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JBL: Welcome to today's Webinar, strengthening measures of college and career readiness and success alignment policies and strategies sponsored by the CCRS center at the American institute of research and American Youth policy forum. My name is Jennifer and I will be serving as a moderator for today's event. Today's Webinar, the first in our series on strengthening measures of college and career readiness and success, aims to draw connections between growing understanding of how states can more accurately measure college and career readiness and success and the relevant state policy considerations. Our topic today, alignment policies and strategies will exam the alignment between secondary and post‑secondary education along with a range of measures beginning to assess readiness for the transition between systems, along with strategies for communication to students and their families. The next Webinar in the series will be held on Monday March 23rd at 3:30 p.m. eastern time. On state long to do data systems, governance and privacy. The registration link is just now being sent out via the chatbox if you'd like to join us. We have a great set of presenters joining you today who will be sharing excellent resources, tools and information aimed at providing support and guidance to you as you do your work around alignment and strengthening measures. As we hope you'll find this information useful and relevant, throughout the Webinar we'll be pausing to take your questions. As you can see, you can submit your questions live using the question box indicated here on the screen.

In addition, if you have any connect cull difficulty during today's we been far please call go to Webinar at. If for any reason during the Webinar you happen to lose connectivity please just go ahead and log back into the Webinar. You should start back off where we left off. Finally, we'll be live tweeting today's Webinar and encourage you to do the same using the hashtag #CCRS measures at the bottom of your screen. Be sure to follow along with us at CCRS Center and at AYPF\_Tweets. Please note the slides and recording of today's session will be available on the CCRS center website, www. CCRScenter.org and AYPF.org three days after the completion of the Webinar. We have closed captioning available during the Webinar. To access the captioning please click on the link on your screen which will open on a separate window that will run simultaneously to our Webinar window. In addition, I'll post a transcript along with the slides and the video on the websites. Let's welcome our presenters listed here in the order they will speak. I will introduce them briefly by sharing what they will be discussing but please know you can find their bio on the websites. First we'll be hearing from Laura Jimenez the director of the college of career readiness and success center who is cohosting today's Webinar. Laura will provide an overview of the CCRS center and the measurement of college readiness and success.

Our next three presenters all come from the education commissioner of the states or ECS. A national organization who provides information and guidance to a range of state leaders. First we'll hear from Emmy Glancy, policy analyst who will be sharing an overview of ECS blueprint for college readiness policies and K12 higher Ed and across the system that contribute to better alignment for college readiness and success. Next we'll hear from Mary Fulton, also a policy analyst at ECS who will be discussing the recent brief on full measures for college readiness. She will also be joined by Lexi Anderson, a researcher who will share in greater detail some of the measurement work related to competency‑based education. Our final speaker will be Paul Turman, vice president of Academic Affairs at the South Dakota Board of Regents who will be sharing South Dakota's work on strengthening the measures of college and career readiness through the use of multiple means and strategies. As I mentioned earlier we'll pause throughout the session for your questions, so please be sure to type them into the question box throughout the presentations. We'll do our best to answer all of them.

Now I would like to welcome Laura Jimenez to start us off.

LJ: Thank you Jennifer for your introduction and for AYPS support of today's Webinar. Thank you all for joining our Webinar on strengthening measures of college and career readiness and success. The college career readiness and success center schools is to help states carry out policies and initiatives that help all students be successful. As you may know, success can look very differently to different people. It can be graduating from high school, attending college, choosing the right career path, earning an advanced degree or any of the above. Instituting the right policies to help students achieve all of these things can seem like a daunting task. The CCRS center working in conjunction with our partners in the field can provide knowledge and guidance that states can use in crafting the best policies and initiatives for their students, because at the end of the day, it's all about them. For those of you who are new to our Webinar, the college and career readiness and success center which is housed at the American institutes for research, is part of a network of federally funded comprehensive center that provide technical assistance and resources to our regional partners. And the states that they serve on key educational reform issues.

Our cohost is a lead partner of the CCRS center. As a technical assistance hub we collaborate with federal and external centers and resource providers to promote knowledge development, dissemination and application through technology based activities such as this Webinar today. Next slide.

The CCRS center developed a college and career readiness and success organizer utilizing feedback and insights from diverse stakeholder communities. We work with experts in the field of work force, early childhood education, career and technical education, community colleges, education non‑profit and out of school time providers to develop this framework. The organizers serve as a visual representation of the complexities of college and career readiness and success. It is intended to display a consolidated yet comprehensive overview of the many elements impacting a student's ability to succeed in college and careers at both the institutional and individual levels. Currently we are developing a series of tools that will help states to utilize the organizer to strategically plan and implement their CCRS initiative. If you would like more information about our CCRS organizer, you can find that on our website.

For today's Webinar strengthening measures of college in career readiness and success, we will be focused on the outcomes and measures trend of the organizer asking how do we know when learners are meeting expectations for college and career readiness and success. Next slide. To 23UR9 help states meet their goals for measuring college and career readiness and success, indicators and outcomes, the center is in the process of developing a four chapter measurement practice guide. This practice guide is designed to help state education agencies define measurement, collect college and career readiness indicators designed to support those goals. Use the data gathered with those measures and indicators to make informed decisions about college and career readiness and success policies, programs and intervention.

The first chapter of this are series is available on our website and subsequent chapters will be ready this spring. If you have questions about the center, our organizer or measures of college and career readiness and success, please visit our website or contact us directly at CCRS center@air.org. Thank you for joining us today. I pass the mic to Emmy glance.

