people at each college), 1 vote from each of the five workgroups (with input from the workgroups), and 2 votes representing the Steering Committee.

Susanna was concerned that if every college chose to have their IT person represent them on the committee, the Selection committee might not be very representative, and Jennifer clarified that the larger group providing input will probably be closer in size to 60, but that there would be 19 voting members representing particular roles: pilot college, workgroup, and Steering Committee. There would be many opportunities for members to go back to the colleges, workgroups, and constituents for feedback. There would only be a few periods of time which would be closed due to confidentiality during the RFP scoring process.

Concern was expressed that the pilot college representation does not include San Diego or San Francisco, and if they did not have members in the workgroups there should be input from those larger colleges in the process. Jennifer explained that there will be opportunities for system-wide input using a tool called IdeaScale.

Motion to approve the adoption of the RFP Selection Committee composition as displayed on the PowerPoint shown at today’s call:

Moved: Kitty Moriwaki
Seconded: Susanna Gunther
Vote: Unanimous
Abstained: None

The project team will bring back a list of members (names, college, positions and representation) at the next meeting for action by the Steering Committee.

RFP Timeline and Input:
Jennifer explained that the workgroups are leading the RFP timeline with more time built in now for input from the field into the assessment standards. The RFP will go out in late fall, with vendor selection in early spring and piloting in fall 2015. The Butte timeline has an official number of dates for each step in the RFP process including disability accommodations, pre-proposal conference, deadline for notice of intent to respond, etc. The vendors must meet the deadline on notice of intent to respond, or they cannot participate further in the RFP process.
There are certain steps within the process during which confidentiality and non-disclosure is maintained, however there are many opportunities for obtaining feedback along the way. One of the new tools that will be used for feedback is IdeaScale, which will allow feedback from the system on different components of the RFP including thumbs up, thumbs down, and comments. Invitations to IdeaScale will be sent out, including targeting those colleges that applied and were not selected for the pilot and the larger districts as well. The project team is encouraging workgroup and Steering Committee members to get feedback and start conversations with constituent groups. Please watch for IdeaScale invitations and pass them on to others as well.

The non-disclosure forms are important during the confidential points in the RFP selection process, and they will be going out as soon as they are available. The project teams are working to make sure that the same format is usable by all three grants. In the meantime, committee members are asked not to have any discussions with vendors about what we are looking for.

Stephen asked about Board of Governors input into the process. Jennifer noted that there are places in the process where their input is spelled out. She will get back to the group on the specifics.

Bonnie and Tim will make sure that there is an exit strategy built into the process, so that vendor lock does not become a problem; we do not want to get stuck with a bad vendor. Additionally, as mentioned earlier there may be concerns about how vendors working together might affect the timeline.

Scoring will include an initial round to make sure that vendors have met the minimum qualifications. That will be followed by multiple days when the Selection Committee will be sort of sequestered while scoring sections in small groups, reporting out, compiling results, and requesting vendor presentations. Afterward there will be a final selection and recommendation made back to Butte.

If members receive questions from vendors, the vendors should be referred back to the project team. Members are encouraged NOT to answer vendor questions; instead questions are compiled so that all vendors receive answers at the same time and in the same manner.

Kitty asked about participation of the larger urban colleges and when they would be notified. She also noted that placement testing calendars that feed into fall 2015 could be occurring as early as March 2015. Ken responded that it will be more likely in the early fall of 2015 rather than late spring.

Wrap up and General Information:
Members are encouraged to provide input to Andrew LaManque and the project team about rumors and concerns from the field that can be addressed and used to update the FAQ document posted on Basecamp and at the website.

Amy is keeping the schedule for workgroup meetings updated in Basecamp and Shana can answer any other questions regarding workgroups. Jennifer and Amy can answer general questions and those related to the Steering Committee.
Andrew LaManque requested that concerns or suggestions for agenda items be sent forward by committee members.

**Next Meeting:**
The next meeting will be in Orange County on September 29, 2014.

**Adjournment:**
The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 pm.