Dynamics of Change: How One District Bridged their Differences

Presenters:
Chase Fischerhall
Community College Associate
@CLPORG

Mina Dadgar, PhD
Director of Research
@CLPORG
Making College Ready for our Students
A Case Study of Improving Placement & Remediation Redesign
Statement of the Problem

“For too long, we have focused on making sure students are ready for college...we now also need to make sure our colleges are ready for students”

- Community College Faculty
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General characteristics of K-12 reform

• Common Core
• Academies
• College readiness curriculum and coaching
• WBL, contextualized curriculum
CURRENT MODEL FOR ALIGNMENT: K12 TO Post-secondary

- Programmatic
- Focused pathways
- Faculty to faculty, counselor to counselor
- Articulation agreements, dual enrollment

But how will this help if the college is not student-ready?
Making College Ready for Our Students
Latino, African American, and low-income students are overrepresented in developmental education.

### Share of students in developmental education by demographic group

- **Latino**: 87%
- **African American**: 87%
- **Low-income**: 86%
- **Female**: 80%
- **White**: 73%
- **Asian American**: 70%

2009–10 cohort average.
Dev Ed Sorting System

Student Progression Through the Developmental Math Sequence

- 100% (63,650) Referred to 3+ Levels of Remediation
- 26% Did Not Enroll in Next Course
- 15% Level 3+ Course
- 7% Level 2 Course
- 4% Level 1 Course
- 4% Gatekeeper
- 2% Did Not Pass/Complete Course
- 11% Passed Gatekeeper Math

Source: CCRC
Student Progression Through the Developmental Reading Sequence

- 100% (11,210) Referred to 3+ Levels of Remediation
- 29% Did Not Enroll in Next Course
- 9% Level 3+ Course
- 4% Level 2 Course
- 5% Level 1 Course
- 2% Did Not Pass/Complete Course
- 29% Passed Gatekeeper English

Source: CCRC
Improving Placement

➢ In mathematics 1 in 4 students are severely misplaced; in English 1 in 3 are severely misplaced (Scott Clayton 2012; Belfield and Crosta 2012; Scott-Clayton, Crosta & Belfield 2012).

➢ Being placed too low is 5-6 times more common that being placed too high.(Scott Clayton 2012; Belfield and Crosta 2012; Scott-Clayton, Crosta & Belfield 2012)

➢ Using GPA and course grades can substantially reduce placement errors.

--GPA alone instead of the tests cut placement error by half in North Carolina and in Alaska (Crosta and Belfield (2012; Hodara 2015)
--Success in Math and English Courses also helpful (Scott-Clayton et al 2012; Bahr et al 2014)
Bracco, Dadgar & Finklestein 2013
F2012 Promise Pathways vs. Fall 2011 2-year rates of achievement

Successfully Completed Transfer Math: 13% (F2011 LBUSD), 23% (F2012 Promise Pathways)
Successfully Completed Transfer English: 24% (F2011 LBUSD), 52% (F2012 Promise Pathways)
Successful Completion of English 3: 3% (F2011 LBUSD), 20% (F2012 Promise Pathways)
Behavioral Intent to Transfer: 31% (F2011 LBUSD), 54% (F2012 Promise Pathways)

Source: Hetts, J. 2014
Co-Requisite Remediation & Math for Pathways
Accelerating College Entry

College Math Taken by Students in Tennessee Community Colleges Co-Requisite Scale Implementation, Fall 2015

- Algebra: 21%
- Math for Liberal Arts: 14%
- Probability and Statistics: 64%

Source: Belfield, Jenkins, Lahr (2016).
Completion of Gateway English by ACT Sub-score

TBR Co-requisite Full Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-score</th>
<th>Full Implementation - Fall 2015</th>
<th>Full Implementation Fall &amp; Spring 2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=13</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ACT</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6071 Students

7147 Students

Source: Denley, TBR, 2016
One Districts’ Efforts

• Our case study: SMCCCD
• Process (and auspicious timing)
• The Story: Beginnings
SMCCCD: What were they looking for?

