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Agenda

• 10:00-10:15 - Introductions and overview of workshop
• 10:15-10:45 - Results from early adopters of AB 705
• 10:45-12:00 - College experiences
  – Irvine Valley College, Saddleback College and Citrus College
• 12:00-12:30 - Networking lunch
• 12:30-1:30 - Breakout sessions/Facilitated discussions
  – Course Sequencing and Supports: Oxnard College - English
  – Supporting Faculty: Citrus College
  – Guided Self-Placement: MiraCosta College
  – Messaging and Communication: Saddleback College
  – Multiple Measures Platform: CCC Tech Center
• 1:30-2:15 - Report out from breakout sessions
• 2:15-2:45 - Q&A with the Chancellor’s Office
• 2:45-3:00 Closing
Results from Early Adopters of AB 705
De Anza College
Change in ENGL1A Success Rate and Volume of Successful Completions: Fall 2017 vs. Fall 2018

The overall success rate increased by 1% and total successful completions increased by 218 total students. < 2.6 HSGPA eligible in fall 2018.
The overall success rate remained the same and the total successful completions increased by 398 total students. Open access to statistics in fall 2018.
Foothill College
Open enrollment in Fall 2018, with tutors added to some sections. Overall success rate declined from 71% to 62%, but the number of successful completions increased.
Open enrollment into sections offered with a corequisite in Fall 2018. Overall success rate declined from 63% to 60%, but the number of successful completions increased.
Cabrillo College
Cabrillo College
Change in Math Success Rates and Volume of Completions

While the overall success rate for Statistics decreased, total completions increased by 156 students. Open access to statistics in fall 2018. Success in 1st calculus course increased 18% and by 133 total students. Default placement rules.
Change in English Success Rates and Volume of Completions

The overall success rate for English1A + corequisite remained the same but the stand alone English1A decreased 1%, total completions increased by 633 students. Default placement rules.
College of the Redwoods
Initial Math & English Level: Of students beginning the Math or English sequence at CR, what percent began in a transfer-level course?
Transfer-Level Enrollment & Success: How many transfer-level enrollments result in success?

### Transfer-Level English
- **Enrollment #**
  - Fall 2013: 220
  - Fall 2014: 259
  - Fall 2015: 288
  - Fall 2016: 281
  - Fall 2017: 339
  - Fall 2018: 426

- **Successful #**
  - Fall 2013: 145
  - Fall 2014: 172
  - Fall 2015: 207
  - Fall 2016: 214
  - Fall 2017: 274

- **Success Rate**
  - Fall 2013: 66%
  - Fall 2014: 66%
  - Fall 2015: 72%
  - Fall 2016: 63%
  - Fall 2017: 63%

### Transfer-Level Math
- **Enrollment #**
  - Fall 2013: 179
  - Fall 2014: 195
  - Fall 2015: 190
  - Fall 2016: 195
  - Fall 2017: 185
  - Fall 2018: 352

- **Successful #**
  - Fall 2013: 127
  - Fall 2014: 132
  - Fall 2015: 126
  - Fall 2016: 104
  - Fall 2017: 107

- **Success Rate**
  - Fall 2013: 71%
  - Fall 2014: 68%
  - Fall 2015: 66%
  - Fall 2016: 53%
  - Fall 2017: 58%

**Initial course in subject at CR?**
- Yes
- No
First-Time Enrollment in Transfer-Level English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Below transfer-level</th>
<th>Transfer-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 15</td>
<td>1,061 (50%)</td>
<td>1,061 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 16</td>
<td>1,072 (51%)</td>
<td>1,072 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 17</td>
<td>1,134 (53%)</td>
<td>1,134 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 18</td>
<td>1,134 (53%)</td>
<td>1,870 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 15: 2,137 (100%)
Fall 16: 2,109 (100%)
Fall 17: 2,154 (100%)
Fall 18: 1,870 (100%)
First-Time Enrollment in Transfer-Level Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Below transfer-level</th>
<th>Transfer-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 15</td>
<td>2,291 (n=405)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 16</td>
<td>1,940 (n=366)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 17</td>
<td>2,165 (n=511)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 18</td>
<td>1,971 (n=1,101)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18% (n=405) 19% (n=366) 24% (n=511) 56% (n=1,101)
One-Year Completion in Transfer-Level English