EG: Thank you so much. My name is Emmy Glancy to get started we'll do a quick overview and invite you to an initiative that we call on the rubric for college and career readiness. Lexi will take it over. So quickly, ECS was created in 1965 for policy, research and provide technical assistance to help state leaders make informed decisions. We covered the P20 sections so we work with politicians, researchers and practitioners all the way from pre K to post‑secondary and beyond. ECS really is one of the national organizations to bring together all these different stake hoards like the governors, K12, departments and education leaders. And believe that the sharing of these type of policy ideas like today is one way we can support the development of excellent education policies. As I mentioned we work with a large level of policy makers and decision makers, from pre school to post‑secondary and work force. On a wide range of these issues that affect state board members, officials and the importance of the businesses in the work force community. A good example of the type of work that ECS does is the blueprint for college readiness. We issued a big report in October of 2014, the end of last year. And it really speaks to provide a framework on how to conceptualize education reform efforts under way in your state. K12 and post‑secondary policy alignment and collaborations is essential if we're going to need that as they move through the pipeline. The report and the findings can add to the discussion that the CCRS measures and other groups are working on it. As I said, how do you know when things are ready and what kinds of signals are we send them throughout the pipeline.

The blueprint included 10 policy issues. We've organized the work into three policy anchors. The first anchor is the high school anchor and it includes four policies. The second is the higher education anchor that also includes four higher Ed policies we reviewed in different states. And the third anchor we're calling the bridge anchor. This includes two of the critical K12 and higher Ed policies we felt that really accelerates the other blueprints efforts as well as it pack K12 and post‑secondary. We designed metrics on these mom sees areas and also captured policy points. We analyzed state by state metrics. So the first anchor is a high school policy. These are the four areas we looked at all the states. This is looking at housing readiness standards. We found 48 states have this in place and also the extent to which states are requiring advanced course work. So our analysis is 25 states work with AT, ID or during enrollment. The second policy we looked at is whether or not the state had a cause for readiness assessment in high school. And also a lot of work going on around the national consortia as well as cause and readiness for high school students. Third, we looked at the graduation requirements and whether state policies existed near one another. Specifically around course requirements and other measures. Both at the high school graduation and the higher Ed admission policies. So that's what you'll be hearing a lot more about from Lexi and Mary.

The fourth and final policy under the high school anchor is the extent to which school and district performance and statewide accountability systems actually use college for readiness as a metric within that performance pretty much. So what they were holding schools accountable for. And found that 24 states overall had a cause for readiness indicator within their state accountability system. Next we have the higher education policy. There are four here that we looked at in every state. The first one is the distance of state‑wide admission policies. Let's see. There we go. I know there's a little delay here. The first one was whether or not statewide admission standards are in place and where the admission policies, 15 were system wide and 13 were statewide. The second we looked at is whether statewide remedial placement policies existed. We found 39 states have either statewide or system wide remedial policies and 29 had repeal annual policies for placement and credit bearing forces on a statewide system. And the statewide system analysis that we have all of this you can study more in‑depth on our website because we've got those links at the end of the presentations. I'm cruising through this pretty quickly.

The third higher education policy looked at was articulation. We studied four different questions under that. That's not a surprise to many of you. We looked at whether there was a transferable core division of courses or Gen Ed. Whether there was course numbering in the states and whether there was a credit by assessment policy transferred across the systems. The fourth and final policy was accountability. In the higher Ed accountability policy we looked at whether number one states were setting goals. Number two the state having included an achievement goal or completion goal in a master plan. And then number three, whether the state had adopted a performance based funding model. For all of those measures, we found 26 states had attained that goal. We found the majority 36 states included those goals and embedded in a master plan in the institutions of higher education. Finally this third anchor, we looked at the existence of a statewide college for readiness definition. And we found that 32 states had definitions of college readiness and you know from either one page to a narrative including assessment scores or 21st century skills. Just a wide variety of those are in place but 32 of those states had moved forward.

The second policy we analyzed was whether P20 data pipeline and reporting process was in place. So looking at whether states were able to hear the data across state agencies so we can understand where our students are moving to higher Ed and into the work force. We found that 42 states and the District of Columbia had this information in the high school feedback reports. And made them publicly available. That's something we were also very excited to see.

So with that, the next slide is a big overview of the results from whitest to darkest we moved from the states who had less of these print policies. This is a disclaimer that a lot of these more centralized states often do this work out side of legislation. So we have the same initiatives in bold but are working in a legislative wave. This is more reflective in our analysis and the results that you see here. The average was six policies out of ten. You're see the bulk of our states there. 16 states in the district of Columbia has 67 and a lot of Great Lakes states and mid western states had four to five. We only had two states for credit in 10 out of 10 policies being in place analyzed and this was Indiana and Georgia. So bravo.

We mentioned this a little earlier but just so you know what's available in this report. For each of these policy areas, we studied the goals, provided the 50 state analysis I just shared. Also include key policy actions. So you're wanting to make sure that not only with this in‑depth review of the policy landscape but also wanted to provide that next layer of both information as well as sort of next step.

