Acceleration and AB705

What we've done to accelerate students historically:

· Chabot's accelerated English 102 brought over to LPC (in 1999?) and dubbed English 104; as a result, we only ever had two levels below (if you don't count Learning Skills, which students could take concurrently with 100A), instead of the sometimes four levels below that other colleges had. We also used self-placement (not much guidance other than course description and counselor advice if student happened to meet with one?)

· Put many more students in 104 than there were in early 2000's, ironically by implementing a cut score—students had been self-placing in 100A more often, but that changed

· Allowed 100A students to challenge out of 104 and enter 1A

· ESL allowed ESL 25 students to take 104 final exam

· Studied placement and program through Faculty Inquiry Network grant

· Through California Acceleration Project grant, experimented with 104W, a sidecar course for 100A students who wanted to take 104; we let all students in except students who were trying to enter having only taken intermediate ESL (aside from disciplinary differences, that would essentially have been like skipping two courses)

· Following Long Beach study and Hetts data and conference presentation/visit to LPC flex day, expanded use of Multiple Measures in placement so that students with a 2.5 GPA could enter English 1A even if Accuplacer score low. For students with lower GPA, a high enough Accuplacer score could get them into 1A. Students coming from other countries or coming back to school after a long time only have Accuplacer as an option.

Data show that students can succeed with co-requisite support and other interventions:

http://accelerationproject.org/Placement
http://accelerationproject.org/Corequisites
http://accelerationproject.org/Two-Course-Pathways
http://accelerationproject.org/Publications
http://accelerationproject.org/Spotlights
http://accelerationproject.org/Portals/0/Documents/Cap_Up%20to%20the%20challenge_web_v4.pdf (Please read before retreat panel)

There is a lot of additional data, along with presentations we have made at conferences and town meetings and the like, on the English department site in "Acceleration."

"A community college district or college shall maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe, and use, in the placement of students into English and mathematics courses in order to achieve this goal, one or more . . . measures. . . ."

2.   **Address concerns addressed in law:**

·   Not lengthening time to degree without due cause

·   Not adding units without due cause

·   Not adding levels based on hunches, performance of individual students whom we've taught.

·   Need for us to make all decisions based on data concerning how students actually do.

What is allowed:

·   Concurrent support (sidecar class, for example): Law says we can only add this only "if it is determined that the support will increase their likelihood of passing the transfer-level English or mathematics course." (Michelle may have suggested to me that the research from other colleges who have added sidecar classes would be the evidence needed to make that determination.) I wonder about whether a writing sample for the students below 2.5 would also allow us to make the determination. We need to ask about the process to add/validate such a writing sample. Dawna DiMartini can speak to that at retreat. Craig Kutil attended a recent curriculum meeting on which the focus was AB705. Ashley, Julia, and I met with him, and he told us the following regarding sidecar courses: we cannot use GPAs to put students into corequisite courses. We can create a new credit course that includes double the amount of time for those below the 2.5 without having to provide statistical analysis required to prove that students wouldn't be successful in order to offer the co-requisite course. The statewide academic senate which gave the presentation suggests a 5 unit course (6 hours) and a 1 unit lab (3 hours) -- only 4 units would be transferable. In my view, this approach has a major downside -- we won't (unless we figured out a workaround) be able to have courses blended with a mix of skills. One obvious workaround would be to allow anyone who feels they need the support take it, regardless of GPA. In order to do this well, we would need to create some good marketing materials, which would be easier to do now that we don't have to be so secretive about our GPA ranges.

"The statewide MMAP analysis provides the direction here. It is divided into three GPA "bands" that relate to students' likelihood of success in 1A. [Michelle commented in a recent meeting that this data is from early adopters of more aggressive use of multiple measures.] For the second and third bands, this research would provide sufficient evidence to require a corequisite.

GPA above 2.6 – average success rate in 1A is 73% statewide -- this is your highly likely to succeed group that does not need a corequisite (as your own experience has shown)

GPA 1.9-2.6 – average success rate in 1A is 58% statewide – this group is still more likely to succeed than not, so you couldn't justify excluding them under AB705 (they're not "highly unlikely to succeed"); however, 58% isn't a strong a success rate as you'd like to see, so this would be a group you could flag for corequisite support, to get the success rate up closer to the first group.

