

FHDA Assessment Taskforce Meeting

2.4.19 / Foothill College, 1901 / 2-4PM

Attendees:

Melissa Aguilar; David McCormick; Paul Starer; Mehrdad Khosravi; Raymond Brennan; Erika Flores; Elaine Kuo; Doreen Finkelstein; Kennedy Bui; Debbie Lee; Ram Subramaniam; Valerie Fong; Anthony Cervantes; Cheryl Balm; Amy Leonard; Erick Aragon; Allison Herman; Casie Wheat; Remote Participation: Nazy Galoyan; Marcy Betlach; Jerry Rosenberg; Brian Lewis; Lisa Mandy; Roland Amit

Notes:

Refer to the January 14, 2019 CCCCO memo on tutoring apportionment and basic skills for clarification on the non-credit discussion held at the 10.18.18 meeting (page 3 of this document).

Ram reported out on Foothill's current math assessment model and AB705 course sequence changes. Math 10: Statistics and Math 48A: Pre-calculus I with a hard-linked 2.5 unit credit co-requisite were offered as open entry. These courses operated with embedded tutors and were funded by basic skills. The co-requisites were offered on a pass/no pass basis. Students could take Math 48A without the co-requisite if they met a certain grade point average minimum. Ram commented that with the implementation of these changes, fall 2018 enrollment was strong. As for student success when comparing fall to fall, student success rates were flat. Ram also shared that basic skills math courses (arithmetic, pre-algebra I and II) were no longer offered, but that the department had plans to continue the offering of Math 105: Intermediate Algebra.

Jerry shared out on behalf of De Anza's Math Department. Currently, Math 10: Statistics, Math 11: Finite Math, Math 44: Liberal Arts Math, and Math 46: Math for Elementary Education, as well as basic skills math courses including pre-algebra I and II and Math 114: Intermediate Algebra, were offered as open entry. For fall 2019, the assessment model would change slightly with the Math 10 placement including a mandatory or recommended co-requisite; and Math 11 would have a recommended co-requisite. Students could place into Math 41: Pre-calculus by GPA or by placement test. Jerry shared that Math 41 and Math 10 success rates had increased slightly. In addition, it was noted that new students in fall 2018 term, who had no math course history, were more successful than those students that had worked up the course sequence. Cheryl noted that the Math Performance Success (MPS) could have contributed to student success in fall. Lastly, Mehrdad reported that the department was working to develop a Guided Self-Placement (GSP) tool in Canvas.

Both math departments then discussed GSP models and content. Once the GSP tool was live, it would replace the math assessment tests. Kennedy shared that Foothill's Canvas math shell would contain course descriptions, videos, as well as a diagnostic based on content created by math faculty. Debbie noted that the diagnostic contained about ten questions per module. The GSP did not issue a score, but instead allowed the student to make an informed decision upon completion. In addition, Kennedy said that an online survey was currently being built which would allow students to self-report their GPA and educational goal. The student would be given a placement; and then the placement data would then be imported into Banner for student registration.

Valerie reported out on Foothill English course sequence plans, which included an English 1A, English 1A + co-requisite and the English 1S (to 1T) stretch model. The English department was exploring the creation of a non-credit co-requisite, and was discussing the possibility of reducing the unit total on the stretch model. Amy, Ray and Casie reported out on De Anza English changes and noted that the fall 2019 offerings would be the same as Foothill; however the unit value for

the stretch model would be ten units total. The De Anza English department was also talking about mirroring credit basic skills course curriculum for the purposes of offering non-credit courses. Lastly, both colleges shared that their GSP tool in Canvas were being built.

David reported out on AB705 changes for Foothill's ESL department and shared that the department was exploring the idea of an English 1A course for ESL students; however, it was unclear as to how this would come about. Marcy shared out on behalf of the De Anza ESL department. The faculty were discussing non-credit ESL course offerings. It was noted that at both colleges, ESL and English faculty were collaborating on the English GSP so that ESL students were appropriately tracked to ESL. The group expressed concern for the placement of international students via the English GSP tool. Casie and Kennedy commented that Assessment would work with the International Student Program to strategize on Language Arts placements for F1 Visa students. Casie commented that the next issuance of ESL recommendations from the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) was now anticipated in May; and that ESL AB705 compliance was required by fall 2020.

Casie provided a brief overview of [AB1805](#) and then opened up the discussion on a district placement reciprocity policy. Paul commented that it would be in the students benefit if the colleges could agree upon an inclusive policy which honored the highest placement earned at either campus. The math department representatives shared that reciprocity might be possible for Pre-Calculus I and Calculus I; but that the colleges had different curriculum for Pre-Calculus II and I. In addition, De Anza had plans to require a co-requisite for Math 10 placements (based on student GPA rules). Valerie shared that the De Anza and Foothill English decision rules and course sequences sounded very similar; and thus it might be possible for English. As for ESL, it was agreed that reciprocity policy would be very challenging because both colleges had very different course sequences and placement rules; and in addition, the departments were waiting for the ESL AB705 recommendations. The group wondered how many students assessed at both colleges for the purposes of shopping for the highest placement, and where those students actually enrolled, and if they continued on with the course sequence at the same campus. Casie noted that while both colleges accepted raw test scores from the same assessment tools, the process of score transfer was not automatic. If placement reciprocity could be established, Banner could be configured to automate the delivery of a placement earned at the home campus and also at the sister college; this would result in the reduction of matriculation steps required for the student to complete before enrolling. Overall, the group agreed that such a policy could help with district enrollment and it was proposed that a policy be drafted for further discussion.

Casie would send a Doodle poll to schedule the next quarterly meeting for the spring quarter.

2. Noncredit Co-Requisites:

The implementation of AB 705 has also raised questions about the ability of colleges to implement non-credit co-requisite courses and pair them with transfer-level courses in order to amplify the likelihood of students succeeding in transfer-level English or quantitative reasoning/mathematics. AB 705 encourages the use of concurrent supports to ensure that more students who are placed into transfer-level English and quantitative reasoning/mathematics will succeed. As it relates to title 5, these courses can be categorized as a “supplemental learning assistance” and are subject to the guidelines published by the Chancellor’s Office in April of 2006.

In that document, the Chancellor’s Office notes that five regulations in title 5 govern supplemental learning assistance: [58170](#), [58172](#), [58164](#), [58009](#), [58050](#), and [59402](#). The guidance also notes that supplemental learning assistance is designed to “further the students’ ability to succeed in the “primary” or “parent” course and its outline identifies the parent course with which it is linked.” As it relates to Section 58172, the memorandum, notes that “apportionment for supplemental learning assistance may be claimed for credit supplemental courses in support

of primary/parent credit courses, or for noncredit supplemental courses, in any of the nine noncredit eligible areas outlined in Education Code section 84757, in support of primary/parent noncredit courses. The key element of this statement is that the course is designed to promote success in the primary/parent course. If the course is created as noncredit, it must specifically be designed to address skills enumerated in [EC 84757](#) (a): parenting, basic skills, English as a second language, immigrant education, disability education, short-term vocational programs, programs for older adults, programs in home economics, health and safety education. For courses that are designed as credit, that is not the case. However, the supplemental learning assistance guidelines still apply. Colleges building co-requisite models should be familiar with the conditions outlined by the Chancellor’s Office in 2006 and is available [here](#).

These clarifications are effective immediately for local implementation and planning. For any questions, please contact Vice Chancellor Alice Perez at aperez@cccco.edu.