

## English Placement and Equity Implications

Jennifer Brezina, Ph.D., Preeta Saxena, Ph. D., Daylene M. Meuschke, Ed.D. and Barry C. Gibbons, Ph.D.

During the 2014-2015 academic year, the English Department made changes to Accuplacer cut scores used to place students into the English composition sequence. In general, cut-scores for English-096, 091/94, and 101 were lowered. These changes were effective for Fall 2015 placements and are detailed in an April 2016 Ad Hoc Report. The English department also made curricular revisions in 2014-2015 that eliminated two courses (ENGL-071 and ENGL-081), added a new accelerated course that replaced the ENGL-071/081 sequence (ENGL-089), and removed the two-course ENGL-081/091 pathway to ENGL-101. These changes were also effective for Fall 2015. In 2013, the English department began allowing students who scored “college-ready” on the Early Assessment Program (EAP) to place directly into ENGL-101 without further testing. This program was expanded in Fall 2015 to allow students scoring “EAP-conditional” who completed an approved senior-year course (e.g. ERWC, AP or IB, or Weighted Honors English) to also place directly into ENGL-101 without further testing.

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (IRPIE) examined placement rates for students assessed with the new cut scores and compared them to placements of students assessed in previous years. More specifically, this research intended to answer the following questions:

- What proportion of students placed into ENGL-071, ENGL-081, ENGL-091, ENGL-101 in 2012 and 2014? What proportion of students placed into ENGL-089, ENGL-096, ENGL-091, and ENGL-101 in 2015?
- How do the changes made to cut scores and curriculum impact the number of levels of required remediation for students overall and for students disaggregated by ethnicity, sex, age, and other group (Veterans, DSPS, EOPS, CalWORKS)?
- How do the changes made to cut scores and curriculum impact the number of levels of required remediation for groups identified in the 2015 Equity Plan as experiencing a disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English Completion?
- Which groups are disproportionately impacted with regard to English transfer-level placement before and after changes to cut-scores and curriculum?

Results are intended to help inform planning for the English program.

### Placement Rates:

Fall 2015 transfer-level placements overall nearly doubled when compared to those in Fall 2012, moving from 16% in Fall 2012 to 28% in Fall 2015.

About half of the number of students placed into the lowest level of the sequence in Fall 2015 as compared to Fall 2012 (ENGL-071 for 2012 and 2014 and ENGL-089 for 2015), moving from 15% in Fall 2012 to 7% in Fall 2015.

Fall 2015 placements in ENGL-091/094 and ENGL-081/096 stayed relatively similar to those in Fall 2012. This is likely because cut scores were adjusted at both ends of the range, allowing students previously placed into this level into the level above, but also placing students into the course who previously would have placed one level lower in the sequence. More information is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1. Overall Placements**

Course	2012		2014		2015	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>ENGL-101</b>	716	16%	780	18%	1042	28%
<b>ENGL-091/094/</b>	1726	39%	1650	38%	1343	36%
<b>ENGL-081/096*</b>	1324	30%	1269	30%	1036	28%
<b>ENGL-071/089**</b>	690	15%	601	14%	265	7%
<b>Total</b>	4456	100%	4300	100%	3686	100%

\*Students placed into ENGL-081 between Fall 2012-Summer 2015 had the option of completing ENGL-096 for ENGL-101 eligibility instead of completing the ENGL-081/091 sequence. Students in Fall 2015 placed into ENGL-096 only. These courses are grouped together in this table due to similar cut scores.

\*\*Students placed into ENGL-071 prior to fall 2015 needed to complete ENGL-081/ENGL-091 to be eligible for ENGL-101. Students placed into ENGL-089 Fall 2015 and after must complete ENGL-091 for ENGL-101 eligibility. These courses are grouped together in this table due to similar cut scores.

