Four important emphases

1. Institutional Scorecard
2. Multiple Measures
3. CCSSE
4. Equity


Principle 1: provided necessary context for valid interpretations. This is reflected in:

a. Comprehensive content – the eventual uses of the scorecard data cannot be anticipated in advance, and users need whatever breadth of content can reliably be delivered, so that they can develop answers that are congruent with their questions and needs.

b. Nested content – uses will vary in levels of abstraction, and users need to be able to navigate the scorecard in a nested manner so that individuals can drill deeper into the data to develop or test their thinking, and drill up to summarize and apply their thinking in a broader scope. Think Google Maps.

c. Cross-correlations – whatever necessary information is available should be provided to give cross-correlations to the standard success/completion data elements. For example, longitudinal data, comparative data, association standards, etc. Again, neither the necessary context for understanding nor the application of understanding can be anticipated, so flexibility, adaptability and power of the data model(s) are paramount.

Principle 2: good design is integral to good understanding. This is reflected in:

a. Aesthetic design – think web 2.0; think Edward Tufte’s books on the design aspects to communicating numerical data, the human need to visualize data, and the need to avoid meaningless distractions (or what Tufte calls “chart junk”)

b. Functional design - there needs to be well-defined portals into the scorecard that anticipate levels of entry, levels of initial engagement that provide users with different, and for them intuitive ways to walk into the complex information. This has the different framework data strands; currently there are four of them.

Principle 3: the data must have ownership and commitment. This is reflected in:
a. Social development – the scorecard is developed socially and in community through an interactive process of engagement and discussion.

b. Social engagement – the scorecard is developed for engagement. If the scorecard had its own scorecard, it would give points to how well the scorecard generates a campus-wide ownership of the data and intrinsically motivates change in practice to move the dial on the scorecard.

II. Multiple Measures

Title 5 § 55502(i) clearly mandates that California community colleges should use multiple measures in their assessment processes: “‘Multiple measures’ are a required component of a district’s assessment system and refer to the use of more than one assessment measure in order to assess the student” [emphasis added]. The requirement to use multiple measures is reiterated in Title 5 § 55522(a): “When using an English, mathematics, or ESL assessment test for placement, it must be used with one or more other measures to comprise multiple measures.”

Under Title 5 § 53200 gives academic senates responsibility for making recommendations about the academic and professional matter regarding “standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.”

In addition to assessment tests, Title 5 § 55502(i) notes that additional measures may include “interviews, holistic scoring processes, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or college transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, education and employment histories, and military training and experience.” Furthermore, Title 5 § 55522(a)(2) allows the Chancellor’s Office to “identify other measures of a student’s college readiness that community college districts may use for student placement into the college’s curriculum.”

As noted in these Title 5 sections, the initial assessment process must consist of multiple measures, meaning that all the various measures must be collected and evaluated prior to determining the student’s placement and before the student is notified of his or her placement. Colleges that rely only on assessment tests for initial placement but then allow other measures to be considered on appeal of the decision are not employing a multiple measures approach to placement. Instead they have a single measure placement approach with a multiple measures appeals process.

Since Title 5 § 55502(i) indicates that multiple measures are a required component of a college or district’s assessment system, colleges must also implement multiple measures of assessment for any subject in which there is an assessment for placement process, and these measures should be determined using data that provide knowledge about each measure’s usefulness and accuracy.

Regulatory Discussion on Assessment Tests
Of the set of possible multiple measures, Title 5 places the most stringent guidelines on assessment tests for placement. Using guidelines prepared by the Chancellor’s Office, districts and colleges must validate all assessment tests to ensure that the tests are being used in a proper manner and that the tests show little or no cultural or linguistic bias. (Title 5 § 55522(a)(1)). In general, with minor exceptions, the following mandates and restrictions apply to all assessment tests:

- Assessment test procedures must be clearly communicated to students including the availability of sample tests, how assessment test results will inform placement decisions, and any limits that the college or district places on retakes of the assessment test. [§ 55522(b)]

- Assessment tests must be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. [§ 55522(c)(1)]

- Assessment tests may not be used in a manner or for a purpose other than that for which it was developed or otherwise validated. [§ 55522(c)(2)]

- Assessment tests may not be used to deny admission to a college. [§ 55522(c)(3)]

- Assessment tests may not be used to exclude students from any particular course or educational program, except that districts may establish appropriate prerequisites. [§ 55522(c)(4)]

The second recent event prompting renewed attention to prerequisites was the adoption of revised Title 5 regulations regarding prerequisites, Title 5 §55003, by the Board of Governors in March 2011. From a multiple measures standpoint, one of the most significant revisions was the clarification that the requirement for the use of multiple measures is not satisfied by simply using two highly-correlated assessment instruments (Title 5 §55003(k)). Although colleges may use two assessment tests to determine placement or readiness, the two tests may not both be measuring essentially the same (i.e. highly correlated) knowledge, skills, and abilities. The currently accepted standard for “highly correlated” is a correlation of 0.75 or higher.