We have a two page individual profile for all of your states. This includes an overall analysis, so this one is Kansas you'll see there in the middle. Then we have the national result on that side and then has examples of strengths and considerations based on our overall analysis. One example on the type of tools that was offered around the blue prints and also includes a 50 state searchable data portal where you can interact with the data and provide for various policies to see the results across the states. Like I said, dig a little deeper within these policy areas. So we hope that you can use this report and certainly this is an example of the type of outreach we want to be providing to help the states move things forward. We hope that this provides sort of a communication tool, which starts these conversations across K12 and higher education in our states, and also identify some of the myths the stories we tell ourselves and wondering what our neighbors at the center are doing or who we can learn from. And you know, I think the next step will really be out to the states and providing technical assistance in person and over the phone policy reviews. And really wanting to make this information in our support acceptable to this field. So now we'll dig in a little deeper to one policy area that is receiving a lot of attention. EPS felt was right for further analysis and discussion. And so we'll hear from Lexi Anderson and Mary Fulton about some of the trends and examples we're seeing that states really offer students to show us, have a number of ways to show us they are college or career ready and how much those policies are aligned among K12 and higher ED. We can see how students get caught in the muddle.

LA: Thanks Emmy. My name is Lexi Anderson and I'm a researcher here at ECS. I'll review quickly some data points we found doing the research for the reports around high school graduation requirements and admission requirements and the alignment. And then I'll talk a little bit about the brief that myself and Mary wrote sort of diving into more of the multiple measures in addition to utilizing course work.

So in the blueprint for college readiness for adults, we found that many states are utilizing multiple measures. We're still seeing that many of these states are using course requirements, but adding these additional indicators for college readiness. We found that 47 states do have established minimum high school course work graduation requirements. Three other states, either do not have them or they're not required or they just don't require specific course work for their requirements. Within those 47 states, we then found that at least 18 of those have complete or partial alignment between those high school course graduation requirements and the statewide or system wide admission standard. So for full alignment, that included English, math, science, social studies and foreign language. For the partial alignment, we found that six of these states are aligned completely except for foreign language. Of the times we found these states, the states that weren't fully aligned required more foreign language course requirement at the higher education level than they do at the high school level. So this was sort of an interesting find that we found for that.

This next map will sort of show you the separation of where these states are and who they've included in the states that have the state system wide admission policies and are working towards the alignment with their high school graduation requirement. So moving from the blueprint for college readiness, myself and Mary then now wrote a grieve that really explored the multiple measures for college readiness, and sort of what these states are looking at in addition to the course requirements that have traditionally been seen as the college and career readiness indicator.

So these are the measures we looked at in our brief. So Mary will be talking a little bit more about the competency based assessments later on. Also included the course work, curriculum, grade point average, class rank and index score. Within these we did find that GPA and class rate can tend to show a better or equivalent indicator as assessments do. We're finding more states are including those. The GPA, at least 20 states include those in admission requirements. And then with assessments, we found that about 24 states are utilizing no, sir in their admission requirements as well. So a good amount of states are adding these as indicators to try to see well-rounded students more than just sort of the courses that they took. And so one area we really wanted to look into is these competency‑based assessments and how those high schools and higher education institutions are allowing students to show the mastery in specific course areas.

I'm going to turn this over to Mary so she can delve deeper into the competency‑based assessments and the state example we looked at.

MF: Great, thanks Lexi. Highlighted the competency‑based assessments out of those Lexi mentioned there's a high level of interest on merging activities. We found there's a trend emerging in U.S. high schools amplifies the mastery of subject content in addition to or instead of completely course work as a means to satisfy high school graduation requirements. Likewise, a growing number of institutions have adopted competency‑based education programs that allow students to advance in courses once they show proficiency. There's a potential for competency‑based pathways to merge at the intersection of high school graduations and college admission requirements. Several states have adopted policies that allow high school students to pass competency‑based assessments to show mastery of subject content. Higher education is just beginning to use these exams in their admission policies. The next slide has a few examples. If we take a look at the Nevada and New Jersey district allows students to receive high school credits if they passed competency‑based exams even if they don't attend courses. New Jersey's actually trying the process for the common core standard. Ohio allows students to earn high school credits based on competency, instead of or in addition to completing course work. At the higher ed level, students can meet course requirements which is English, Matt and science through ACT or AT scores. We highlighted this example in the blue present roar that Emmy discussed. And we'll hear more from Paul Turman who is the next presenter. And lastly, the university of Wisconsin system allows students to submit competency‑based profiles to show evidence of course work preparation. Next slide, please.

To wrap up our presentation, I want to mention a few actions that state policy and education leaders can take to create a more successful transition for students between high school and higher education. These include clearly define, align and communicate college expectations, revisit measures used to determine students post‑secondary readiness and chances of success. And encourage ongoing and meaningful collaboration among K12 and higher education faculty and leaders. So our paper on multiple measures college readiness that Lexi and I authored, includes more specific actions for policy and education leaders. And these were also reflected in the blueprint report. I'm going to turn the mic back to Jennifer and we will be happy to respond to any questions.

JBL: Great, thanks so much. I'm just going to go through a couple slides right here. Some information about ECS on social media. And then also contact information for these presenters. As the well as the links to the publications that were discussed. Both of which will be available on the AYPS and CCRS Center website. As Mary mentioned we are going to pause here and take a few questions. I see that questions are beginning to come in and I think one question in particular that folks are asking in a variety of different ways and perhaps Emmy you can take this first and then Mary and Lexi. When you talk about alignment, are you talking specifically about alignment of content standards? Are you beginning to look at alignment of other expectations as well?