### Levels of Developmental Coursework:

In addition to the changes in numbers of students placed in each course, changes to the course sequence have also impacted students' placement as it relates to the number of developmental courses required before ENGL-101 eligibility. National research has shown that the more levels of developmental coursework required is associated with students being less likely to complete the transfer-level course in that subject (Bailey, Jeong & Cho, 2008). This "pipeline" effect has also been demonstrated in statewide (Hayward and Willett, 2014) and local studies (Brezina, Parker, Meuschke, and Gribbons, 2015).

The percentage of students required to complete two or more levels of developmental coursework in English dropped dramatically from 2012 to 2015, with only 7% of students required to complete two or more developmental courses in 2015, compared to 45% of students required to complete two or more developmental courses in 2012. The percentage of students placed directly into transfer-level English courses in 2015 is nearly double the percentage placed at that level in 2012 (28% in 2015 vs. 16% in 2012).

The percentage of students placing into a course one level below transfer also significantly increased, moving from 39% in 2012 to 65% in 2015. This group includes students placing into ENGL-091/094 (3-unit classes) and students placing into ENGL-096 (a 4-unit class).

These changes should lead to significantly higher completion rates for transfer level English for students at College of the Canyons as the levels of developmental coursework in English have decreased substantially for students, particularly for those previously placing at the lowest levels of the sequence.

### **Levels of Developmental Coursework by Ethnicity.**

While the levels of developmental coursework required dropped for all groups, there were significant differences between groups when placements are disaggregated by ethnicity.

For Native American, Asian, Filipino, White, and Other students, the percentage of students placing directly into transfer level English in 2015 exceeded the overall rate for this placement, with transfer-level placements more than 10% higher than the overall rate for most of these groups (overall transfer placement = 28% while transfer placements for these groups ranged from 36-52%).

For African American and Latino students, the percentage of students placing directly into transfer level English was lower than the overall rate for this placement, with 15% of African American students and 20% of Latino students placing directly into transfer level English and an overall transfer placement rate of 28%. This gap is similar to the gap between transfer level English placements for these groups in 2012 (8% for African American students and 10% for Latino students, with an overall transfer placement rate of 16%). The percentages of both groups placing directly into transfer level English in 2015 is approximately double the number of transfer level English placements for these groups in 2012, which is consistent with the overall trends for all ethnic groups when 2015 transfer level English placements are compared to 2012.

African American and Latino students placed into the level that requires one developmental course before transfer English eligibility at rates slightly higher than the overall group. African American and Latino students placed into this level at a rate of 72% respectively, while 65% of students overall placed into this level. The change in placements at this level for these two groups increased substantially between 2012 and 2015, increasing by 44 percentage points for African American students (from 28% to 72%) and by 37 percentage points for Latino students (from 35% to 72%).

Placements changes were not as dramatic for other groups. For instance, the increase was of 17 percentage points for students of Unknown ethnicity placing one level to below transfer (33% in 2012 to 50% in 2015) to no change in the percentages of placements at this level for students indicating Other as their ethnicity (43% in 2012 and in 2015).

With the elimination of ENGL-071 and ENGL-081 effective Fall 2015, all students benefitted with dramatic changes for placing two and three levels below transfer. Students were not given the option to place three levels below transfer in 2015 (29% of African American students and 19% of Latino students placed at this level in 2012), and the percentage of students placed two levels below transfer was small in 2015, ranging from 13% of African American students to 4% of White students placing at this level in 2015 compared to rates of 35% for African American students and 24% for white students placing two levels below transfer in 2012. Although all students benefitted in the two-three levels below transfer placements, placements are still disproportionately impacted for Transfer level placement.

