

**SJR 41 Task Force Meeting #1 Notes**  
**September 9, 2019**  
**CCC – Harold Washington**

**Stephanie** – Introduction

**Brian** – Welcome

Review of charges for the Task Force – through review of the SJR41

- By April 2020 - Inventory of Instructional Models
- July 2020 – Scaling up report based on scaling of committee
  - Models being used
  - Methods most likely to produce acceleration
- January 2021 – final report to the governor’s office
  - Evidence-based report on models most likely to produce
  - Disaggregated data on enrollment and how/what students place

**Opening Comments:** Senator McGuire discussed his background, experience in higher education & TRIO program

*Introduction of Council Members:*

- Mike Boyd, President Kankakee Community College
- Allison Ready – U of I Dir, Math Placement
- Brad Peters, NIU
- Normah Salleh-Barone, VP, Student Development, Moraine Valley
- Wendy Yanow, Board Member, Oakton
- Emily Goldman, Senior Policy Manager, PCC
- Sarah Labadie, Assoc Director of Policy, WE
- Mollie Foust, Senior Counselor with Governor’s office
- Gloria Gibson, President, NEIU
- Meera Komarraju, Provost and VC, SIUC
- Emmanuel Awuah, VP, ICC
- Bob Novarro, ISU, Board of Trustees
- Susan Grace, Assoc Professor English, Wilbur Wright
- Bambi Jones, Dev Ed Math, Lake Land Community College
- Lisa Helm, Dir of Advising, Governor’s State University
- Jackie McGrather, Professor of English, College of Dupage

**Debra Bragg** (see PowerPoint slides)

1. Norm setting and establishment of ground rules (see responses at end of this set of notes)
2. Design Thinking
  - What happens during, before and after, and what data do we have about the user’s experience?
  - The more we understand the user’s experience, the better we can help and meet their needs.
  - Building on strengths rather than just doing what has been done.
  - Testing ideas

**Report out from round table discussions** about the value of a “design thinking” approach:

- About users, who they are and what services are we trying to provide to them? Need to leverage technology. What are needs of younger learners today that we can be preparing them for later. Need to be conscious of cost, e.g., money, time, psychological preparation.
  - How do faculty and those who support students understand services and student needs. Students have to be able to focus on first semester experience rather than pile up credits because of enrollment level needed to qualify for financial aid. Need to consider the role of empathy in working with students who come underprepared.
  - Who is served, which institution determines how much variability is in needs of students? Disconnect of students from K-12 to higher ed. Focus on semester block rather than getting up to speed. Consider the cost to students and to the state. Legislative solution does not guarantee outcomes. How do we bring parity to outcomes and strategies? How do we ensure mandates or laws don't cause further barriers? Who is getting what degree and what are the needs? What does remedial education aim to do?
  - Dev Ed to what end? What is the goal? How do we bring in student perspective and how the students experience Dev Ed? Not just those currently enrolled but those who dropped out or left before completion. Complementing student perspective with data.
  - (Non-council) design thinking could help define what Dev Ed is. Why do we need to call it developmental, all education is developmental. Where is the line drawn? Could help us move past current line and trench. A way to draw students in to the conversation and design—even to how financial aid is design and provided. Help to move from one and done solutions.
  - (Non-council) think about student profiles, attitude students bring, remind that courses are for adults, applications based, say out loud and keep in mind that the job is not to fix K-12 but to see students where they are. Both courses as package or chunked (module) based or 8 weeks, etc. to see success faster—having lots of options.
3. Level-setting: What we know and what we need to know (handout).

**Nathan/Eric:** Remediation Data in Illinois' Higher Education System – (see slide handouts)

- ICCB (Attempted and earned within three categories for remedial):
  - **Mathematics** - Courses designed to develop math skills. Courses may be related to basic arithmetic, math applications, elementary algebra, pre-algebra, intermediate algebra, geometry, and mathematical literacy.
  - **Writing/Communications (English)** - Courses designed to develop writing and speaking skills. Courses may be related to fundamentals of writing, communication skills development, and language skills development.
  - **Reading** - Courses designed to develop college reading skills. Courses may be related to reading fundamentals, reading comprehension, and literacy.
  - Plus information at the course level.
- IBHE:
  - **IBHE's Fall Enrollment I-** preliminary fall enrollments and unduplicated counts of students enrolled in remediation.
  - **IBHE's Fall Enrollment II (partially retired)**-includes final fall enrollment disaggregated by academic program, degree-level, residency, race/ethnicity, transfer status, and gender
  - **IHEIS** (IBHE's Component of the Illinois Longitudinal Data System)
    - All semester-specific enrollment records at the student level from all degree-granting entities specified in the ILDS Act