EG: Yes. I would say both. You know, I think some of these areas are easier to actually pull up and compare like the multiple measure when looking at specific content areas and benchmarks that we're expecting students to make and meet those in high school and credit‑bearing courses. We're also looking at both the policy language and policy signals and levers. One area we might tell a student you're ready to graduate from high school if you have met this certain criteria or have this certain expressive core for format classes or English classes or whatever. They go to try to get into the local college and say oh man, you need actually two more years of foreign language. Or you have to sit for a remedial course and bring up to speed before you're able to enter a freshman course. Just trying to make clear both of those and recognizing there's a number of ways that states can do it in arguing this within this sort of college readiness and college goals and policy states.

JBL: Mary or Lexi, do you guys want to add anything?

LA: Yes, this is Lexi. I would just add really for the blue print we started off really looking at the alignment of those work requirements. So more of that basic level of you know, how are we requiring the same amount of units at both the high school level and the higher education level. And so now that we're sort of moving into this next phase, Mary and I then wanted to look at okay, as we were, as we were doing this research and looking for all of these both high school graduation requirements and higher ed requirements for admissions. What are these other things we're seeing and we started to see all of these other measures that institutions are utilizing in increasing amounts. So that's sort of how we're trying to progress it at this point, starting at a little bit more basic level and then sort of looking into what are these innovations that states are doing and what are these other ways we can look at measuring college and career readiness in addition to course work.

MF: Great. And I'll just add a quick note because I think Emmy and Lexi covered most of it. Some of the emerge is along with the research that's coming out of the various shops, research shops that have started to demonstrate there are limitations to just looking at course work or an assessment. And those don't necessarily represent the full skills that the only students aren't test takers. So a lot of this is really consistent and starting to pay attention to the emerging resource on what are these different ways to take and different students can demonstrate their college readiness. They're starting to write those into policies or starting pilot projects. We're looking at those and trying to follow kind of the lead states and researchers trying to demonstrate some of these states are a little further ahead.

I would also say that in our upcoming measurement practice guide, we will be including an appendix of the current college and career readiness creators that are being crate broadly used and we're including research considerations of those.

LJ: One note I would add to that's that the research is relatively new in this area, in terms of how well particular measures are a proxy for readiness for success. So I think these going to be a lot more to come over the coming years as we have more research on particular measures.

JBL: Thanks Laura for jumping in there. So we've had a couple questions and perhaps someone from ECS can take this first and then maybe Laura, you can talk about this from the perspective of the CCRS center.

As any of those measures ‑‑ profiled and does that fit in the definition of college readiness and success from the perspective of the center.

LA: This is Lexi from ECS. I guess I would say, I have done the admissions research for the blueprint. So in reading those multiple many policies, I didn't necessarily run across any that were in the policy yet. I know this is something that I've seen emerging on campuses individually and something that is sort of brought into this holistic idea of admissions. But as far as the research we found so far, they haven't been placed into actual policies as of yet.

JBL: Great thanks. Laura, maybe you can talk in the overall definition what it means to be ready for success.

LJ: Sure, I'd love to respond. So states are in a process of many of them are coming up with the state‑wide definition of college and career readiness or college and career readiness and success. In September of 2014, we published a document that provided an overview of these definitions. And we did find that a number of them really refer to a student being ready when that student doesn't need remediation in reading or math. But other definitions did include indicators such as 21st isn't tree schools, which include social emotional learning, some non‑cognitive factors, even though that's not quite the right term but it is kind of the term of art to measure or to talk about these skills that are more the soft skills and not strictly academic. So I would urge the audience to download this publication to read more about where states are headed. But I would say a trend is to include more of the nuance measures such as these social emotional skills in the definition of college and career readiness.

JBL: Great. There are a number of other questions about the definition and I'm hoping that folks from the ECS team might be able to answer this question or talk about perhaps some trends that they're seeing about how closely a state's definition of college and career readiness is aloned with the measure that you're seeing, particularly around admission into post‑secondary education.

MF: This is Mary. And Lexi, you can certainly jump in. Actually ECS will be taking a deeper dive into that question as well of admissions and also probably remedial placement. But actually in reading Laura's report, which is excellent by the way and I hope you can send that out to the audience. It appears that most of these college and career definitions or college and career readiness definitions are a little more on the qualitative side and not necessarily putting in like an ATC score or something that is much more on the quantitative side. And I know my work in remedial placement and course placement and I think in remixes they are starring to, have this shift to looking at these multiple measures. There's still looking at some of the ATC scores or SAT scores or some Accu‑players scores and they're not ready for the career admission but a little more on the qualitative side.

LA: Hi. I can add to that as well. I would say the way we're thinking about the definition, they are much more qualitative. We're looking right now in our measurement practice guide to look at what are the particular data points that a state can use to measure whether a student is meeting that definition. So we are seeing this as a related but sort of separate issue of having a state definition and then defining the measures, the indicators and then the data that you are going to use to measure against that definition.

JBL: Great, thanks. And just one final clarifying question. Perhaps Emmy, you can answer this. When was all the information used for the blueprint collected and what information exactly did you collect? You mentioned some states did not have legislative policies. Did you limit to legislative policy or what was the time frame of the information you included.

EG: Yes. I should have mentioned this in the beginning. This reflects the 2014 legislative session policies. And as of September 1st. So we sill are together to have to be capturing what happened this year. We know there's a lot of activity around this work. So we work mainly at state statutes but also especially with the higher education policies look at some of the more rule making and that level of analysis. But yes, the first one we looked at was the state statute. It's possible we know in California there's a certain reason for system wide or statewide policies. In Nebraska as I mentioned earlier, we recognized the decentralized nature of their governance in higher ed. So we tried to take those into account but the report and the analysis certainly did rely more heavily on state‑wide policies at the state level statute.