Table 2. Levels of Developmental Coursework by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	2012 (n)	2012 %	2015 (n)	2015 %
<b>Native American</b>	<b>27</b>		<b>20</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	3	11%	8	40%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	15	56%	12	60%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	6	22%	0	0%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	3	11%	-	-
<b>Asian</b>	<b>286</b>		<b>168</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	98	34%	67	40%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	113	40%	86	51%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	47	16%	15	9%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	28	10%	-	-
<b>African American</b>	<b>350</b>		<b>277</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	29	8%	41	15%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	97	28%	200	72%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	122	35%	36	13%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	102	29%	-	-
<b>Filipino</b>	<b>221</b>		<b>151</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	40	18%	54	36%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	100	45%	89	59%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	57	26%	8	5%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	24	11%	-	-
<b>Latino</b>	<b>1,986</b>		<b>1852</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	190	10%	370	20%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	702	35%	1333	72%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	714	36%	149	8%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	380	19%	-	-
<b>White</b>	<b>1492</b>		<b>1171</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	345	23%	485	41%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	664	45%	637	54%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	353	24%	49	4%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	130	9%	-	-
<b>Other</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>21</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	6	16%	11	52%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	16	43%	9	43%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	7	19%	1	5%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	8	22%	-	-
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>57</b>		<b>26</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	5	9%	6	23%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	19	33%	13	50%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	18	32%	7	27%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	15	26%	-	-

## Levels of Developmental Coursework by Age.

Table 3. Levels of Developmental Coursework by Age

Age	2012 (n)	%	2015 (n)	%
<b>17 or below</b>	<b>953</b>		<b>403</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	250	26%	164	41%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	401	42%	222	55%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	233	24%	17	4%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	69	7%	-	-
<b>18-20</b>	<b>2749</b>		<b>2586</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	355	13%	706	27%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	1056	38%	1699	66%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	883	32%	181	7%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	455	17%	-	-
<b>21-24</b>	<b>350</b>		<b>311</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	48	14%	65	21%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	122	35%	220	71%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	105	30%	26	8%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	75	21%	-	-
<b>25-34</b>	<b>246</b>		<b>229</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	37	15%	66	29%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	86	35%	146	64%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	68	28%	17	7%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	55	22%	-	-
<b>35 and above</b>	<b>155</b>		<b>147</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	26	17%	38	24%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	61	39%	88	56%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	32	21%	21	13%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	36	23%	-	-

All age groups saw an increase in transfer level placements in English when 2015 placements are compared to 2012, ranging from a 15 percentage point increase for students 17 or below to a 7 percentage point increase for students ages 21-24 and 35 and above. For 2015, students 17 or below had the highest transfer placement rate at 41%, and students ages 21-24 had the lowest transfer placement rate at 21%.

For all groups except for students 17 or below, placement into the course one level below transfer was the most common placement in 2015, ranging from 35% of the placements for students ages 17 or below to 71% of the placements for students ages 21-24. Students ages 21-24 also saw the largest increase in this placement (36 percentage points), increasing from 35% to 71% of placements

for that age group. Most other age groups saw increases for this placement as well.

Placements two levels below transfer decreased for all groups, ranging from an 8 percentage point decrease for students ages 35 or above (from 21% in 2012 to 13% in 2015) to a 25 percentage point decrease for students 18-20 (from 32% in 2012 to 7% in 2015). For 2015, students in the 18-20, 21-24, and 25-34 age groups placed into the course two levels below transfer at approximately the same rate as students overall, but students ages 17 or below placed into this course at lower rates than the overall population (4% for students in this age group compared to 7% of students overall), and students ages 35 and above placed into this level at higher rates than the overall student population (13% for this age group compared to 7% overall).

With the elimination of ENGL-071, no students placed into a course three levels below transfer, which had a significant impact on placements for all age groups except for students ages 17 or below (placements two levels below transfer in 2012 ranged from 17-23% for all age groups other than 17 or below).