- Fall 15-Spring 16: 49%
- Fall 16-Spring 17: 55%
- Fall 17-Spring 18: 54%
- Spring 2019: 65%
One-Year Completion in Transfer-Level Math

- Fall 15-Spring 16: 19%
- Fall 16-Spring 17: 23%
- Fall 17-Spring 18: 28%
- Fall 18: 32%
- Fall 18 Statistics: 59%
- Spring 2019: 59%
# Statistics and English 101 Course Success Rate: Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistics (with Corequisite)</th>
<th>Statistics (Regular)</th>
<th>Statistics (Overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rate</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading &amp; Composition (with Corequisite)</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Composition (Regular)</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Composition (Overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Which of the following best captures your feeling about this course?*

- This course is too easy for me. (5%)
- This course is the right level for me. (73%) - the majority of students felt the course was just right for them
- This course is too difficult for me. (22%)

...but how well did these students do in the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5 Response</th>
<th>Total respondents (that provided Student ID)</th>
<th>% of respondents successful in course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course is too easy for me.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course is the right level for me.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course is too difficult for me.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Growth Mindset”

“when I understand the concept...once I make that connection and understand it, it makes me feel happy. When you’re happier, you are going to try harder and be more successful so I do feel like this class has made me feel better about myself mentally.”
- Samantha

“I feel like it’s mostly having the confidence to be able to do the math work because I know in high school I didn’t have the confidence. I still overthink myself but I keep trying...”
- Oscar

“We learned how to struggle in the beginning will actually help you succeed in life. I learned when we get the problem we struggle to figure out how to solve it. We learned nothing is easy and if you do struggle, it will be easier later in life to do other problems.”
- Izabel

“One thing that I take away from this class that I use outside is from time to time [Professor Berberyans will] show inspirational videos – he’ll show a lot of Michael Jordan and stuff. But outside of math, being able to look at a problem and not give up necessarily and just know that it is a temporary setback and you can figure it out...the grass is always greener on the other side, right?”
- Phillip

[The phrase] “Never give up” is something that has always helped me but now receiving it every day from team mates younger than me and from the professor who is always saying, ‘The fact that I tried matters.’ So that helped me a lot. I feel like I’m not alone.”
- Reina

“It had helped me not have a fixed mindset about doubting myself, instead actually trying it and trying to learn instead of doubting myself that I can’t learn it. That has really helped me.”
- Crystal

“Normally I’m not good at math but I felt it helped me feel more motivated that I could actually understand math.
- Anonymous

“Mr. B talks about all the time how he wants us to succeed and it is okay if we don’t get it the first or third time; as long as we just try hard and push ourselves we will eventually get there.”
- Courtney

“One thing that I take away from this class that I use outside is from time to time [Professor Berberyans will] show inspirational videos – he’ll show a lot of Michael Jordan and stuff. But outside of math, being able to look at a problem and not give up necessarily and just know that it is a temporary setback and you can figure it out...the grass is always greener on the other side, right?”
- Phillip
Statewide Results
Transfer-level success rate by GPA Band – English Corequisite (13 Colleges)

- HSGPA < 1.9 (N=759) - 45%
- HSGPA 1.9 to 2.6 (N=1688) - 79%
- HSGPA ≥2.6 (N=1886) - 96%

Students with high school transcript data available in CalPASS Plus with verified enrollments in English AND a simultaneous corequisite course, F2016-F2018 – n = 4332

Statewide adjusted success rate if placed directly without support – 43%
Statewide 1 year throughput if begin one-level below: 12%
Transfer-level success rate by GPA Band – Statistics Corequisite (Five Colleges)

Students with high school transcript data available in CalPASS Plus with verified enrollments in Statistics AND a simultaneous corequisite course, F2016-F2018 – n = 1888
Transfer-level success rate by GPA Band – Open Access SLAM (Four Different Colleges)