- Evidence-based (forwards equity and student success)
- Alignment
- Innovation
Multiple Measures Model

1. College adopted policies and practices as a pilot

2. Faculty reps convened to discuss evidence-based practices and models to adopt in order to scale

3. Faculty carried proposals from each convening to departments and divisions

4. Proposals approved or revised, carried back to next convening.

5. Outcomes summarized, shared with Implementation Team.

Timeline

Early adopters =>
Faculty Convenings =>
   Small group => large group
Implementation => Evaluation.
Feedback from this process?

What was missing - an earlier opportunity for English, ESOL/ESL, Math and Counseling faculty to discuss proposals together.

Other thoughts?
Why did this work?
In what ways did it not work?
What was the role of the facilitators?
Process (what worked for SMCCCD)

- Pre-work to document what had been done
- Clear timeline, roles & expectations
- Inclusive process (representative decision making and campus vetting)
- Evidence-based framing
- Communication at all levels
1. Placement based on GPA & Grades in Math and English

Effects of Districtwide conversation:
- Increased access more than any of the colleges would have working alone, by lowering threshold and revisiting unnecessary restrictions
- More inclusive than even the state standards (MMAP)
2. Remove Barriers to Students taking advantage of MM policy

• Unnecessary Recency Requirements
• Requiring transcript records
High school GPA is only good for recent graduates

Decay function for the predictive utility of HSGPA on Math grades

Correlation between Predictor and 1st CC Math Grade

Semesters of Delay (approx. 6 months each)
Potential use of self-reported high school info

• UC admissions uses self-report but verifies after admission
  – 2008: 9 campuses, 60,000 students. No campus had >5 discrepancies between reported grades and student transcripts: http://bit.ly/UCSelfReportGPA

• College Board: Shawn & Matten, 2009: “Students are quite accurate in reporting their HSGPA”, $r(40,299) = 0.73$: http://bit.ly/CBSRGPA

• ACT research often uses self-reported GPA, generally find it to be a highly powerful predictor and highly correlated with students actual GPA: ACT, 2013: $r(1978) = 0.84$ http://bit.ly/ACTSRGPA
## High School GPA and Self-reported HSGPA


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSGPA Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean HSGPA</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Self-reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50–4.00</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00–3.49</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50–2.99</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00–2.49</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50–1.99</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00–1.49</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Guided Self Placement in English

- Skyline was able to share their decision tree and GSP platform with their sister colleges; all campuses adopted versions of it – validation in one year and two

**MULTIPLE MEASURES**

Are you ready to take college level English, math, or ESOL courses?

*What is Alternative Placement (aka Multiple Measures)?* Skyline College is able to use Alternative Placement (also known as Multiple Measures) as an assessment measure in addition to (or instead of) the college placement test to place some students into a college level English, math or ESOL course. A counselor works with a student to determine appropriate placement in courses a student will take their first semester in college.

Skyline College offers two Alternative Placement options:

- **OPTION A - Alternative Placement Test Score:** Students who have achieved at or above the required score on an alternative placement test (ie. AP, IB, EPT, etc.) may waive the Skyline College Placement Test and be placed into appropriate English, math, or ESOL courses according to these test results.

- **OPTION B - High School Transcripts:** Current high school Senior (grade 12) students or students who have graduated high school within the last two years may use qualifying grades in high school
3. Expanding the co-requisite model across the district

- Provided a forum to continue this conversation, which had reached a wall
- English faculty now working on co-developing curriculum to align their co-requisite models
General Implications for Implementation

**Math**
- Remove any Recency for GPA/Grades (see CSM’s exception for placing students above transfer level)
- Recommend students reporting their GPA/grades (recommend not requiring transcripts)
- ALEKS PPL.