- Annual graduation collection at the student level from all degree-granting entities specified in the ILDS act.
- New course and teacher assignment system specific to remediation and dual credit

***Questions/statements raised from Data presentation:***

- Proportion of students in slide 7 (answered in slide 8)
- Differentiation from FY13 to FY18 – non-stem pathway, co-requisite, multiple measures/placement reform, decreases in CTE (v. transfer) programs
- Outliers in slide 9 (perhaps due to heavy CTE enrollment and not much remediation needed in those programs)
- ?: Comparison of the populations overall (not just in remedial framework) – demographic data
- Math historically higher area of remediation in CC system than reading and writing.
- Slide 14.... Proportionally, what does that number represent against total population?
- Who is benefitting from the drop in remediation (by raw numbers – and demographics pairing) by race/ethnicity, SES?
- Are Latinx/Af Am, since overrepresented in remedial enrollment having the same success proportionally?
- Is there a relationship between increased completion and the type of students who are enrolled?
- Disaggregate the three areas (math, reading and writing) by modality
- Data about those who graduate out of dev ed (?) and whether they complete? Are they at 4-year schools or other community colleges? (slides 19 and 20)
- How does credit accumulation compare with a national average? ICCB-driven data (slide 21)
- What is the rate of completion within a given term? So if a student enrolled in 15 hours in one term, what is the percentage of completion (remedial or not) that they complete? Or within a given year
- What is the placement level in comparison to enrollment?
- How do you account for students who place and delay enrollment? Collection of micro data
- For student who enroll in dev ed at what point do they progress and complete/enroll in gateway course? Does the student continue to progress? Can you isolate – how does the student progress in math only or in English only or in reading only?
- What are the impacts of students from the data – with regard to financial aid, budget impasse, impact comparison with ISAC, transfer and sequencing, etc.?
- Who benefits from use of SAT scores or other standardized exams?
- How do we capture the data for those who enter through workforce development but need remediation, e.g. apprenticeship programs, adult ed, training programs, etc.?
  - Alignment of programs, adult education, etc.
  - Does Depts of Labor or Commerce, keep record of those who enter and need remediation or those who don't get in because of their need?
- Is slide 47 repeatable for community college system?
- Is there information on students who don't offer (take?) remediation and those who do and their success rates? Do student have different outcomes, majors, selection in or out based on success/placement rates?
- How does equity play across all areas? In terms of race, gender, age, access to major, access to the college, selection/deselection into or out of a college?

**Wrap up conversation: what is still needed in regards to data and what does the Task Force need to do – Debra Bragg**

- Revisit shared conversation of impact and importance of equity and being on the same page
- Mindful of putting students' first

- Mindful of power and privilege and leaving egos at the door
- Remembering who it is we represent and why we are here

**Homework:** Read briefs included in packet and come prepared to discuss on Nov. 1 (Briefs are from ECS-Education Commission of the States)

**Wrap Up (Stephanie):**

1. Future meeting dates
  - a. Included in packet – GSU on November 1
    - i. Effective models underway – array of colleges and presented
    - ii. Students moving through pathways and disparity of students in each (data) and trend data
    - iii. Ensure opportunities to engage thoughtfully with students (including students not currently enrolled)
    - iv. Engage ISBE staff in work moving forward
    - v. Email Deb, Brian or Stephanie with comments
2. One sentence to conclude from each about reaction that happened/experienced today: “I am...”
  - a. concerned about equity
  - b. encouraged/on right track/encourage student success/collaboration to move from fixed to growth mindset
  - c. thoughtfulness/hopeful/like start/hopeful about open process
  - d. excited about diversity of attitude/optimistic/thrilled and excited by process
  - e. thankful/privileged to be a part/grateful
  - f. daunted/thankful for data provided
3. Public comment
  - a. Aware of language that was used and around “remediation” and thoughtful that lowered credit accumulation is related to potential statements about students rather than shifting thought
  - b. Impressed about diversity of voices and robust conversation. Hopeful that all voices will continue to be heard and there will not be a one-stop fix.