- HSGPA < 2.3 (N=404): 28%
- HSGPA 2.3 to 3.0 (N=460): 54%
- HSGPA ≥3.0 or HSGPA ≥2.3&Precalc (N=495): 93%

Statewide adjusted success rate if placed directly without support – 29%
Statewide 1 year throughput if begin one-level below: 8%

Students with high school transcript data available in CalPASS Plus with verified enrollments in open access Statistics or Liberal Arts Math course, F2016-F2018 – n = 1359
Transfer-level success rate by GPA Band – STEM Corequisite (One College)

Statewide adjusted success rate if placed directly without support – 28%

Statewide 1 year throughput if begin one-level below: 13%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Band</th>
<th>Number of Students (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA &lt; 2.6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA ≥ 2.6 or Precalc</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSGPA ≥ 3.4 or HSGPA ≥ 2.6 &amp; Calc</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students with high school transcript data available in CalPASS Plus with verified enrollments in PreCalculus or Business Calculus AND a simultaneous corequisite course, F2016-F2018 – N=241
College Experiences
Irvine Valley College
Irvine Valley College
AB 705 Overview

Angel Hernandez, Counselor & Basic Skills Coordinator
Deanna Scherger, English Professor
Deejay Santiago, SSSP Director
Miriam Castroconde, Math Professor
Vinh Nguyen, Senior Research & Planning Analyst
Structure for implementing AB 705

- Ongoing communication & dialogue
- Capitalized on existing efforts:
  - Utilizing high school coursework for placement: English in Summer 16 & Math in Fall 16
  - Writing faculty first started offering accelerated curriculum in Fall 12
  - Transfer level WR coreq first offered in Fall 17
  - Pre-Stats first offered in Spring 17
  - ESL Transfer level coreq being piloted in Fall 19
  - Math Transfer level coreqs being offered for the first time in Fall 19
Matriculation: Guided-Self Placement (GSP)

Implementation

- Development: discipline driven with input from matriculation, research, and counseling

- Band-aid roll-out since September 2018: matriculation + research offices using automated data pulls and manual triggers

- Full-scale (automated) process being implemented by technology team

Been modifying GSP and processes through trial and error
Lessons Learned

- Corequisite course registration process
  - Working with district technology, bundled registration
- Messaging students about retroactive placement changes
  - Nudges, texts, video
- Ongoing faculty professional development (Community of practice)
  - CAP, conferences, and local development
- Aligning math course recommendations with students educational goal
  - Placement table and HS transcripts
  - Challenge Exam
- Planning process for future corequisite course needs
  - Characteristics of student population (intended major, transfer goal, etc.)
- Informing the campus community about AB 705 (need for prereq changes)
  - Prerequisites and enrollment changes
Questions?

Angel Hernandez: ahernandez107@ivc.edu
Deejay Santiago, dsantiago10@ivc.edu
Deanna Scherger, dscherger@ivc.edu
Miriam Castroconde, mcastrocond@ivc.edu
Vinh Nguyen: vnguyen216@ivc.edu
South Orange County Community College District
AB705
Game of Groans
South Orange County Community College District
Saddleback College
Irvine Valley College
Gerlie C. Jeltema
Experiences

• Common Assessment is coming, they said
• We prepared and waited

• Cross-college work groups regularly met
• We started updating our systems
But then CAI was no more

• And that was a game changer
AB705 was born and chaos ensued.
Irvine Valley College

• Started their own AB705 Implementation Team
• Piloted English support courses
• Created their own “GSP”
• Developed a workflow for student placement
Saddleback College

• Started their own AB705 Implementation Team
• Developed a workflow for student placement
• And evaluated hundreds and hundreds of HS transcripts
Colleges marched down separate paths

- Subject Area work groups were formed
- Curricular decisions were made and implemented
- They developed or updated Marketing Collateral in support of AB705
- Independent student messaging updates were implemented
- They started asking District IT for technology solutions in support of AB705
But then District IT stepped in and said, “Hold up! Your goals are the same!”
AB705 Design Team