Long Beach Study STEPS and follow up-

1) Data analysis to implementation.

The first step was a combination of open and multiple presentations of our findings, strong leadership support, and a willingness to answer any question and talk about data for as long as anyone was willing to listen. Met with the Math faculty between 6-8 times over 3 months - one as a collective and the others with a group of 5-6 faculty and the department
chair to address any questions they had and to talk through the data and the implications of the data and what that would mean in the long term. That got us to the stage where we all agreed on piloting multiple measures assessment and what the parameters of that assessment would be (A or B in senior year English, students in Math predicted to be at least as successful as a whole as the average success rate in the course using all significant predictors of college math performance: HS GPA, Math grade, A-G courses, Math CST, and last HS Math course taken). The good news is that there are significantly more resources available to do the research locally and that support the approach more broadly than when we started.

The second step was how to generate the assessments. There's a lot of different pieces to that but it can be summed up by saying that we reverse engineered the original data analysis using the logit link function (i.e., weighting the components of the alternative assessment in proportion to their utility for predicting student success) to create a method for assigning placements to new students. Working with LBUSD, we arranged to have them share data from graduating seniors which we could then use to generate alternative placements. To do this, we worked with them to set up the file structure for queries, to arrange for consent for data sharing from students, and parents for students under 18 (this step has been far simplified and grew out of an exceptionally cautious initial interpretation of FERPA), a secure method of file transfer, and revised our institutional MOU. Our method is based around data that K-12 has to produce for the CA DoE and formatted in the way they have to format it to submit it to Cal-PASS but it could be easily adapted for other delivery mechanisms/formats.

The third step was how to deliver the assessments to students. Here again, we were overly cautious compared to the way we've simplified it now. After we generated placements for students, we created large datasets of student information, pulled them into Excel, and then mail merged them into individual student plans, prepopulating student info, the Accuplacer placements, the alternative placements, AP courses, and a number of randomly assigned groups for different pilots to reduce the amount of work Counselors had to do. These were provided to the counseling department digitally for access from anywhere counseling was being held and then they met with as many of the students as
possible to help ease students into taking English, Math, and Reading courses (and participating in other pilots). These were delivered in counseling workshops with a small overview and then very short individual appointments.

2) Additional supports
A) School-provided registration - for the first term, we registered students in classes based on their preferences. This was a disaster and undermined the first semester of the program significantly by enrolling students in impossible combinations, such as enrolling students in courses back to back at different campuses with only 10 minutes between them. We've switched this to registration workshops for first semester students only where we reserve one of our large computer labs for two days during their initial registration period and staff it with counselors and enrollment services professionals to provide an overview to registration at the college and assistance as needed.
B) First year success courses - every student, unless they opted out, was randomly assigned to receive one of two success courses in each of their first two semesters. There was little evidence that these courses significantly influenced same or subsequent term success or persistence (except to a limited extent for students that the multiple measures assessment suggested were likely to do poorly) so we've scaled that back to a single, one-unit course except for non-declared students who also receive an additional 1-unit career exploration course.
C) Achievement coaches. A subset of the first year students were randomly assigned to receive achievement coaches, masters level students in education or counseling that could act as achievement coaches to complete service credits or for a very small stipend. Though they didn't seem to have much effect for students more likely to succeed, they had a meaningful impact on students who evidence suggested would be unlikely to do well. It increased their success rates somewhat and increased their likelihood of persisting more meaningfully. However, this has proven challenging to maintain on an ongoing basis for a variety of reasons, most notably that without being associated with a course, finding ways to maintain participation was challenging.

3) Existing supports - two supports that already existed but were not
having the significant impact on improving success rates or achievement of key milestones that we had hoped were nonetheless maintained.

Early registration - students who completed assessment and orientation by mid-May traditionally have received an earlier registration slot as an incentive to do so in order to encourage responsible development of an education plan and better enrollments in students first semester. Students throughout greater Long Beach have also, since 2008, received the first semester of college tuition free (our foundation covers the tuition fees of non-BOGG fee waiver eligible students for the first semester). Both of these were rolled into the new program.

4) Planned supports that we have been unable to implement:
   A) Early alert - we've got better data on need for intervention than almost any community college but are not sure how to translate that into intervention delivery, which ones, and how to manage that process.
   B) Point of contact - to create a continuous sense of engagement, we were hoping to execute something like PCC’s College 1 course but that would create a single, continuous point of contact for students so they had a consistent advocate on campus, not unlike a blend of a success course and freshman advisors in 4-year institutions. Too many stakeholders found this alternative threatening which led to B and C above.
   C) Timed second semester and second year activities - we ambitiously expected to be able to design into the program key elements after the first semester timed to desired student trajectories. Found that we couldn't pull it off because at that point in time, we were deep in planning/tweaking for cohort two and didn't have the additional bandwidth to sustain additional activity for cohort one.