## Levels of Developmental Coursework by Sex.

Placement rates when disaggregated by sex are comparable to the overall placement rates for both 2012 and 2015 placements. Male students showed a slightly larger increase in rate of placement directly into transfer level (a 13 percentage point increase for males compared to an 11 percentage point increase for females). Female students showed a higher increase in rate of placements one level below transfer with a 28 percentage point increase when compared to a 24 percentage point increase for male students. For placements two levels below transfer, rates were comparable for both sexes in 2012 (29% for males and 30% for females), and showed respective decreases of 22 and 23 percentage points for 2015, with just 7% of placements two levels below transfer for each group in 2015. Compared to 15% of males and 16% of females in 2012, none of the students received the option of placing three levels below transfer in 2015.

**Table 4. Levels of Developmental Coursework by Sex**

Sex	2012 (n)	%	2015 (n)	%
<b>Male</b>				
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	365	16%	559	29%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	924	40%	1242	64%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	673	29%	145	7%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	355	15%	-	-
<b>Female</b>				
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	351	17%	475	28%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	798	38%	1125	66%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	644	30%	117	7%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	331	16%	-	-

## Levels of Developmental Coursework by Other Group (Veterans, DSPS, CalWORKS, EOPS).

**Table 5. Levels of Developmental Coursework by Other Group**

Groups	2012 (n)	%	2015 (n)	%
<b>Veterans</b>				
	<b>69</b>		<b>66</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	13	19%	23	35%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	36	52%	42	64%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	10	14%	1	2%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	10	14%	-	-
<b>DSPS</b>				
	<b>305</b>		<b>272</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	20	7%	31	11%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	64	21%	173	64%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	93	30%	68	25%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	128	42%	-	-
<b>CalWORKS</b>				
	<b>22</b>		<b>16</b>	
Transfer Level (ENGL-101)	1	5%	9	19%
One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)	4	18%	12	75%
Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)	9	41%	1	6%
Three levels below (ENGL-071)	8	36%	-	-

All groups studied showed an increase in English placements at the transfer level, with students identified as Veterans and students participating in the CalWORKS program showing the largest increases (respective increases of 16 and 14 percentage points), moving from 19% of placements in 2012 to 35% of placements in 2015 for students identified as Veterans and from 5% of placements in 2012 to 19% of placements in 2015 for students participating in the CalWORKS program.

While students identified as Veterans place at the transfer level more frequently than the overall

**Table 5. Levels of Developmental Coursework by Other Group (continued)**

Groups	2012 (n)	%	2015 (n)	%
<b>EOPS</b>	<b>70</b>		<b>84</b>	
<b>Transfer Level (ENGL-101)</b>	8	11%	15	18%
<b>One level below (ENGL-091/094/096)</b>	18	26%	96	75%
<b>Two levels below (ENGL-081/089)</b>	28	40%	6	7%
<b>Three levels below (ENGL-071)</b>	16	23%	-	-

student population (35% for Veterans compared to 28% overall), the other groups studied have a smaller proportion of students placing at transfer level than the overall student population.

The most common placement for all groups was one level below transfer, which is consistent with placement rates overall. Students identified as Veterans and students participating in the DSPS program placed at this level at approximately the same rate as students overall (64% of placements for each of these two groups compared to 65% of overall placements). Students participating in the CalWORKS and EOPS programs were placed into the course one level below transfer at higher rates than students placed into this course overall (75% of placements for each of these two groups compared to 65% of students overall).

All groups experienced decreases in placements two and three levels below transfer. For 2015, students identified as Veterans as well as students participating in the CalWORKS and EOPS programs were placed in the course two levels below transfer at rates equal to or lower than the overall student population (2%, 6%, and 7%, respectively compared to 7% of overall placements). Students participating in the DSPS program were placed into the English course two levels below transfer much more frequently than students overall (25% of placements for DSPS students compared to 7% of placements overall), but this still represents a decrease of 5 percentage points in this placement for this group when the 2015 rate is compared to 2012.

