Common Assessment Initiative Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, June 24, 2014
Courtyard Marriot, Natomas

Opening and Introductions:
Andrew opened the meeting at 10:00 am and welcomed all attendees. Each person introduced themselves and identified the constituent group they were representing. The following voting members were 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>X</td>
<td>Elmer Bugg</td>
<td>Peralta College</td>
<td>CCCCIO</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></td>
<td>Andrew Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sonya Christian</td>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>CEO (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></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></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></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></td>
<td>Mojdeh Medizadah</td>
<td>Contra Costa CCD</td>
<td>CISOA (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td>Margery Regalado</td>
<td>Cabrillo College</td>
<td>Student Services Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 staff members were present:

<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>
The following guests were present as well: Julie Adams (Academic Senate), Kathy Booth (West Ed), Darla Cooper (RP Group), Bill Curry (Ethics Consultant), Carole Gallagher (West Ed) and David Morse (Academic Senate).

Minutes:
There were no corrections or changes to the minutes of May 13th or June 5th 2014.
Motion to approve the minutes:
Moved: Sonya Christian
Seconded: Patricia Banday
Vote: Unanimous
Abstained: None

Updates and Reports:
The twelve colleges that were selected for the pilot provide a good representation for the system. There will be opportunities for other colleges to help in the process especially in developing, refining, and testing elements. Now that the pilot colleges have been selected, the project team is filling out the workgroups that provide input for the assessment and platform components of the RFP. The Multiple Measures workgroup met recently and their recommendations will form the basis for the discussion by the full Steering Committee today.

Discipline area workgroups for English, Math, and ESL will have their first meetings in July. Most of the members for those workgroups have been notified but there are a few who are still being vetted by the Statewide Academic Senate, and those members will be notified when that process is completed. Ken and Jennifer will contact CCCCO to make an appointment for each workgroup. When the workgroup lists are finalized they will be publicized.

Ken was excited that there were more than 300 people who were interested in participating in the workgroups, and more than 75 faculty members will be on the subject area workgroups. The workgroups will start with knowledge gained using the Environmental Scan and leveraging work that has already been done in the state and the rest of the nation, including the extensive ESL work that has been done. Those
who were interested, but were not selected for participation on the workgroups, will be able to provide ongoing input to the project team. A license for IdeaScale is being obtained which will allow ideas, features, and elements that are being considered to be put out for input from the system. This will enable wider feedback beyond those who participate on the workgroups.

The RFI went out to vendors in early June and the results are due back at 5pm on Friday. There was a webinar to answer questions from the vendors. This RFI will inform the Steering Committee and workgroups about best practices and challenges as the project proceeds. The vendors are being asked to do things that they are not used to, especially with respect to potentially working with other vendors. This is important because with the neutral test platform and three different subject area tests, there could potentially be four different vendors working together. Thirty-five vendors were identified and the RFI was also posted on the CCCAssess website for use by others. Participation in the RFI is not a prerequisite for participation in the RFP process. The RFP will go out in the fall, and be due in December.

The pilot colleges will be engaged quickly to play a key role in the workgroups, particularly in the selection/development of the test platform. The intent is to start to have test items to pilot in mid to late spring of 2015. There will be extensive piloting and validation with the Chancellor’s Office leading to having a test ready by spring 2016. There will be a lot of activity involved and it will be a very well-defined process. There might be a need for additional workgroup meetings, but Ken noted that they are going to try to start with the schedule that has already been set out.

Jennifer will post a FAQ document on the website with answers to some of the questions that have come up surrounding the CAI. The desire is to provide clear, accurate answers to commonly asked questions and to clear up misconceptions about the project and the process. There is also a link to the legislation so that interested members of the system can see the actual verbiage.

The project team is working with the Chancellor’s Office on several elements that are known areas of concern. Since students cannot be placed based upon the common assessment during the pilot test phase, some students will need to test twice. Various options are being investigated. Additionally the project team is looking at the threshold requirements for the Critical Mass Approval process.

**Ethical Considerations:**

Tim explained that because the bidding process is very high stakes, it is not out of the realm of possibility that a vendor might approach a committee member with a bribe. Bill Curry has been hired by Butte College as a consultant to provide information regarding ethical behavior in the RFI/RFP process and the dangers of communicating inappropriately with vendors. The presentation provided critical background information before the committee moves into the high stakes process in the fall.