• Let’s slay this beast together
• Let’s form a brain trust
  • English, ESL and math Faculty
  • Counselors
  • Assessment Office
  • Research & Planning
  • Admissions & Records
  • District IT
AB705 Design Team

• Regular Design Team Meetings
• Colleges brought forth what they’ve developed independently
• Colleges designed GSP questions
• Design Team vetted various GSP options
Pain points

• Absence or ambiguity of state guidance
  • What questions are we/are we not allowed to ask?
  • How many units for a support course?
  • Are support courses grade?
  • What about repeatability rules?
  • Should we make arrangements to get HS transcripts with brokers or will the state provide this?
  • And on and on...

• Curricular churn – which courses require a prerequisite?
What we’ve seen together

• Students had a hard time finding the required support course
• Students who didn’t need the support course are enrolling in it anyway
• Support courses are working really well
• Scheduling to demand is still more art than science
• Assessment Centers are inundated
So where do we stand?

• Colleges are still using their independently developed solutions
• Districtwide GSP integrated with SIS is almost complete
• Automated Placement determination for Self-Reported and CalPASS measures are in progress
• ESL workflow is being finalized
What next?

• Completion of integrated GSP
• Placement Letter Updates
• Refinements and Adjustments based on Results
Saddleback College
AB 705: How are we doing?

Truong Tran
Level Up, Office of Research, Planning, and Accreditation
Timeline

April 16, 2018
Change in Process: Place students using MMAP rules based on high school data

Spring 19 Semester
District wide development and design of GASP

Fall 18 Semester
English 1A + English 201 launch

Fall 19 Semester
Full AB 705 Implementation

T. Tran
English Placements by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 17 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 18 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Level Below</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Levels Below</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Math Placements by Cohort

Transfer Level:
- Fall 17 Cohort: 34%
- Fall 18 Cohort: 60%

One Level Below:
- Fall 17 Cohort: 24%
- Fall 18 Cohort: 10%

Two Levels Below:
- Fall 17 Cohort: 19%
- Fall 18 Cohort: 29%

Three Levels Below:
- Fall 17 Cohort: 13%
- Fall 18 Cohort: 11%
AB 705 Focus

• Throughput rate: percentage of cohort that successfully completes transfer level English/Math
How are our first-time college students doing?
One Semester Throughput Rates: First-time college students

English:
- Fall 17 (n = 1878): 21%
- Fall 18 (n = 1856): 35%

Math:
- Fall 17 (n = 1878): 10%
- Fall 18 (n = 1856): 13%
One Semester English Throughput Rate: First-time college students

- Asian: 38% Fall 2017, 21% Fall 2018
- Black or African American: 18% Fall 2017, 13% Fall 2018
- Hispanic / Latino: 29% Fall 2017, 15% Fall 2018
- Two or More Races: 36% Fall 2017, 23% Fall 2018
- White: 38% Fall 2017, 24% Fall 2018
- EOPS: 24% Fall 2017, 16% Fall 2018
- DSPS: 31% Fall 2017, 18% Fall 2018
- Vet: 21% Fall 2017, 16% Fall 2018
- CCPG/BOG: 33% Fall 2017, 17% Fall 2018
One Semester Math Throughput Rate: First-time college students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPS</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPG/BOG</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are our continuing students doing?
Fall 18 English 1A Success Rates for Continuing Students that Reassessed

- English 200 (n = 149): 84%
- English 390 (n = 101): 84%
- ESL (n = 7): 100%

CTEP Placement

T. Tran
Fall 18 Transfer Level Math Success Rates for Continuing Students that Reassessed

- Math 253 (n = 64): 52%
- Math 353 (n = 39): 44%
- Math 351 (n = 7): 29%

MDTP Placement
How are our students doing overall?
Fall 18 Transfer Level Success Rates

Math
- Fall 17: 54%
- Fall 18: 56%

English
- Fall 17: 75%
- Fall 18: 78%
What does this mean for the students?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 18</th>
<th>Number of Units Students Avoided</th>
<th>Amount Students Saved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>$ 83,835.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>$ 16,761.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>$ 100,597.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways from AB 705 in Fall 18