No students were placed three levels below transfer English in 2015 while significant numbers of students participating in the DSPS, CalWORKS, and EOPS programs placed at that level in 2012 (42% of 2012 placements for students participating in the DSPS program, 36% of placements for students participating in the CalWORKS program, and 23% of placements for students participating in the EOPS program).

These changes to the lowest levels of placement in English are particularly notable for students participating in the DSPS, CalWORKS, and EOPS programs. For 2012, 72% of DSPS students, 77% of CalWORKS students, and 63% of EOPS students placed two or more courses below transfer level English. For 2015, those numbers drop to 25% for DSPS students, 6% for CalWORKS students, and 7% for EOPS students.

**Disproportionate Impact and Equity:**

As College of the Canyons has worked to address areas of disproportionate impact, Institutional Research utilized three methods to measure potential disproportionate impacts, including the 80% rule with the highest group (column A.), the 80% rule with the overall rate (column B.), and the proportionality index (column C)(please see Methods on page 9 for additional detail).

In College of the Canyons’ 2015-16 Student Equity Plan, several groups are noted to be experiencing disproportionate impacts for the Basic Skills English Completion indicator. African American students, students aged 21-24, 25-34, and 35 and above, and students participating in the DSPS program showed disproportionate impact for Basic Skills English Completion by all three measures of disproportionate impact. Male students and students participating in the CalWORKS program showed disproportionate impact by two measures, and Latino/Hispanic students were impacted by one measure of disproportionate impact.

Comparisons of Transfer-level (ENGL-101) placements across gender, ethnicity, age and special populations: Veteran, Disabled (DSPS), CalWORKS and EOPS students are presented in Table 6 for 2012 and Table 7 for 2015. Although as indicated in the previous section of this brief, there is a general increase in transfer-level placements for all groups over the two time points, the increase does not address disproportionate impact for certain disadvantaged groups. For both time periods African-American/Black students and Latino/Hispanic students were disproportionately impacted where their rates of placement in transfer-level English were less than 80% of the overall rate (column A), less than 80% of the highest performing groups (column B) and had a low proportionality index indicating that their transfer level placement rate was substantially lower than their representation rate among those who took the placement exam (column C). Similarly, DSPS students were disproportionately impacted for both time points by all three measures. In 2015, students in the age-group of 21-24 and EOPS students showed disproportionate impact (data did not indicate disproportionate impact for these groups in 2012).

**Table 6. Disproportionate Impact Analysis for Transfer-level English placement 2012**

<b>ENGL-101 Placement 2012</b>									
	ENG 101 Placement 2012	ALL those who took placement 2012	ENGL 101 Placement Rate	A. 80% Rule Ref: Highest Performing Grp	B. 80% Rule Ref: overall Rate	Proportion of Cohort	Proportion of ENGL 101 PLACEMENT	C. Percentage Point Gap 3% or higher	Disproportionate Impact
<b>Gender</b>									
Overall	716	4456	16.1%						
Female	351	2124	16.5%	100.2%	102.6%	47.7%	49.0%	0.5%	
Male	365	2317	15.8%	95.5%	97.8%	52.0%	51.0%	-0.3%	
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Overall	716	4456	16.1%						
Native American	3	27	11.1%	32.4%	69.0%	0.6%	0.4%	-5.0%	
Asian	98	286	34.3%	99.9%	212.8%	6.4%	13.7%	18.2%	
Af.Amer./Black	29	350	8.3%	24.2%	51.5%	7.9%	4.1%	-7.8%	
Filipino	40	221	18.1%	52.8%	112.4%	5.0%	5.6%	2.0%	
Latino/Hispanic	190	1986	9.6%	27.9%	59.4%	44.6%	26.5%	-6.5%	
White	345	1492	23.1%	67.4%	143.6%	33.5%	48.2%	7.1%	
Other	6	37	16.2%	47.3%	100.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.1%	
Unknown	5	57	8.8%	25.6%	54.5%	1.3%	0.7%	-7.3%	
<b>Age</b>									
Overall	716	4456	16.1%						
17 or below	250	953	26.2%	100.1%	162.9%	21.4%	34.9%	10.2%	
18-20	355	2749	12.9%	49.3%	80.2%	61.7%	49.6%	-3.2%	
21-24	48	350	13.7%	52.3%	85.2%	7.9%	6.7%	-2.4%	
25-34	37	246	15.0%	57.4%	93.4%	5.5%	5.2%	-1.0%	
35 and above	26	155	16.8%	64.0%	104.2%	3.5%	3.6%	0.7%	
<b>Special Population</b>									
Overall**	716	4456	16.1%						
Veterans	13	69	18.8%		117.0%	1.5%	1.8%	2.8%	
<b>DSPS</b>	20	305	6.6%		40.7%	6.8%	2.8%	-9.5%	
CalWORKS*	1	8							
EOPS	8	70	11.4%		71.0%	1.6%	1.1%	-4.6%	