JBL: Thank you for that clarification. We have many more questions people have been sending in but I want to keep us moving along and we'll be able to return to some of the questions that have been sent in following Paul's presentation. So I would like to turn it over to Paul Turman from the South Dakota Board of Regents. Welcome, Paul.

PT: Well thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to come share some of the activity we have going on here in South Dakota. One of the things that we have had in place for roughly about a decade now has been a comprehensive assessment strategy for the way that we place students across all of our post‑secondary institutions at the four year level as well as our collaborative work with our technical institutes. And so as you can see on the slide kind of label assessing student placement, the common approach we have taken has been trying to align a variety of college readiness indicators with two in particular that have been in place for quite sometime. We've relied quite often on ACT as well as the compass placement. Predicting how well a student will do in a corresponding college level course in that given area. And so we've used those for quite sometime, but I think as new assessments have come along, we've also been quite open to making sure that we have as many indicators as possible based on the types of scores or assessments that a lot of our students are bringing forward and so a couple years awe due we placed into the mix and what we're planning to adhere in the next month is student performance on our new smarter balance assessment that's required for 11th graders in South Dakota as well as our other grade levels. But the ability to take a students' smart balance score and determine at that point if the student is ready for college level work or needs additional preparation to be prepared. And then I think what this then fits with is what our department of education is doing now with the way to define career readiness. They use the NCRC, the ACT assessment to help determine that for students in a variety of our districts. And so using this common platform aligns with a common course catalog that we have in the system. So a student knows right away if they are able to get an ACT subscore of 21 on math that puts them at least at a college algebra level at any campuses in South Dakota. What we started to do is begin to align these strategies with the student seen year experience by doing direct messaging to parents and students about what their avenues are. Really this has fallen into one of two tracks. The first track will be those students based on the scores on any of those measures above, need some level of developmental courses to prepare them for success in our most secondary institutions. And so this is very similar to what some states have begun to view as transition courses. But we promote and have developed a couple different opportunities for remedial courses to be delivered and completed by students in high school. Rather than waiting for them to arrive on the our institutions and spend time during that freshman year trying to just simply get themselves prepared for completing that set of curriculum. The other thing and what we really emphasize here to parents and students is that the state of South Dakota does not support financially any developmental course work that we offer in our system. As a result the entire cost is placed on students which becomes zero credit courses that do not help move them toward the completion. So we really emphasize getting them down in high school, save the student significant time and money.

The second track ends up being those students who have demonstrated their ability to do extremely well. They're prepared for college level work, they still have their senior year to complete. We push the placed on the guidelines in place. What we really push for parents and students here is the ability to complete their post‑secondary experience early by really using that senior year and not wasting it in ways they may have in the past. They completed their core requirements and what they're finding themselves do is spend more time on electives that don't meet any of their long term post‑secondary goals. And so on the next slide, which is entitled dual enrollment opportunities. I'll talk about these different paths. When we look at the dual credit opportunities we try to provide different options. We have the traditional concurrent enrollment programs that a lot of states have. That will be joint partships either with the don't of education to deliver course or we have one of our institutions that have an E‑learning center that allows for the delivery electronically of our courses in the school districts for seniors who are ready for college‑bearing courses. We've also done quite a bit expanding our AP and making those courses free for students. Especially providing a variety of opportunities for students in rule districts that may not have teachers with qualifications that are needed to be able to offer that curriculum. Still have options that other larger districts would not or that would.

So I think we also see the last one there being, we started to encourage our districts in the state to take our curriculum and begin to offer those same courses to their students working in a mentoring relationship with the faculty that we have at our campuses. So very similar to what a number of states are doing with current credit or we recognize the need for various options for school districts. We expanded this year and taking an approach to look at finding ways for students to enroll specifically in the courses that we offer at our general institutions and at the technical institutes in states. So whether those courses are delivered on campus at our physical locations, we've also expanded our on‑line offerings as well as any university or satellite campuses that we have. Students are able to do that through course work and the assessments we have in place. What we try to do with that particular program is open it primarily to our general curriculum noting that if a student takes any of those courses they make a decision to stay in South Dakota at one of our campuses. Because it fits nicely with our common course cat log, those students are able to immediately transfer those courses in without really any need for review or assessment by faculty or administrator or registrars on a campus. So with dual credit in mind, we've also as I had noted, the next slide kind of talks about what we do with these developmental courses here in South Dakota or the transition courses that a lot of other states have pursued. And so we're really encouraging students to any place where they have a deficiency in mathematics, English, any of those indicators, we've govern them basically three different options. The completion of our remedial course work through our virtual high school that the superintendent of education manages and runs. We also have the ability for students to take those courses through most secondary institution through maybe a dual credit option even though it's not counted toward meeting college level credit bearing course work. They also can do that through the high school actually delivering the course. This is the one we've really been working more aggressively with school districts where in the past a student may not have taken a advanced math course or senior math course. All they're required to take is the first three years of math, algebra 1, geometry and algebra 2. That sometimes is not enough to make sure a student is able to successfully complete our college a bra course. So we have a series of districts that are delivering our remedial integrated algebra or college algebra course to their students during the course of the entire senior year. And this is the one place that we're expected to see some significant benefits because of students ability and willingness to get this out of the way. Regardless of which of those approaches they're taking, we have embedded across all three different content areas, three relatively easy steps that students, once they have a smarter balance or an ATC score or even if they accu‑placer we can determine they need some level of developmental course work. We ask them to complete an accu‑placer diagnostic exam which provides and establishes the various modules they're required to take which then that establishes a common set of course work that they can complete through any of those med Williams. Once they've done that work, they then complete and finish an accu‑placer exam that we use as a verification they now have met the core requirements to be able to go into their college level course work.