• Students saved money and time because of the opportunity to enroll in transfer level English and Math

• Success and throughput rates increased for both first-time and continuing students after AB 705 implementation
Questions
Citrus College
Implementing AB 705 at Citrus College: Practices and Effectiveness

**English**
- Becky Rudd rrudd@citruscollege.edu
- Jamie Dingman jdingman@citruscollege.edu
- Gina Hogan ghogan@citruscollege.edu

**Math**
- Victoria Dominguez vdominguez@citruscollege.edu
- Kevin Punsalan kpunsalan@citruscollege.edu
- Michael Wangler mwangler@citruscollege.edu

**Institutional Research**
- Yueyi Huang yhuang@citruscollege.edu
- Lan Hao lhao@citruscollege.edu
AB 705 Work at Citrus College: English

What we’ve done in support of students and faculty

• Curriculum, Sequencing, and Pedagogy
• Classroom Support
Citrus College English Sequence prior to Fall 2018

ENGL 098
2 units
2 levels below transfer

ENGL 099
5 units
1 Level below transfer

ENGL 101
3 units
Transfer Level
Citrus College English Sequence for Fall 2018

ENGL 101   4 Units
• Transfer Level

ENGL 101+S  5 Units
• Transfer Level+1 Unit Co-Req
Citrus College English Sequence for Fall 2019

ENGL 098
098A  2 units
   Reading

098B  2 units
   Writing/Critical Thinking

ENGL 101
101  4 Units

101+E  5 units
   Embedded Tutor
   Co-requisite
AB 705 Work at Citrus College: English

What we’ve done in support of students and faculty

• Curriculum, Sequencing, and Pedagogy
• Classroom Support
English: Innovative Strategies

- Modified curriculum to include non-fiction and thematic units
- Trained faculty to increase student voice in the classroom
- Developed methods to provide just-in-time remediation
- Established faculty leads to support faculty in the transition
- Encouraged the use of embedded tutors in the co-requisite course
- Increased faculty collaboration
- Contextualized learning opportunities in cross-disciplinary learning communities

Citrus College, April 19, 2019
Data on Embedded Tutoring (ET) and Writing Center (WC)

Fall 2018 Offerings:

• 45 sections of English 101S: 22 sections had embedded tutors
• 44 sections of English 101: 8 sections had embedded tutors

Findings:

• ENGL101S: Students from a class with an ET visited the WC at a higher rate (53%) than the ones without an ET (18%)
• ENGL101S: Out of the students who visited WC, students with an ET yielded higher average number of visits (4.6 visits per student) than students without an ET (3.0 visits per student)
• ENGL101 and 101S students who visited the WC at least once had a higher success rate (73%) than those who did not (59%)
• Students who attended the WC had the highest retention rate for both 101 and 101S (96%)
More on Embedded Tutors (ET) and the Writing Center (WC)

In an ET survey for Instructors:
- 88% recommend ET to colleagues, 85% incorporated WC into the class pedagogy, and 96% found having a tutor is very helpful
  
  “My ET is such a remarkable role model for my students and helped me in guiding them with each step.”
  
  “Robert has a great rapport with the students and has been an impressive asset in the class.”

In an ET survey for Students:
- 58% had a clearer understanding of the course material and 61% say ET encouraged them to use WC
  
  “My tutor is very confident and helpful...made me want to be in class and in the WC.”
  
  “Randall was a great support at a time when I was lost with all these outlines and essays.”