\*Cohort less than 10

\*\*Overall rate for these groups is the Highest Performing group

Highest performing group	Disproportionately Impacted group based on 2 measures
Disproportionately Impacted group based on 3 measures	Disproportionately Impacted group based on 1 measures



**Table 7. Disproportionate Impact Analysis for Transfer-level English placement 2015**

<b>ENGL-101 Placement 2015</b>									
	ENG 101 Placement 2015	ALL those who took placement 2015	ENGL 101 Placement Rate	A. 80% Rule Ref: Highest Performing Grp	B. 80% Rule Ref: overall Rate	Proportion of Cohort	Proportion of ENGL 101 PLACEMENT	C. Percentage Point Gap 3% or higher	Disproportionate Impact
<b>Gender</b>									
Overall	1042	3686	28.3%						
Male	559	1946	28.7%	100.1%	101.5%	52.8%	53.6%	0.5%	
Female	475	1717	27.7%	96.4%	97.8%	46.6%	45.6%	-0.6%	
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Overall	1042	3686	28.3%						
Native American	8	20	40.0%	96.6%	141.3%	0.5%	0.8%	11.7%	
Asian	67	188	35.6%	86.1%	125.9%	5.1%	6.4%	7.4%	
Af.Amer./Black	41	277	14.8%	35.8%	52.3%	7.5%	3.9%	-13.5%	
Filipino	54	151	35.8%	86.4%	126.4%	4.1%	5.2%	7.5%	
Latino/Hispanic	370	1852	20.0%	48.3%	70.6%	50.2%	35.5%	-8.3%	
White	485	1171	41.4%	100.0%	146.4%	31.8%	46.5%	13.1%	
Other	11	21	52.4%	126.5%	185.1%	0.6%	1.1%	24.1%	
Unknown	6	26	23.1%	55.7%	81.5%	0.7%	0.6%	-5.2%	
<b>Age</b>									
Overall	1042	3686	28.3%						
17 or below	164	403	40.7%	100.0%	143.8%	10.9%	15.7%	12.4%	
18-20	706	2586	27.3%	67.1%	96.5%	70.2%	67.8%	-1.0%	
21-24	65	311	20.9%	51.4%	73.9%	8.4%	6.2%	-7.4%	
25-34	66	229	28.8%	70.8%	101.8%	6.2%	6.3%	0.6%	
35 and above	38	147	25.9%	63.5%	91.3%	4.0%	3.6%	-2.4%	
<b>Special Population</b>									
Overall**	1042	3686	28.3%						
Veterans	23	66	34.8%			123.1%	1.8%	2.2%	6.6%
DSPS	31	272	11.4%			40.3%	7.4%	3.0%	-16.9%
CalWORKS*	9	22	40.9%			144.6%	0.6%	0.9%	12.6%
EOPS	15	117	12.8%			45.3%	3.2%	1.4%	-15.4%

\*Cohort less than 10.