We have found those two approaches are finding great opportunities for the students in our state to be successful.

I'll tie this in my last slide how it work as we approach our admission policy across the system as well. We have started and always embraced the idea that students need multiple entry points like they need multiple indicators for college readiness. If you're a traditional student, most of those students go through, they're coming straight from high schools. We have course requirements they must meet. If they're not able to do that, they can also demonstrate those requirements using other measures. That could be the Dante's exam, AP or for credit which a lot of institutions are using, credit by exam. High schools also use a number of course exams that are admissions reps can look at to make informed decisions that the student has the curriculum requirements as well as testing requirements that are needed to be successful.

We also have a relatively large and growing non‑high school graduate population which ends up being even those students who stopped out or home school students we need to provide them with opportunities. And so we often times relied primarily on ACT composite scores or benchmarks that ACT is for our given areas as well as the student completing the GED. We really push this option to encourage students to continue on with post‑secondary opportunities through our college preparation portal or select decode.org are people are interested in reviewing that. I'll end with the regents colors program. Those on the advanced track completing four years of math, four years of science as well as all the other high school curriculum are automatically become eligible to be admitted into any of our general institutions. As long as they obtain a C or higher in all of those courses that we have listed. And so I think what we found is that one particular admission structure does not work for all students and we've tried to ensure that students have various options to make the best choice about where they want to go on the school.

I will be happy to answer any questions that people on the Webinar have of how we approach things here in South Dakota.

JBL: Paul, thanks so much. And what a great presentation and what a great really set of comprehensive strategies that you guys have developed not only to think about the readiness side in terms of ensuring students are best prepared for entrance but also standardizing the entrance across the state to make it easier for students.

JBL: First just a clarifying question. Earlier in your presentation, you mentioned your advanced curriculum. And if you could just define for folks, they were a little curious about exactly what that meant.

PT: Would that be for the regent collars program.

JBL: You talked about AP curriculum to rural districts. People want to know the difference between the AP and advanced curriculum.

PT: Often times what we've struggled with as a state that has a relatively significant teacher shortage right now, the availability for some school districts to hire enough staff to teach will be maybe an advanced math course, the physics course, foreign language has been one of those areas we've had districts that just have not been able to have the capacity to offer that robust curriculum. And so we have through the E‑learning center the ability to deliver that to a variety of districts and get a cohort of students that other students can interact with and engage with as well. So I think probably it's our rural, very rural districts that have maybe only four or five seniors in a given class. And so having just advanced course work for those students alone just doesn't meet the bottom line for some of those school districts.

JBL: Absolutely understand. In a rural state like South Dakota and what a great strategy and tool. You also mentioned earlier in your presentation, you know, looking at some measures of career readiness and beginning to standardize some of those. Can you talk a little bit more about how you're approaching that, simply using standard national test or are you also looking at specific readiness standards by program?

PT: We primarily relied on the NCRC, the ACT instrument, the national career readiness certificate. Which our department of labor and department of ed really have aggressively been working with the school district to have juniors complete, juniors and seniors, they use the various standards, the platinum gold and silver designations to indicate the level of readiness that students have. When South Dakota was going through the process of asking for their or getting the request for a waiver for their accountability framework, the NCRC along with the now different measures that I list there are all used as an indicator for students who are college ready and if the they are not college ready, establish they are career ready for employers in South Dakota would need.

JBL: Great. And the other program folks were curious about and wanting a little bit more detail was how you're beginning to provide some sort of remediation or sort of pre-remediation course work in the high school so that students are better prepared upon entry. Can you tell us a little bit about any success that you've had yet with that, either quantitative numbers or qualitative examples.

PT: I can. But the one that's at least we're into the second year was the project with the South Dakota virtual high school. That was our initial pilot moving down this approach where students would take the accu‑placer, given the set of modules and given basically six months to work with the staff at the virtual high school to complete those modules and then tells at the end. What we found is that roughly 75% of those students who took part in that project were successfully able to meet the benchmark scores needed to go right into college level works in mathematics or English right away. I do not have numbers for what the second year is going to produce for that. But the other one is the actual delivery of the course as a teaching mode for teachers in the district. We currently have 13 districts that are engaged in that process with the department of ed right now. And we're certainly expecting that because of the size of the number of students in those districts that it's going to begin, certainly chain away at the total number of remediated students we recruit and attract to our system.

JBL: Wow. That sounds great. And we look forward to hearing more results. Sorry to stick with you, Paul, but you're getting lots of questions. Folks are very curious about South Dakota. If you can tell us how to help students with the college match process.

PT: The portal really is kind of broken into two general areas. The first one is information for middle school students on how they need to here is the course you need to take to get prepared to be successful. Once you finally make a decision about post‑secondary routes, the section of it that is devoted to our high school students is more specialized because they now are taking the specific courses that we recommend and then that also then aligns with once they've identified a potential career industry area, they can go into our portal and list that and then it tells them the types of majors they could pursue that they wanted to do a career in that and that aligned it with the various post‑secondary institutions that have those programs. So that's one side of it. The other side is we used that to also recruit, provide information for the non‑traditional students or transfer students who may have left South Dakota and are coming back or they stopped at one of our institutions and want to find a way of getting reengaged. That's the place where we see a lot of good information about the home schooled or GED students who may not be taking their traditional path. We had to go into the Welsh site three years ago and had quite a bit of success because we use a process where we collect the addresses of all middle or seventh grade through senior, every student in South Dakota and we do direct mailings to them and push them to that website so they can be thinking early and often about preparation and how critical it is if they want to be successful in post‑secondary.