Take away: ET ➔ WC = Higher success rates

Having ET makes it more likely that students will attend the WC and students who visited the WC at least once had higher success rates overall.
AB 705 Work at Citrus College: Math

What we’ve done in support of students and faculty

• Curriculum, Sequencing, and Placement
• Classroom Redesign, Pedagogy, and Support
Citrus College Math Sequence prior to Fall 2018
Citrus College
Math Sequence
for Fall 2019
(Pathways Placement)
AB 705 Work at Citrus College: Math

What we’ve done in support of students and faculty

• Curriculum, Sequencing, and Placement
• **Classroom Redesign, Pedagogy, and Support**
Math: Creating the Equity-Minded Classroom

- Physical Classroom Changes
  - New pod furniture
  - Whiteboards on all walls
  - Portable whiteboards
  - Manipulatives: beads, cards, dice, snap cubes, tape measures, TI-84 calculator
  - Magnets
  - PAL Carts

Citrus College, April 19, 2019
Math: Creating the Equity-Minded Classroom

Pedagogical Changes

○ Minimal lecture - Instructor guides the learning process
○ Productive Struggle
○ Encourage groupwork
  ■ Rearrange Groups 2 to 3 times per class session
  ■ Uber Driving
  ■ Ambassador Exchange
○ Inclusive Atmosphere
Math: Creating the Equity-Minded Classroom

Student Support

- Belief in Student Capacity
- **Embedded Tutors** (Adjunct Faculty and Professional Experts from the tutoring center)
- Just-in-time Remediation
- Guided Lectures
- Activities and Class Worksheets
  - Think-Pair-Share-Square
  - Gallery walk
- In-Class Exam Reviews
- Counseling Classroom Visits (embedded in the Math building)
AB 705 Work at Citrus College

What we’ve done in support of students and faculty

• English Support
• Mathematics Support
• Data and Results
Shift from Basic Skills to Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 15 (n=2,291)</th>
<th>Fall 16 (n=1,940)</th>
<th>Fall 17 (n=2,165)</th>
<th>Fall 18 (n=1,971)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transfer-level Math</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Basic Skills (Two or more levels below)
- Intermediate Algebra (One level below)
- Statistics (Transfer-level)
- Other Transfer-level Math
Equity data:
One-year Completion Rate in Transfer-Level English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 15-Spring 16</th>
<th>Fall 16-Spring 17</th>
<th>Fall 17-Spring 18</th>
<th>Fall 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Equity Data: One-year Completion Rate in Transfer-Level Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 15-Spring 16</th>
<th>Fall 16-Spring 17</th>
<th>Fall 17-Spring 18</th>
<th>Fall 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

**English**
Becky Rudd  rrudd@citruscollege.edu
Jamie Dingman  jdingman@citruscollege.edu
Gina Hogan  ghogan@citruscollege.edu

**Math**
Victoria Dominguez  vdominguez@citruscollege.edu
Kevin Punsalan  kpunsalan@citruscollege.edu
Michael Wangler  mwangler@citruscollege.edu

**Research**
Yueyi Huang  yhuang@citruscollege.edu
Lan Hao  lhao@citruscollege.edu
Lunch

At your tables, discuss the following prompt:

How has your college chosen to fund and support various initiatives around AB 705? From which funding sources? How are funding and resources determined and allocated?
Breakout Sessions

- Course Sequencing and Supports: Oxnard College - English
  - Room: B205
- Supporting Faculty: Citrus College
  - Room: B212
- Guided Self-Placement: MiraCosta College
  - Room: B213
- Messaging and Communication: Saddleback College
  - Room: B214
- Multiple Measures Platform: CCC Tech Center
  - Room: B230
Multiple Measures and Enabling the AB 705 Legislative Mandate:
An Integrated Student Journey
Multiple Measures Placement Service

• Developed in collaboration with the Chancellor’s Office and the AB 705 Advisory Committee

• Development partners:
  o CCC Tech Center
  o California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI)
  o Educational Results Partnership (ERP)
Your Presenter…

John Hadad, Product Manager

- Over 10 years working in Higher Education Technology
- California Community College Tech Center since 2015
  - MMPS since 2018
- Colorado native, live in Phoenix, love California
Multiple Measures Placement Service

• MMPS Overview - How MMPS works
• Implementation Requirements
• Frequently Asked Questions
• Next Steps
Multiple Measures Placement Service

- Facilitates placement in three steps:
  - Step 1: Collect available high school transcript information
  - Step 2: Generate recommended placements
  - Step 3: Deliver placement information to colleges
Step 1: Collect Transcript Data

