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Building a case for change

- Reviewed national research and data
- Collected our own data
- Predicted effects on enrollment in courses and sections
- Visited stakeholder groups
- Revised placement policies
- Revised placement testing processes
Rationale

- More accurate placement
  - GPA a more accurate predictor of success
- Faster completion
  - Two opportunities to place in college-level courses—through GPA and then placement tests
- Reduce equity gaps
- More efficient placement
Communications strategy

- Review of national data and research by Success and SSTF teams
- Review of our own data and the analysis by Math Dept. especially convincing
- Meeting with all stakeholders: IR department, English and Math departments, SSTF and Success teams, Advisors, HS Counselors, President’s Cabinet to explain, receive input, and fine tune adoption
- Meet with students as part of routine enrollment process
Model selection

- For post-high students (not CCP)
- 2.7 GPA for college-level placement with successful completion of high school Algebra II for College Algebra or successful completion of high school trigonometry and/or pre-calculus for placement in College Calculus
- Self-reported GPAs regardless of age used as primary placement measure with subsequent official transcript confirmation
- Two-part sequential process: GPA used first and test scores second
- Test scores used as secondary means to place students in college-level courses and also used to place in developmental remediation
Policy changes

- Revised policies and procedures to document changes and secure approval from stakeholders
  - 3357:13-14-20 Assessing Incoming Students’ Readiness Skills (Student Placement) Policy—revised to reflect rationale of two-part process
  - 3357:13-14-201 Assessing Incoming Students’ Readiness Skills (Student Placement) Procedures—revised to provide details of applying GPA bands and test scores
Placement process efficiencies

- Self-reported GPA allowed faster placement
- Online testing also created greater speed and convenience for students
- Simple model and easy to implement
## Enrollment changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before MMP (2019-2020)</th>
<th>After MMP (SU/FA 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developmental</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-requisite</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College-level</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developmental</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-requisite</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College-level</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

- Review of success data and faculty/student experiences
- Refinement of model
- Revision of any process problems