JBL: Thanks so much for sharing. And at this point, I do wanted to open up our questions to the rest of the panelists. Laura, if you could take this question first, and Emmy and Mary, if you want to chime in afterwards, please feel free to. Folks are wondering, we've been talking a lot about system measures of college and career readiness and success. And folks are wondering a little bit about what might additional measures to be considered at the school and the student level. And how those might be all part of a comprehensive measurement system. Laura, if you could take that first.

LJ: You got it. So, are one thing that is an over arching comment. The closer to the student level you are with measures, the less stable measures that you can use in real time. So what I mean by that is teachers can utilize measures that come from an assessment of say 21st century skills. They can use that in real time to consider additional learning support for students in the classroom. But that wouldn't be an appropriate measure say at the district level as an accountability measure for that school. Because that type of measure is so instable and can change from day to day.

You could utilize measure such as student growth as measured by with portfolios or even growth on assessments, diagnostic exams. Those can all be used to inform instructions, professional development and additional learning support for students I would say at the school and district level you can utilize measures in proficiency in English language arts and math. We could use school climate measures like attendance and discipline. Even teacher effectiveness measures both in student growth and observations. Those can also inform things like professional development and other district policies. And some of those like proficiency and teacher effectiveness measures can be utilized for accountability of the school or for teacher evaluation systems. Then you've got the state level measures we have been talking about such as proficiency, enrollment in post‑secondary, rates of remediation, employment and these can really be used at the state level to drive resources and policy.

LJ: Let me know if you'd like any more information on that.

JBL: I think that's great. I want to open it to the group and see if you guys have anything else you'd like to add. I have a little bit of a follow‑on question for you guys as well many I'm fairly confident that in the blue print you looked at states that were collecting high school feedback or creating high school feedback reports as one mechanism particularly around the data sharing. And perhaps you can talk a little bit about trends related to high school feedback reports here as well.

EG: Sure. This is Emmy. Yes. I would just add to Laura, Laura had such a good answer to that last question. We'll see a lot more of those student level assessment results this school year. Most states have already open up administration and so hopefully these little assessment systems are designed to provide the feeding bare our edge educators and student throughout the year and whether they have mastered the content they're expected to every year. I just wanted to add that to the student level that we're seeing.

In terms of the publicly available high school feedback reports, yes, we did look at those under the bridge anchor. And found out that 42 states produced this annually available high school feedback report. The feedback reports include aggregate level information. They are on test scores and often include the post‑secondary readiness and performance indicators. So this could look at things like enrollment in both credit bearing and remedial course work. Include any health and labor analysis that's available as we start to link both the K12 data to higher education as well as our work forms data systems. We also looked at the type of indicators that are included in some of those reports. And there sure was a variety. Hawaii and Colorado are two examples we often times look to. As good examples of feedback reports and have some of those reports as examples. I think a lot of the, one of the biggest challenges we see with the high school feedback reports is both the timeliness of the data. So sometimes we have a hard timesharing this data in a timely fashion so it can help inform and improve our decision‑making both at the secondary and post‑secondary levels. And then some of the quality of the data is still being worked out. And of course the student privacy and all of those issues that hopefully will be addressed in this next Webinar that was announced today. But those are real issues and trying to assess how we can share these, this information. How we can report it in a way that's both useful and actionable for K12 and secondary. As well as timely. So it can be both useful for post‑secondary, secondary as well as our school district leaders.

JBL: Great answer. Thanks so much for plugging our next Webinar in the series that will look at the longitudinal systems and some of the issues around data collection, data governments and of course privacy. I want to open up this question to the whole panel and perhaps start with Paul first and then move through. It's a little bit of a philosophical question perhaps but it's one that think was raised very interestingly through this discussion today. As we have this discussion around multiple measures of readiness and we begin to look at some of the competency‑based approaches that we're starting to see both in the K12 and higher education rounds. Do you think we will make the move to completely replace placement exams such as at ACT or the college placement. Paul, can you take that question first?

PT: That's a tough question. I think the ACT and SAT at least in the short term will have significant benefit. Especially in South Dakota we tie that to a number of state scholarship programs. Until we have more comprehensive data on things like smarter balance and how accurately that will assess students' success in some of our courses, then I think we will find ourselves using some of these national assessments is for quite some time.

JBL: Great. And Emmy or Mary, do you guys want to take that?

MF: This is Mary. I actually agree with Paul. I think we are and also a point Laura made earlier. The measures research is just emerging. I think until we get some more solid evidence about the local measures and how they really play out with different students and different context and higher education institute still ‑‑ I think we will at least in the short term corporate, be more standardized competency to basic exams. We're seeing in the blueprint report, in the remedial section, I did reference there's kind of a growing number of days in the post‑secondary systems that are either allowing, encouraging or requiring the use of multiple measures. Connecticut new remedial policy, they're still ironing that out but that will require multiple measures. Same thing with California and Florida. There's some recent activity but I don't think there's a move away from some of these standardized exams. But you get what you see including the common core assessments, I think institutions are intrigued but they're taking a wait and see approach. I don't think they'll abandon them quite yet but it will expand these measures or understand the student readiness at the college level.