## Senate Joint Resolution 41 Task Force - Ground Rule Assignment Notes

Compiled by Debra Bragg, Facilitator

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committed to an honest dialogue that does not privilege any one agenda over another</li> <li>• Including rigorous quantitative and <u>qualitative</u> data</li> <li>• Grounded in common guiding principles</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common goals</li> <li>• Mutual goals</li> <li>• Mutual respect of opinions and ideas</li> <li>• Common understanding of terms and research</li> <li>• Positive attitudes</li> <li>• Not being afraid to share an idea and see where it takes the group</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for the practitioners to humanize the problem</li> <li>• Recognition that there is not a known solution and a group willingness to be searchers and not just planner.</li> <li>• Discussions of who is accountable and how success will be evaluated</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be willing to accept the reality that the warrants and assumptions I have about developmental education may be deeply flawed.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People leave egos at the door and act humbly, listening first</li> <li>• People want to get it right, not be right</li> <li>• No fear about disagreeing</li> <li>• People are honest</li> <li>• People put students first and act with empathy for students</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forward 50 – I was on this national task force to look at financial aid and student loans – its accessibility, impact on students’ competition and students/parents’ accountability as well as college’s accountability. Our first day was on brainstorming after listening to some panel presentations (diff. reps of various stakeholders). The ideas were then grouped into four themes and based on our work and interest, we were assigned to one of the themes to conduct further research, engage in discussions to come up with guidance/recommendations for Congress</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear agreement/focus on goals at the beginning of the meeting</li> <li>• Acknowledge gaps in knowledge</li> <li>• Share committee work outside of meeting and bring new perspectives back</li> <li>• Remember why we’re here</li> <li>• Keep momentum going between meetings</li> <li>• Create space for inquiry (pausing)</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share multiple views and varied past experiences</li> <li>• Share initiatives that are currently being done</li> <li>• Share initiatives in progress or in the inception stage</li> <li>• Share past practices that didn’t work and why</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect for the charge of the group (for example, being open minded to the overall goal of the task force)</li> <li>• Time limits – force us to resolve or come to resolution in a timely manner</li> <li>• See <u>specific</u> goals</li> </ul>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small break out groups for more intense discussion that report back to larger group for a more comprehensive discussion – allows for <u>generating and building on common themes</u></li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group must stay focused on original charge. Don’t wonder away from charge.</li> <li>• The group must receive data and research requests quickly an in full.</li> </ul>

12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key project manager who consolidated ideas and repackaged between meetings and could pull together needed knowledge for the group to consider</li> <li>• Ability to see clear, physical (or visual) progress on the goal at the start of every meeting.</li> </ul>
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping students at the center of the discussion</li> <li>• Recognizing that those in the room are often seeking the same outcome. We just may disagree about how to reach the outcome given our perspective</li> <li>• For this discussion in particular, that the approach we're seeking is change to the structure, not change to the instruction (meaning faculty are doing good work and new structures may help them to do more).</li> </ul>
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compromise</li> </ul>
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In meetings that have been productive:</li> <li>• Clear agenda and group sticks to it</li> <li>• The group leader moves us toward achieving the deliverables or action items</li> <li>• The group leader manages the conversation to reduce tangents</li> </ul>
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Say open to issues that, at first pass, may not seem relevant to the students in your community.</li> </ul>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use aggregate data wisely.</li> <li>• Focus on what's in the best interest of students and not any parochial interests</li> <li>• If an expert on a topic, do not dominate the discussion, but allow others to share their perspective and listen actively two that they have to say</li> </ul>
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share common end result or goal (vision)</li> <li>• Defined tasks and expectations</li> <li>• Measurable outcomes</li> </ul>
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No leader – everyone shared and directed evenly</li> <li>• No one spoke the majority of the time</li> <li>• Everyone had a common goal</li> </ul>
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect specific areas of expertise belonging to individuals in the group (e.g., don't talk over if your expertise is another area)</li> <li>• Everyone is some of how much space they like talking in discussions and sometimes respect the group by not sharing (every) thought</li> </ul>
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good group:</li> <li>• Everyone contributes – doesn't have to be equal, but everyone gives/does something</li> <li>• Clear purpose that was agreed upon</li> <li>• Ongoing communication/check-ins about progress and adherence to purpose</li> </ul>
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People committed to the process</li> <li>• People were on time</li> <li>• People left their egos at the door</li> </ul>
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There weren't pre-determined outcomes/biases</li> <li>• Each participant had "skin in the game". No one felt like others controlled the agenda without their authentic input</li> <li>• An "honest broker" facilitated – that enabled each participant to trust the process and engage</li> </ul>
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had very clear goals and outcomes and everyone who participated were very vested in completing the work. Had a clear plan, benchmarks and expectations. Regularly met and left enough time to do homework/tasks to be completed.</li> </ul>
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Find common ground despite different experiences, concerns, and wishes for outcomes</li> <li>• Developing action steps that are concrete and followed through</li> <li>• Keep students' needs at the forefront of all.</li> </ul>