- Submission of application on CCCApply triggers MMPS workflow
- MMPS accesses multiple sources of transcript data:
  - California College Guidance Initiative
  - CalPASS +
  - Self-reported data from CCCApply
  - CDE (CalPADS) *future development*
Step 2: Generate Placements

• Select prioritized dataset
• Execute decision logic:
  o Statewide AB 705 decision logic for English and math
  o Statewide MMAP decision logic for Higher Level Math
Step 2: MMPS Recommended Placements

- AB 705 Recommended Placements and Recommended Support Level:
  - English
  - Statistics and Liberal Arts Math (SLAM)
  - Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM)

- Higher Level math placements, when applicable:
  - Trigonometry
  - Pre-Calculus
  - Calculus
Step 3: Deliver Placements to Colleges

- Placement data delivery to colleges achieved via one of two methods:
  - Downloadable CSV file via new download client, or
  - Writing to staging table within a college’s SIS via the SuperGlue College Adaptor
- Locally developed script to update the core registration tables
Proposed Placement Recommendation Logic (version 3)

1. **SSID Match with CDE**
2. **CCCApply/MyPath Process Steps**
3. **Collect Self-Reported data**
4. **Multiple Measures Placement Step**
5. **Application and Placement Data**
6. **Colleges**
7. **CCCData Warehouse**
8. **Math/English Placement Recommendation Plus all available data**
9. **AB705 Rules Engine (Ed Results)**
10. **Use SSID Match**
11. **Does record exist in CCGI?**
    - Yes
    - Does record exist in CalPASS?
        - Yes
        - Does record exist in CDE (real-time API)?
            - Yes
            - Add Self-Reported data
            - No
        - No
    - No

If the CDE interface is batch:
- Does record exist in CDE?
  - Yes
  - No

Store CDE’s batch data to CCCCO’s DW accessible only to colleges and for their students only.
Technical Requirements for MMPS

• Use of CCCApply
  o Opt-In to self-reported high school transcript questions
• Implementation of selected SIS integration
• Locally developed script to update the core registration tables
Frequently Asked Questions
Frequently Asked Questions

How will students receive their placement recommendations?

The current version of MMPS does not deliver placements and recommended support directly to students.

Future development efforts enable functionality to deliver the placements and recommended support directly to students via an integration with MyPath.
Frequently Asked Questions

What if self-reported data would result in a more accurate recommendation?

In situations where self-reported data results in a more accurate Math placement recommendation, MMPS uses a combination of both verified and self-reported data to produce placement.
Frequently Asked Questions

Can we customize the decision logic to locally defined thresholds?

The current version of MMPS supports only the statewide decision logic. Support for local customization is not currently in scope.
Frequently Asked Questions

How do we place students for whom we do not have any data?

MMPS will notify a college that an attempt was made to generate placement, but no placement was produced due to lack of data.

Students who do not receive placement recommendations from MMPS should be placed by a locally-developed self-guided placement process.
Does MMPS support Guided Self-Placement?

The current version of MMPS does not offer functionality to assist students in guided self-placement.
Frequently Asked Questions

What data will my college receive from MMPS?

In addition to identifying information and the placement recommendations, colleges receive several data elements to support the placement process.

Please refer to the MMPS Implementation Guide for a complete data dictionary.
I’m interested! What’s next?
Next Steps

Contact John Hadad (jhadad@ccctechcenter.org) to schedule an MMPS overview session with your local AB 705 implementation team
Questions?
Thank you!
Main Take-aways from Breakout Sessions?
Q & A with the CCCCQCO

FAQ from previous convening: bit.ly/AB705FAQAPRIL12
Closing
Contacts

Craig Hayward, chayward@rpgroup.org
John Hetts, jhetts@edresults.org
Mallory Newell, newellmallory@deanza.edu
Terrence Willett, twillett@rpgroup.org
Mia Keeley, mkeeley@cccco.edu

This slide deck: bit.ly/AB705IVC
FAQ from previous convening: bit.ly/AB705FAQAPRIL12