GPA below 1.9 – average success rate in 1A is 43% statewide – while this success rate is the lowest, this group probably still does not meet the AB705 bar of "highly unlikely to succeed"; placing these students one level below also would not meet the "maximize the probability" standard because statewide MMAP research shows they are less likely to complete 1A in a year if required to start one-level-below than if they enroll directly in 1A (13% vs. 43%). But because 43% is a disappointing success rate, you'd want to require corequisite support."

She further explained the "maximize" language. She noted that other colleges have tried to interpret the one-year timeframe "to mean that as long as students CAN get through in a year, it's OK to place them one level below. However, that's not the legislative intent (as presented by two key legislative staff at the AB705 implementation team meetings). Basically the "maximize" requirement means students' placement cannot make them LESS LIKELY to complete 1A in a year than if they enroll directly in the transfer-level. As the data above show, for students with GPA below 1.9, starting in English 104 would make them less likely to complete (and 100a even more so)."

I asked her some more about the idea of requiring some students to take a course one level below based on a writing sample. She replied, "I know that you would not be able to use this to require/direct a student into a basic skills course that would make them less likely to complete 1A in a year," but I asked her why. To me, since the data is only based on success numbers and not on actual writing, I would like to make the case that a writing sample that does not indicate readiness would be sufficient, in combination

·   Students who are not passing (42% for GPA 1.9-2.6, 57% for GPA 1.9 and below). What do they need? How many of them might be "highly unlikely to succeed," and how would we find out?

How we should move forward:

- We should change the cut off to 2.6 from 2.5 to be in line with the state data. If MG, remembers correctly, this according to Ashley, might be very tricky to do the way Accuplacer works, but other schools are probably doing it.
- Work with "knowns"—we know that we want a 1A co-req.
- Research placement options and data on success with different types of co-requisites

Various co-req. options:

Option 1: 3 LEC unit 1A, keeping 1-hour TBA lab plus 2 LEC unit sidecar [or 3 LEC, to double the time as CCBC does?], ideally taught by same instructor

Include a 104-like exit exam in the curriculum for the sidecar class?
In the future, we might want to get rid of the 1-hour TBA lab and make the 1A four units, but this would require a revision to AA/AS and is a much more complex discussion.

Scheduling proposal:

Tuesday: 10-11:40 LEC
Thursday: 10-10:50 LEC, 10:55-11:45 LAB

The sidecar would be added onto this. 2 LEC would be two 50-minute sessions a week.

Placement: I initially thought that the placement would be the current cut score for 104, but the guidelines released March 22 seem to indicate that all students will be eligible for 1A + sidecar.
We may add a writing sample as a diagnostic, either along with the assessment or on the first day of class. The former option would cause fewer scheduling problems.

Benefits:
·   Gets rid of clunky lab

·   Could mimic Skyline's "promise," that students enrolled in 5-unit English, 5-unit math, 5-unit counseling get priority registration?
scheduling for students given increase in units and time
·   If all LEC units, this would be 6.25 CAH. Part-time instructor could still take 3 or 3.75-unit course. Could not take a 1A, though.

Disadvantages:
·   Would have to change units for AA/AS, but perhaps not if two of the units coded as pre-collegiate?
·   Might be hard to keep students at college level
scheduling for students given increase in units and time
·   additional time in 1A required for students who may not need it (could this be circumvented by using guided self-placement?)

Option 3 (a "down the road" option):
·   keep it a 3-unit 1A but add a 1-unit library skills co-req. We talked about this a couple of years ago—I think Angelo taught a 1A like this, and I had shown Tina Inzerilla a booklet explaining the curriculum. This would allow us to do 3 LEC unit 1A (3 hours, 3.75 CAH) plus 1-unit library coreq. (library load) plus a 1 LAB unit (3 hours, 1 CAH). That would be 4.75 CAH for us and 1 CAH for library, 5 units for students.

MW 1A class and 1A sidecar
T or R library class?

Or, to make scheduling less wonky, perhaps make sidecar .5 LAB units, only 1.5 hours, and then library co-req. is also .5 LAB units? Then you can have this:

Monday: 1A class and 1A sidecar (for those enrolled)
Wednesday: 1A class and library class (for all)

Total units for students 4.5, total CAH for us 4.25.