\*\*Overall rate for these groups is the Highest Performing group

Highest performing group	Disproportionately Impacted group based on 2 measures
Disproportionately Impacted group based on 3 measures	Disproportionately Impacted group based on 1 measures

### ***Recommendations:***

- Conduct additional analyses, including examining overall and disaggregated retention and success rates for students in the English composition sequence for Fall 2015.
- Consider additional curricular revisions, including co-requisite models of remediation for students placing into ENGL-091.
- Consider additional revisions to the placement process, including expanding disjunctive placement options for transfer-level placement to mitigate disproportionate impact.
- Consider these results in conjunction with other existing data including the English Academic Program Reviews, CCCCO Scorecard, Student Equity Plan, and Basic Skills Progress Tracker.

### ***Action Implications:***

Upon review of Research Brief #114 from December 2016, “English Placement and Equity Implications”, the English Department will consider the recommendations made by the office of Institutional Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. We are also planning significant changes to our multiple measures, which is likely to address equity issues in our placement process beginning in Spring 2018.

1. The English Department is currently planning to overhaul our placement measures by using a disjunctive multiple measures model; this will ultimately affect placement, student success and will most likely address the issue of disproportionate impact.
2. The English Department will be assembling a Faculty Inquiry Group in Fall 2017 to research the possibility of developing non-credit courses and/or certificates.
3. In addition to the non-credit conversation, the English Department is also considering revising the existing course sequence to include only one course below English 101. This will dramatically affect disproportionate impact and will remove barriers to student success.
4. The English Department is also researching different co-requisite models to determine how to best serve students testing in at the lowest level without adding additional barriers.

### **Methodology**

To conduct the analysis, placement data for Fall 2012, Fall 2014, and Fall 2015 (April 1-October 15 for each year) were obtained from MIS. Data were also obtained from student ID referential files from these terms. To perform the analysis, data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS v22, 2013) and Microsoft Excel (2013).

**80% Rule Methodology:** The 80% Rule methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by a reference group. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. The 80% Rule states that: “A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.” [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80% when compared to a reference group is considered to have suffered an adverse – or disproportionate - impact. For the Student Equity Plan, the 80% Rule methodology was used with two reference groups: the rate of the highest performing group and the overall rate. This provided additional vantage points on the data.

**Proportionality Methodology:** The proportionality methodology compares the percentage of a disaggregated subgroup in an initial cohort to the percentage of that group in the outcome group. The formula for proportionality is the percentage in the outcome group divided by the percentage in the original cohort (outcome percentage/cohort percentage). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both conditions at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the outcome than the cohort. Conversely, a ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is more prevalent in the outcome than the cohort. The higher the proportionality index, the higher the rate at which a subgroup has attained a desired educational outcome compared to its representation in the cohort; the lower the proportionality index the lower the attainment rate.

## References

- Bailey, T., Jeong, D.W. & Cho, S.W. (2008). Referral, enrollment, and completion in developmental education sequences in community colleges. CCRC Working Paper No. 15 (Rev. 2009). New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/referral-enrollment-completion-developmental-education.html>
- Brezina, J., Parker, C., Meuschke, D. M., & Gribbons, B. C. (2015). English 096 success and progression analysis, spring 2012-spring 2014. Santa Clarita, CA: College of the Canyons Research Brief #80.
- Hayward, C., & Willett, T. (2014). Curricular redesign and gatekeeper completion: a multi-college evaluation of the California Acceleration Project. Berkeley, CA: The Research & Planning Group for California Community Colleges. Retrieved from [http://rpgroup.org/system/files/CAP\\_Report\\_Final\\_June2014.pdf](http://rpgroup.org/system/files/CAP_Report_Final_June2014.pdf).

For more detailed information on this research brief, stop by the Institutional Research office located in BONH-223, or call Preeta Saxena, Senior Research Analyst at 661.362.3072 or Daylene Meuschke, Dean of Institutional Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness at 661.362.5329.