Bill worked on many government contracts in the Air Force where he had experiences working with government procurement. He shared both personal experiences and ethics investigations that were newsworthy. He outlined specific rules and consequences and also discussed commonsense guidelines to follow to avoid any question of unethical behavior. He suggested that groups: establish ethics guidelines, develop a contracting code of ethics, post contracting code of ethics on the website, advise contractors of ethics rules in the RFI/RFP itself, train new members on the code of ethics, and that individuals should seriously consider adopting their own zero tolerance rules.
A question came up regarding whether members will have a conflict of interest if their college has a contract with a particular vendor. Tim explained that although this might bias a member for or against a particular vendor, in itself that is not an ethical problem. Butte has retained Bill to review the process so that it is as clear as possible and the project will be able to defend the process that is followed, including sharing the scoring that will be used with the vendors as part of the RFP process.

**Interim Environmental Scan:**
Kathy Booth led a discussion of the key implications and recommendations that came out of the Multiple Measures workgroup in order to get feedback and look for areas of agreement and concern. The intent was to look for consensus on several big questions so that those areas of agreement can help to lead the process and progress of the workgroups beginning in July. Those groups will meet on a tight timeline for the next couple of months in order to get information for the RFP to be released in October.

**Big questions to attempt to address today:**
- What do we mean by assessment? Is it just a test, or is it a bigger process which includes a test?
- What do we mean by multiple measures?
- How do you develop a test when there is no common definition of college readiness and standards that go along with it?
- How would you feel about developing common standards?

**Big questions that will need to be addressed at a later meeting:**
- How to exempt students from assessment?
- Which specific elements to include in multiple measures?
- How to do test prep, the test platform and how will the scores be communicated?
- What will be the content of the subject discipline standards?

**Overview of Multiple Measures Guiding Principles:**
The multiple measures workgroup defined assessment as "an evidence-based, multiple measures system, with a test as one component." One of the purposes of assessment might be to provide diagnostic information regarding students’ mastery of essential prerequisite knowledge, skills, and abilities for college success. Kathy reported that colleges could then locally relate this diagnostic information to their curricular offerings as well as support services.

Kathy noted that language of the grant is about common assessment and NOT on common placement. The ultimate goal is to give colleges information they need to make local placement decisions. These multiple measures would provide a universe of information to help the college better place and advise their students. After one meeting, the Multiple Measures workgroup recommended that there be a statewide formula that is based on research that colleges could choose to use or not.

The workgroup also looked at the blueprint for C6 and the CB21 rubric. Because it isn't possible to include all of the curricular elements in the test, it would make sense to try to construct standards that look at the skills, knowledge, and abilities that students need to be successful in the community college system. Some work has been done on a crosswalk, but it is still at a really high level, so the discipline workgroups will need to focus on key concepts and skills that students need to know in English, Math, and ESL. At the end
of the environmental scan is a simplified version of a crosswalk of key concepts for English and Math developed from the Common Core that could be used to assist that effort.

Discussion ensued regarding:
• How developing standards is intertwined with the content of the curriculum.
• How CB21 could be used in developing standards since it is not a curriculum.
• How some states have aligned their standards to the Common Core.
• How to pull together an assessment and placement so that a college will have the information they need in order to fit the student into the existing curriculum.
• The potential of creating a multi-stage assessment process including establishing measures that would exempt students from assessment.
• Concerns that use of CB21 to develop “bands” of assessment would lead a state system of placement into a diversified curriculum as well as potentially be used by vendors to limit the testing scope.
• The importance of having a diagnostic test that would include discipline area skills as well as assessment of non-cognitive skills.
• Determining how low to go with the tests based on feedback from the field.
• Making sure multiple measures are used at each stage of a multi-stage assessment process.
• Where CTE fits into the discussion of prerequisite skills and how we assess in a way that may provide information on program-specific English and Math skills.
• Concern about the appearance of trying to develop a common curriculum versus setting common standards on the prerequisite skills to move up to the next level. Tim emphasized that the goal is to develop a process which would allow a college to determine placement from the results, and one in which the test results would be the same regardless of where the student took the test. What the college does with the results is a local decision. Ken agreed and explained that the workgroups will be developing “assessment standards” to be used to write the items for the test, they are not developing or requiring common curriculum.