There's still the problem of bumping up AA/AS units, but the librarians might be willing to advocate with us. The AA and AS need to be revised soon anyway. Craig mentioned this at Academic Senate meeting.

Suggestions for further study of curriculum options and research of students' performance:

writing sample help us learn what we want to learn about students who have a GPA below 2.5. I do see the wisdom in including a writing sample in order to make ESL or LS recommendations.

· Work with DSP&S and new director to re-think learning skills classes and their relationship to our curriculum, ESL curriculum. Invite William Garcia to our very first department meeting so he can ask what is required by law, and what, beyond the law our, DSPS Center plans to do verses should be doing given AB705.

· Request data (success and throughput) on our students vs. versus students state-wide. We should include those who successfully complete 1A the first time after taking 104 even if it took more than a year because some students choose to wait even though they could complete 1A in a year.

· Request data on whether LPC students completing 1A at all is sharply reduced if they don't complete these key courses in one year.

As for the concern that standards are being lowered, continuing SLO and other research (norming?) on this would be important, expanding to cover grammar, perhaps comparing current work to papers from the semester before the change, looking at reading. We know from our 104 experience that some students with poor grammar can pass a class if they're very diligent.

· Marty asked a great question--will students' GPA suffer if they take a while to pass 1A? That might be something to note in counseling of students. I wonder, too, if certain students would be more likely to pass 1A in one year if they do 104 first vs. repeating 1A three times. Can we do research on who is repeating?

· Relatedly, Richard is curious to find out "pass 1A success rates for our 104 students versus state wide (including 104 students who pass 1A but take longer than a year because they choose to skip a semester or more in between)"

· As we work to implement this in conjunction with the state guidelines, we will want to keep contrarian views in mind and watch student success, studying why more students are successful as well as why some students are still not successful even with additional support. Here is one example of a contrarian point of view, and there are likely more from NADE (the National Association of Developmental Education) and others.

http://communitycollegedata.com/articles/the-corequisite-reform-movement/. This article, for example, might inspire us to keep a close watch on whether earlier completion of 1A improves graduation/completion rates or not.

· Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIG's) to study 25% of students not passing 1A--market sidecar to them?

· FIG's to study how students do in sidecar and in parent 1A course

- How has your orientation changed? How do you advise students? Are they automatically placed according to your new placement procedure, or do you have guided self-placement or both?
- How do students feel about doing transfer-level work? What is their experience of high-unit path to 1A completion, of sidecar? Do some choose to do course one level below, and if so, how do they feel about that?
- How do you offer reading instruction? How is it different than what you do to teach reading in the stand-alone first year transfer-level course?
- How is the writing process taught differently in transfer-level course versus in co-requisite?
- Does the co-req. go beyond the required 6,000 final draft words? If not, does it provide more informal writing practice, scaffolding, etc.?
- Has your English program coordinated with other programs like math, ESL, DSP&S in making this change? How will your acceleration pilot/program fit into Guided Pathways work?
- Does your department still offer basic skills classes? If so, how is the structure of those courses changing? Has the cap been lowered or curriculum changed?
- Did the new pilot/program change your hiring practices because of 10.05 unit limit? Scheduling?
- What has your professional development model been?
- Do you use themes, and if so, do you think that helps and why? Are themes pre-announced in schedule of classes?
- Do you use portfolios in the co-requisite and/or in the stand-alone transfer-level course?
- What would you like that you don't have?

For Dawna (sidecar, writing assessment):
- How did you validate the writing assessment? Do you think it accounts for your higher success rates, at least as reported in *Up to the Challenge*, compared to Skyline and Solano?
- Since students who place directly into transfer-level comp. don't have to do a writing sample, might you be blocking entry to transfer-level comp. for students who might succeed but who struggle with in-class writing?
- How does passing/failing in the co-req. affect progression?
- How is the course structured?
- How would you describe general dynamic of the class? Is mix of students beneficial? How do you do peer review with mix of skill levels?
- Does it feel strange to have the number of "underprepared" students outweigh the number of students who are placed in 1A without needing co-requisite?