EG: I think the notion is there. I think the value and certainly the questions that a lot of the research of current practices and outcomes of our current placement policies especially in a certain student population is creating a lot of momentum around questioning around what we're using and how we're measuring student readiness. I think one of the key questions that will turn this to a more comprehensive approach is whether or not all of these are created equal. There are multiple measures but the research is still not quite there but are these multiple measures created equally. And is perhaps a collection of evidence the strongest way to measure student readiness. And let's be honest. I crude to work for the department of ed, higher ed. And there's hole stoic approaches andism of those areas of priority that we believe are valuable, are also very, you know, driven by resource and capacity needs of both our institutions, our systems in the secondary system. So I think the money and the capacity will always be an issue too in terms of how much we can actually used to validate and to see evidence. And more accurately place them.

JBL: Thanks Emmy. Laura can also answer that question.

LJ: Sure. My answer is in two parts. It's complicated. Until we come into a environment where some states are actually moving to use assessments like the ACT as their state assessment, then there becomes a blurry line between a placement exam and a state assessment. So from that perspective, it's just a bit complicated. The other is that we're starting to see a move of some states or I wouldn't say states but some institutes of higher education within a couple states are beginning to come out to say that they will be using the results from the smarter balance and park assessments in their placement of students into create‑bearing courses. Rl was starting to make that move with their park assessment. Washington state and West Virginia have made pledges to use the results of their smarter balance in placement of students in credit bearing courses.

I think it's starting to happen but I don't know, like the other panelists said, I don't know that we'll see a rapid or wholesale abandonment of the current placement test.

JBL: Great. I want to build on something that Emmy mentioned in her comments around the challenges of using and really building multiple measures as those are resource and a capacity issue. I want to dig into another issue which we pressed to talk about on this Webinar, which is around the communications issue. And how are we communicating with folks that some of these opportunities are available. And again, I'd like to start with Paul and we can work our way back up the panel for those who feel comfortable answering this question.

Paul, can you talk a little bit about how you are letting students know about, you know, these multiple opportunities to assess the rodeness. As well as the multiple entry points that you mentioned into the institutions of higher education. I know you talked about the portal but perhaps you can talk about broader strategies you have been using.

PT: We utilize the addresses that we get from students and districts, communicate directly to them. Our secretary of education also reaches out after we split and look at ACT score performance and now a year from now we'll do the smarter balance when those test schools are available. They do direct mailings to those students and their parents explaining to them what the various opportunities are for them.

The other place that we do it and I think it's normally as we each fall go through and I think you just spent some time talking about transition reports. But South Dakota has been doing transition reports like many other states for quite some time. We take the opportunity when we share the report with districts highlighting the impact that remediation has for their students and showing how those students tend to under perform both on credit hour production as well as GPA. Primarily because their district needs to encourage students to do something different or the district needs to do something with their curriculum that allows students to be more successful. And so we think that those two approaches are certainly garnering some benefits with a new scholarship program we implemented about ten years ago, our remediation has dropped by about 9%. We've also come out with a new dashboard that tracks the transition report data for every school district over a five year period so they can see what; is that correct trends they're starting to experience at the local level making an impact of their student performance as they move on.

JBL: Great. Thanks for sharing. Emmy, can you talk a little bit about what ECS is seeing as trends across this or how you are providing guidance on this issue.

EG: Sure. We just had a Webinar ourselves on talking about transfer policies in particular. And sharing results of the trend but also highlighting a couple examples. One of those we did in Florida for the very reason you can have the best policy in place but if it's not clearly communicated to the students families and educators then it really won't have the impact that we I think intended to. So Florida's doing a massive outreach to make sure that students who are transfer students and high school students are aware of all the courses, the students and the resources that they have available to them. And that's something that we're really excited to see and also just need to help them out.

I think the other thing in terms of communication that we're studying right now, we will be releasing a report and database on these questions. But looking at these 11th and 12th grade, this is like a trigger basically. Let's say if a student's in a smarter balance state one or two on that 11th grade assessment, what happens with that information. And so I think too that kind of gets this idea of communicating with our students and families about where they are. And then what does that mean in terms of the next school year. I would just add, when we're working at the role of student advising and looking at the importance of having our high school counselors and leaders and they have to communicate with the family in areas where we can improve and certainly reach our communications level.

JBL: Great. We'll look for those new resources coming from ECS.

Laura, can you talk a little bit about this issue but some of the resources that the CCRS center has well.

LJ: I would be happy to. I perspective I'm taking on this question as a technical assistance provider. We support states in implementing various education initiatives. And one thing that we have found is super important. No matter the particular initiative is that you have the right stakeholders at the table to help conceptualize, to buy in and to carry out. And within that process, it's super important that you do have very clear roles for all of these stakeholders. And one of them is being to communicate out to their various constituencies. What we've developed over the years of our existence at the center are products that do support the facilitation, taking states through a process by which they are bringing the stakeholders to the table coming up with an implementation plan and carrying it out. For anyone who is interested in any particular tools that we have, I encourage folks to get to our website or contact me directly.

JBL: Great, thanks so much, Laura. So I actually am going to end today's session a little bit early as we've gotten through most of our questions. We didn't have a chance to answer some of the specific questions folks have but we will happy connect with our presenters for you to follow up on those details. I hope you'll join me in thanking all of today's presenters. As you exit today's Webinar please fill out the feedback survey that will pop up on your screen and know all the information will be available on these two websites, the CCRS Center and the AYPF. Be sure to tune in on March 23rd at 3:30PM eastern time for our next Webinar in this series. Thank you to all our presenters today and we look forward to seeing you again online soon.