Long beach Steps Project - http://www.rpgroup.org/projects/STEPS

CCRC RESEARCH OVERVIEW Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform  February 2013
http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf

A Framework for Evaluating the Technical Quality of Multiple Measures Used in California Community College Placement Rachel Lagunoff, Hillary Michaels, Patricia Morris, and Pamela Yeagley at WESTEd
Predicting Success in College: The Importance of Placement Tests and High School Transcripts (February 2012) Belfield and Crosta

Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform
http://cerc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf

(This is a good article on the problems with reform in developmental education particularly with reference to placement. The brief shows a large placement error rate produced by using standardized tests by themselves (30% in English and 25% in Math). That error is reduced (in half) by adding HS grades)

Do High-Stakes Placement Exams Predict College Success? By: Judith Scott-Clayton

Improving the Targeting of Treatment: Evidence from College Remediation Clayton, Crosta, Belfield Oct 2012 National Bureau of Economic Research (Discusses the cost of misplacement on a National Scale.)

Why Traditional Placement Testing Is Being Replaced by Multiple Measures By Brad Bostian
Leadership Extract League of Innovation December 2012, Volume 25, Number 12
http://league.org/blog/post.cfm/why-traditional-placement-testing-is-being-replaced-by-multiple-measures

Multiple Measures Placement – Improving Placement Accuracy with ACCUPLACER and Background Information (College Board) The company solution to their inaccuracy

Meaningful Access and Support (August 2013) Martha E. Casazza and Sharon L. Silverman
http://www.cladea.net/white_paper_meaningful_access.pdf

“This paper is a call to action for U.S. colleges and universities and higher education policymakers to provide meaningful access and academic support for all students. Meaningful access and academic support are imperative to increase graduation rates, develop an educated workforce, strengthen the economy, and compete globally.”
NADE resolution on Placement Testing Dec 2010 – A Standing and revised resolution


Basic Skills Accountability (CCCCO.Nov 2012)

http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/Basic%20Skills/2012/REPORT_BASICSKILLS_FINAL_110112.pdf

III. CCSSE

Administrators and Weekly updates from the data

IV. Equity

Equity & Research Into Equity Workgroup

Scope: Gather, research, synthesize and analyze data related to disproportionate impact within services provided to the student population. Identify barriers toward achieving student equity which leads to student success. Identify goals and recommendations aligning with the Student Success Plan. Efforts will be made to research and strategize action plans and recommendations for the student success indicators. The plan will be guided by the College’s Values, Goals and Core Values wherein the commitment to student equity:

College Value:

Fostering a learning environment that respects and supports the diversity of people, ideas, learning styles and instructional methodologies.

Student Success College Goal:

Become an exemplary model of student success be developing and implementing best practices.

Diversity Core Value:

We insist that diversity be valued and promoted, recognizing that multiple perspectives lead to a better education and knowledge of the world; listening and witnessing different experiences helps us to understand and contextualize power and privilege related to gender, race, class, religion, disability and sexuality in terms of access and barriers to resources and opportunities.
The scope of work involves six student success indicators:

Success Indicator (A): Access

The percentage of each population group that is enrolled compared to that group’s representation in the adult population within the community served. This percentage is frequently calculated as a participation rate.

Success Indicator (B): Course Completion

The ratio of the number of credit courses that students, by populations group complete compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term.

Success Indicator(C): ESL and Basic Skills Completion

The ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course compared to the number of those students who complete such a final course.

Success Indicator (D): Degree and Certificate Completion

The ratio of the number of students by population group who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal as documented in the student educational plan developed with a counselor/advisor.

Success Indicator (E): Transfer

The ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English, to the number of students in that group who actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years.

Success Indicator (F): Student Success and Support Program Services

The effect of the requirements related to mandatory participation of new students in SSSP services and enrollment priority on indicators A-E, as well as the loss of Board of Governors (BOG) fee waiver of new student.

Policy Needs: New policies, updating policies or policy changes may have to be made depending on the disproportionate impact and analysis of data.

Critical Relationships: Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Campus Constituents, College Committees, Kern Community College District

Professional Development Needs:

1) Create Student Equity Training
2) Align SSSP trainings to include student equity
3) Include student equity with program review training
4) Hold brown bag lunch series on student equity

Research/Data Protocols:

CCCCO Data Mart
CCCO Data on Demand
Student Success ScoreCard
Basic Skills Tracker
Local Student Information System

Work Plan:

- Identify and explore the issue: How is the college monitoring disproportionate impact now? Explore the sample research.
- Develop shared understandings of the meaning of data
- Plan and design actions: Given the data and analysis, what changes need to be made and/or addressed? Develop actions plans to mitigate the impact disparities in student equity wherever possible
- Identify strategies and approaches to address the way students are affected by various activities/programs implemented to provide equal opportunity for each student population group.
- Implement/recommend change
- Integrate student equity into other institutional planning processes and program review
- Address key SSSP services regarding, student access, equity and disproportionate impact:
  - Admissions
  - Assessment and Placement
  - Counseling and Advising (educational planning)
  - Follow-Up Services (evaluation of student process)
  - Prerequisites

Report: Please use outline of Report Format as guide