On the question: What should assessment mean? The committee agreed unanimously that assessment is more than a test. They also felt strongly that a diagnostic component was important.

Discussion ensued regarding:
• Concern that if the test was multi-phase, the initial phase should not keep a student from getting accurate and complete diagnostic information.
• Clarification of how the colleges’ matriculation funding is tied into the new process. Kathy explained the only thing that the law requires is that if you use a test, you must use the common test in order to get matriculation funding. It does not require a particular set of multiple measures, but use of some multiple measures must be included in the assessment process.
• The fact that this process will provide a larger universe of information to colleges to use making their local placement decisions.
• As the process moves forward, having more descriptive definitions of diagnostic, assessment, non-cognitive, and so on, would be very helpful.

What will be involved in the multiple measures process? The assessment system would prioritize flexibility to support local processes while at the same time supporting portability. Anything that is developed must be grounded in data and what research indicates is most predictive of success.
Discussion ensued regarding:

- The possibility of a machine learning prediction model that would be provided to all colleges, tailored by discipline and student group and based on evidence (it would change over time based upon new research and data). The use of this multiple measures model would be optional, colleges could use this for their multiple measures placement, or they could use their own combination of elements based upon research, evidence and validation.

- The timeline of availability of such a predictive model. Ken noted that research design and testing has already begun working to validate some of these pieces using the STEPS project and the assessment project. The system would allow for non-prescriptive but informative and validated information. “Other students like Johnny have benefitted from...” or “Students like Johnny tend to be more successful in this course rather than the other course.”

The committee seemed to support the idea of creating a multiple measures process that is weighted based upon what is most predictive of success. However, some voiced the need for the Chancellor’s Office to provide technical support to colleges that want to use a different set or combination of multiple measures. In addition it was noted that we should track whether the importance of the test ends up being minimized in a future the multiple measures model. Tim and Bonnie noted that there might be funding in the future that would allow the Chancellor’s Office to assist colleges with grant work on different combinations of multiple measures.

The committee generally agreed with the idea that there are some elements that would act as an alternative form of assessment, or that may waive the need for a student to take the test. (It is important not to say “exempt” when that is not meant, as it affects whether a student is eligible for priority registration and whether he or she is fully matriculated according to SSSP.) What those elements might be was not discussed, and might be appropriately discussed by the discipline workgroups. David Morse felt that to the degree that it was permissive would be fine, but that if it was prescriptive, it would need to be addressed by the Academic Senate.

Kathy summarized that she thought the goal is to have an integrated multiple measures model where all the data available to us will be used to develop some sort of methodology to recommend where students might be most successful that will include test data, but also other data, and this information will be given to the college in diagnostic fashion that will allow them to decide where to place that student within their own local curriculum. The college would make the placement and could pass that information on to the student (perhaps in a report of some kind). Kathy noted that such a system would open the possibility for conversation in the future about whether or not colleges want common cut scores and further portability of information, but that is not the intent right now.

The work that is developed by the workgroups will be used for the RFP. The Academic Senate has plans to work on developing CID’s for pre-collegiate courses in the fall. During their process they could provide feedback and suggestions to the workgroups and the project team, to make sure that the assessment standards for the tests developed with the vendors are vetted by and not out of alignment with the work of the Academic Senate.

Concerns were raised regarding the length of the test and whether or not it could be reasonably short, while still providing sufficient diagnostic depth, and Carole emphasized that with a robust item pool and a well done adaptive test, it is unnecessary to do a long test, or even multi-phase testing.
Kathy asked about the investigation of non-cognitive measures and how they might be used in the assessment process. Ken noted that these would be likely to end up as questions asked before students take the test and therefore would be a component of the platform rather than of the test itself, but they would need validation. There are currently 15 pilot colleges involved in the multiple measures pilot, and they are in the process of exploring some of those elements and will be able to provide more information for this project to build upon. The committee agreed that the multiple measures workgroup would be the entity to do investigation of how to leverage what is learned from the multiple measures pilot.