**English**
- Remove any recency requirements
- Similar Platform as Math, AND integrate guided self placement questions
- Accuplacer as a last resort (thresholds included)
Future Faculty Discussions

Math

Guided self-placement

English

Canada adopting co-requisite model in English 105

ESL

TOEFL
Implementation Lessons learned

- Collaboration between Counseling and Instruction
- Campus Wide Communication
- Inclusion of both faculty and staff in decision making, messaging and framing (include those who work directly with students)
- Considerations of workload and turnaround
- Comprehensive communication with high school partners
Next Steps

• Formative qualitative and quantitative evaluation
• Other Dev Ed reforms
• Guided Pathways
Intersegmental collaboration key to Dev Ed reform

Examples of Collaboration Efforts that can include Placement reform or other Dev Ed reform:

• CPTs
• Promise pathways
Thank you!

LINKEDLEARNING.ORG
GUIDED PATHWAY DESIGN PRINCIPLES

1. GUIDED EXPLORATION FOR UNDECIDED STUDENTS

2. CLEARLY DELINEATED PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (DEFAULT SEQUENCE)

3. PROACTIVE AND INTEGRATED ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORTS

4. DEV ED TRANSFORMATION
Organized National, State, and Regional Efforts to Implement Guided Pathways at Scale

Note. The institutions shown on this map are community colleges and universities involved in organized national, statewide, or regional guided pathways initiatives. A growing number of two- and four-year institutions are implementing pathways on their own.

http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/guided-pathways-scale-adoption-initiatives.pdf
We already talked about comprehensive Dev Ed Redesign
Two-Year Course Sequence Beginning in the Fall Semester

You can use the following pattern to complete an Associate in Science Degree for Transfer in Business Administration. This is only one possible pattern. If you wish to earn an associate degree, you must participate in the Student Success Program (Matriculation), which includes assessing academic skills and developing a Student Education Plan (SEP) with a counselor. This plan will map your sequence of courses to help you complete your degree regardless of the semester you begin classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Semester/Fall</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 010 Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 016A Calculus for Business and the Life and Social Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Elective Courses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Semester/Spring</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 002 Introduction to Business Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 001 Principles of Economics (Macro-Economics)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Elective Courses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Semester/Fall</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 001A Financial Accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 002 Principles of Economics (Micro-Economics)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Elective Courses</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Semester/Spring</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 001B Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 013 Introduction to Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Elective Courses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE SEQUENCE FOR AA IN BUSINESS - CALIFORNIA CC

- BUS5001A: Financial Accounting
- BUS5002: Introduction to Business Law
- BUS5010: Introduction to Business
- MATH200: Elementary Algebra
- MATH201: Intermediate Algebra – Part 1
- MATH202: Intermediate Algebra – Part 2
- MATH203: Intermediate Algebra (Lab) - A-D
- MATH204: Intermediate Algebra (Lab) A-D
- MATH205: Elementary Algebra
- MATH206: Introductory Statistics
- MATH207: Pre-Calculus
- MATH208: Trigonometry
- MATH209: Precalculus with Analytic Geometry
- MATH220: Mathematics for Technicians
- MATH221: Business and the Life and Social Sciences
10% of students majoring in Business reached Math 016A within 5 years
• >50% Concerned about making a mistake when choosing classes
• (Moore & Shulock, 2014)

• Surprised to find that courses taken do not count towards credentials (Nodine et al 2012)
Guided Pathways

- Structure & guidance to help students explore careers and programs

- Clarity of the path to student goals

- Make Sure students are Learning

Thomas Bailey, Director, CCRC
Shanna Jaggars, Assistant Director, CCRC
Davis Jenkins, Sr. Research Associate, CCRC
So how might these reforms fit together?
Areas of Overlap

- Dual Enrollment within Meta-Majors
- Counselors specialize in meta-majors
- Developmental education reform and multiple measures
  - KEY WORD: Collaboration
We hope to answer throughout the course of this presentation:

• Why is Dev Ed reform necessary to improving college outcomes?
• What does Dev Ed reform look like in practice (one community college’s story)
Remedial Placement Rates by Race