## RCC Pre-requisite Model (Developmental English 2010)

## Passing Rates:

- ENG 080
- ENG 090

59\%

- ENG 095

58\%

- For every 100 students who placed into ENG 080, 21 passed into ENG 101 (first transfer-level English course).
- 79\% were barred from enrolling in ENG 101.

RCC Developmental English Curricular Pathway (2013)


## RCC Co-Requisite Model: Success Rate over Time

## Accelerated English Success Rate

|  | F14 | S15 | F15 | S16 | F16 | S17 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eng 082 | $64 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Eng 101/DC | $73 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Eng 101/EC | $67 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Eng 101 Total | $73 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $71 \%$ |

## Revising RCC English Placement

- Accuplacer scores sole criteria for ENG 101
- Placement in ENG 092, 095 and ENG 096
- New Options: SAT, ACT, or English Regents
- Courses no longer offered; students now place into ENG 082, 101 + 098, or 101
- CAPR Study using multiple measures: HS GPA strongest predictor of success
- Using CAPR: ENG 101 placement jumps from 60\% to $79 \%$ : stable success rate!
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## Why Guided Pathways?

- Initial idea in 2013
- Academic home for students
- Clear pathway from the beginning
- Contextualized support along the path


## A Model: Criminal Justice

- Block Schedules with Learning Communities
- Developmental English, College Success, Criminal Justice
- Faculty teaching all courses communicate and plan
- College Success course taught by a criminal justice faculty member
- Contextualizes course content
- Expert in pathway advisement


## Co-requisite Model

- ALP 101 \& ENG 101
- Pilot moving to full scale - using multiple measure (high school GPA and Accuplacer - have used regents \& ACT/SAT)
- Data
- 100\% of the ALP students attempt ENG 101, versus only 39.5\% of the sequential TRS 105 students
- $54.5 \%$ of the ALP students earn a C or Better, versus only $18.5 \%$ of the sequential TRS 105 students
> that we don't have a unified vision of college readiness that most community colleges are not really open access institutions, but practice a two-stage admission process where over $50 \%$ of students are paying for courses before they can be fully admitted
that we presume community college success \& completion primarily has to do with academic preparation
that for a variety of good reasons community colleges rely on a 90-minute standardized test \& that, because it produces numbers, it is valid \& reliable (vs. the 230,000 minutes represented on the hs transcript)
> that we believe there is curricular alignment between high school coursework, the test, dev ed courses, \& college classes
$>$ that we are overplacing students in dev ed who could achieve a C or better in college courses
> that we are not respecting student choice


## THE DATA IS DISTURBING

$>$ In a USDE study (2016) 68\% of FTFT community college students (2003-2009) were required to take one dev ed; $48 \%$ were required to take 2 or more; $59 \%$ were required to take at least one math.
$>48 \%$ of students with a strong academic preparation were required to take one or more dev ed courses! HUH????
$>75 \%$ of poor, or Black, or Hispanic students are required to take an average of 3.5 dev ed courses.
$>$ Only $49 \%$ of those placed into dev ed courses complete them all.
$>$ Number of dev ed placements is negatively correlated to student completion at SCCC at 150\% of time.
$>$ With results like this, we better be sure it is the right decision!


## ....AND PRTHWHYS?

> Which comes first: placement or pathways?
$>$ Are we considering curricular alignment from hs, through holistic placement assessment, through dev ed, to cc coursework, to 4-year transfer?
$>$ What placement considerations are being given to our more mature students? Veterans?
$>$ Dev ed as imbedded support as opposed to stand alones
$>$ Respecting, and not blaming, our secondary partners \& working with them to address issues
>Consideration of grit, resilience, and a work ethic
$>$ Creating varied math sequences for the program needs

>Fully informed students

