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Project Support

WSU Provost Office, WSU Department of Mathematics and Statistics, and ODHE:

Bridges to Success – joint with Sinclair Bridges to Success Implementation

We targeted three of our pathways:
MTH 1450: quantitative literacy/general audience
STT 1600: introductory statistics
MTH 1280: college algebra
MTH 1450:
We overhauled the curriculum to match OTM QR

Served small N, but good pass rate:

23 coreq students across two sections.
70% pass rate

This is in comparison to:
CoLA

Started DEV in Fall 2013, 2014 or 2015
N=361 (Total)

Passed DEV in Fall
N=158 (Eligible)
44% of Total

>1 year to complete DEV

Passed math gateway in Spring (Successful)
N=55
74% of Attempted
47% of Eligible
15% of Total

>1 year to complete both DEV and gateway

Attempted math gateway in Spring (Attempted)
N=74
47% of Eligible
21% of Total

>1 year to complete DEV and attempt gateway
Registration model

We are fortunate that WSU has experience with this from implementing the corequisite English writing program.

- **DEV 0950 – Section 01:** 20 Students (Co-Req Only)
- **DEV 0950 – Section 02:** 20 Students (Co-Req Only)
- **QR – Section 11:** 20 Students (Co-Req)
- **QR – Section 12:** 20 Students (Co-Req)

Students must register for both the DEV and a QR.
We are piloting co-requisite remediation in three pathways:

1. MTH 1450: Math and the Modern World
2. MTH 1280: College Algebra
3. STT 1600: Statistical Concepts
Our corequisite remediation model

Gateway Mathematics Course

| 20 Students (Need remediation) | 20 Students (No remediation necessary) |

Customized DEV Course

Just in time remediation. Curriculum is merged with the gateway content.
• The “just in time” curriculum working well for QR course with Dana Center materials for MTH 1450.

• Professional development opportunity focusing on active learning techniques delivered by Dana Center folks for a group of faculty WSU and Sinclair.

• STT 1600 co-req material was designed this summer. It’s being run through for the first time.

• MTH 1280 College Algebra co-req material was also designed this summer. It is a mix of home grown, on line ALEKS, and publisher provided.
• What structure is necessary to make sure there is sufficient communication between the instructor(s) and the GTA’s teaching the DEV courses?

• How do we accommodate differences in approach and notation between the two instructors?

When we go to scale we will have 10+ sections of each course. Will be impossible to guarantee same instructor feeds the coreq course. Using the MTH 1450 and STT 1600 pilots to learn.
College Algebra

• Who will be successful in co-req remediation? In particular, translating content necessary to appropriate placement marker.

• If students come in with too big a deficit, there is too much to do “just in time”

• It seems some students should be able to drop the MTH and keep the DEV. Consequences?

• ALEKS: its structure forces too much “backtracking” for remediation students, not enough flexibility to do “just in time”.
Chair’s perspective/Lessons learned

• Crucial to work with Student Success infrastructure of the university.
• Crucial to work with advisors.
• Crucial to have registrar support to set up registration structure.
• Crucial to have good course numbering to avoid confusion.
• Crucial to share data with constituents.
• Everything flows more smoothly if the curriculum of the college credit bearing class is overhauled along with the design, everyone is perforce “on the same page” lessening communication issues.

• Stretch courses are not as good models for co-req (except for Calculus level).

• You have to convince your faculty it’s not a waste of resources saving students from the inevitable eventual failure.

• You should track “successor course” success

• You should track “persistence”