



College Readiness Mathematics Test (CRMT) Working Meeting
University of Washington, Roosevelt Commons B, 416
June 22, 2007, 9:00-5:00

Meeting synopsis:

1. Welcome and testing system overview
2. Individual tests
3. Items and test specifications from last meeting; CR and MPT-I comparative ratings
4. Item writing
5. Pre-test planning

1. **Welcome and testing system overview.** Nana Lowell, Director, OEA, welcomed the group and provided an overview of the testing system of which CRMT items and tests will be a part.

Testing system overview – Although the legislation (2007 Second Substitute House Bill 1906) supporting CRMT development refers only to the creation of a common college readiness test, ongoing maintenance and administration of a statewide exam requires a well-developed testing infrastructure such as that provided by the Academic Placement Testing Program (AFTP). The AFTP manages the current Math Placement Tests and is made up of several [components](#): an item bank and multiple test versions, continuously renewed; a complex test delivery process tailored to several test populations and conditions; test scoring and reporting directed to various constituencies; and a supporting database. Each of these AFTP components will be expanded and made more robust to accommodate statewide college readiness testing at high schools and post-secondary institutions.

2. **Individual tests.** Jerry Gillmore, Director Emeritus, OEA, led a discussion on the relationships among current Math Placement tests and a potential third test for use by post-secondary institutions.

In the original CRMT proposal, it was planned that the existing Math Placement Intermediate and Advanced tests be revised to conform to the CRMS, and that the revised Intermediate test then be used to determine college mathematics readiness for students entering post-secondary institutions. However, in the May 11 CRMT meeting, a consensus was reached that the criteria for college readiness should include readiness for math courses other than precalculus (such as finite math, introduction to probability and statistics, or math for elementary teachers, liberal arts or business majors).

To clarify the distinction between the existing precalculus test and a potential test for placement into general math, participants were asked to provide comparative ratings of the importance of CRMS components as described further below. The ratings and consequent discussion at the current, June 22 meeting, confirmed that the MPT Intermediate test, should retain its intended purpose of placement into precalculus (with some improvement of its alignment with the CRMS), but that a third post-secondary placement test should be created directed at general college math. Participants concurred that this test should not differ from the precalculus in difficulty, but only in content.

3. Items and test specifications from last meeting; CR and MPT-I comparative ratings.

Jon Peterson, Research Scientist, OEA, provided copies of the items developed at the May 11 meeting and presented the results of comparative ratings of CRMS components.

Comparative ratings of CRMS components – Subsequent to the May 11 meeting, participants were asked to repeat their ratings of the importance of each CRMS component in measuring college readiness, but this time to provide two sets of ratings, one for readiness for precalculus and the other for readiness for general college math. The resulting [comparative ratings](#) showed small prioritization differences across Number Sense and Geometry components but much larger differences for the other Content components. Whereas all four Probability/Statistics components were rated more important for assessing readiness for general college math than for precalculus, the opposite was true for all seven Algebra and Functions components. Although sizable differences were found for several Process components, none held across all components for a particular standard.

4. Item writing. The mid-part of the day was spent in writing items to fill in gaps from the previous item-writing session. Working group members were formed into four small groups made up of representatives from each sector (K-12, 2-year, 4-year). Each group was assigned the task of writing multiple-choice items for selected CRMS Content components. Participants were asked to map their items to one or more evidence of learning indicators and encouraged to write items in such a way to simultaneously target Process standards. Additionally, participants were asked to specify both correct and incorrect answers.

5. Pretest planning. To provide background for the fall pretest, Jon Peterson described a [recent MPT pilot test](#) at the UW and solicited possible fall 2007 pretest sites. In addition to UW Seattle, possible pretest sites were identified as: Eastern Washington University (10 sections of Math 115); UW Bothell; Spokane Falls and possibly Spokane CC; Pierce CC; Yakima CC and possibly Wenatchee CC.

Attending:

Linda Bolte	EWU	David Lippman	Pierce CC
Vauhn Foster Grahler	TESC	Bev Parnell	Yakima Valley CC
Cinnamon Hillyard	UW-Bothell	Katy Absten	Olympic ESD
Russ Killingsworth	SPU	Bradford Dallas	Nooksack Valley HS
Jane Lane	EWU	Dave Thielk	Central Kitsap SD
Michael Lundin	CWU	Bridget Monahan	Lake Spokane Elem
Ginger Warfield	UW	Jerry Gillmore	OEA
Jim Brady	Spokane Falls CC	Nana Lowell	OEA
Gary Glaze	Spokane Falls CC	Jon Peterson	OEA

Not attending:

Stuart Boersma	CWU	Bill Thelen	CWU
Ken Bube	UW	Tjalling Ympa	WWU
Linda Cave	WWU	Patrick Averbek	Edmonds CC
Jackie Coomes	EWU	Jan Ray	Seattle Central CC
Tom Henderson	CWU	Linda Brown	Spokane IEL
Jeanette Martin	WSU	Ron Donovan	OSPI

Guests:

Celia Gilger	OEA	Bill Moore	SBCTC
John House	TMP		