**Test Development Process Update:**

Jennifer thanked Patricia, Kitty, Stephen and members of the Chancellor’s Office Assessment workgroup for bringing forward their concerns about the rollout of the assessment, especially with respect to the approval and validation process. The project team met with assessment expert, John Poggio, and he put together a recommendation document outlining a sequence of tasks with the number of weeks that would be appropriate for each one. Jennifer reviewed John’s document and aligned it with the CAI work plan, and she is confident that the team is moving in the right direction and having the right conversations. The intent is to seek Probationary Approval with the initial assessment, using the Critical Mass process.

With a neutral platform and three different subject areas, there might potentially be four different vendors, and pilot colleges will be piloting all of those pieces. Other colleges will be helping to test specific components of some elements, making sure that there is a robust representation of ESL and non-credit populations. The platform workgroup which is composed primarily of pilot colleges will become the steering committee that will provide the feedback over time of the selected platform tool. Tim explained that with technology development that is generally the process. The team is making sure that there is plenty of faculty participation in the development phase as well. There are a lot of different pieces and although this is a 5 year grant, the assessment is supposed to be available to colleges by the end of 2015, so the work process does need to be focused and on track.

There may be many different questions and concerns moving forward, so as issues come up please forward them to Jennifer so that she can make sure that everyone has the best information possible about the work being done. The goal is to meet the needs of the students in developing a test that is the right length and provides the best information. In addition, while the English, Math and ESL tests are being developed to run on the neutral platform, discussions about other elements that might be plugged into that platform are being discussed. Tim explained that the intent is for the testing platform to be general purpose enough to be used for professional development for online learning as well. If target deadlines are met, the rollout of the assessment to colleges would be begin in spring of 2016, to be used for placement for fall of 2016.

**Action Item:**
Get information from Elmer/Debbie about the CIO and CSSO fall conference.
Kitty suggested contacting San Diego CCD due to their extensive knowledge of CASAS and non-credit.

**Assessment Development Process Considerations, led by Carole Gallagher of WestEd:**
Carole noted that this process is very important and will be of great interest to schools and researchers across the nation if it is done well. The steps in the assessment development process include steps that
lead to the test blueprint, then development steps through the process of building and testing the assessment and the entire process makes up the validation steps that ensure that the test has been checked for validity, reliability, fairness, and feasibility. Looking at content, the measurement model and the item types are all early on in the process and lead into building the test blueprint. The blueprint is then used to build the assessment with the development vendor. Then there are many elements of revising, piloting and field testing that will need to occur.

Carole noted that for an assessment for the community college system the process should probably involve a small scale trial, a pilot and a field test. The small scale trial would probably have about 300 students, would include one-on-one interviews and be followed by a big revision. The pilot would probably include 1200 students and would be followed by some revisions. Finally the field test would probably include 18,000 students. There will be ongoing work to ensure technical quality, equity in assessment and usefulness of emerging assessments. For example, Smarter Balanced will be taking 5 years to collect information after 2015, because they are looking at college readiness, so they need to continue looking at that as students get into college. For CAI validation will continue for the life of the project.

Committee Business:
Andrew asked for nominations for a new Vice Chair to replace Phil Smith. Craig Rutan was nominated by Andrew and Alicia seconded the nomination. Kitty was also nominated but declined the nomination.

Motion to approve Craig Rutan as Vice Chair
Vote: Unanimous
Abstained: None

Future Meetings:
Following the pattern that has been established of one in person meeting, followed by two on-line meetings; there will be conference calls for the CAI SC in the third week of July and another in August. This will be followed by a September face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, on either September 29th or 30th. Darla Cooper from the RP Group will provide a report on evaluation through June 30, 2014 at that September meeting. Jennifer will try to get out a schedule for the year soon so that members can plan and make travel arrangements.

There are six workgroups that will be meeting in July, the locations and dates are going out to the workgroup members. There are additional faculty members being vetted through the local and statewide Academic Senates who will be notified when they are approved by those groups.

Next Meeting:
The next meeting will be online in the third week of July via conference call.

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.