

CCCC President's Address CCC Board of Trustees Meeting
Thursday March 4th, 2021

Chairperson Massey, Board of Trustees, Chancellor Salgado, Provost Potter, Officers of the District, faculty, staff and all others streaming: Good afternoon!

My report this month is much shorter than usual, so I won't be before you long.

In our meeting with Dr. Potter last week, one of the concerns we brought up surrounded adding more face-to-face courses for the summer and fall semesters. Faculty have been concerned about arbitrary quotas set for the number of face-to-face classes. Dr. Potter has said that, in conversations with our vice presidents, the goal has been to offer one f2f class for every multi-section class we offer. He acknowledged that we are still following health department guidance around capacity and sanitization of spaces. He also acknowledged that due to these restrictions, in practice, we wouldn't actually be able to offer one f2f per multi-section course and that VPs in conjunction with department chairs would prioritize what should be offered f2f. While there is a great amount of flexibility in how he has framed this, that doesn't negate that there is still a goal to maximize the f2f offerings, and when our leadership tells his team that there's a goal, it is implicit that there is an expectation for them to help meet that goal. Our concern doesn't lie in reopening because we never closed. Faculty have been in our buildings teaching since the pandemic began. Our concern lies with who will teach those courses and their ability to prioritize their health. Full-time faculty get first choice of the schedule. If there is pressure to add f2f classes and we don't feel comfortable teaching them for whatever reason, we have first choice of remote courses. If no full-time faculty member chooses to teach the f2f course, it is then offered to our adjunct faculty. While they may have the same reservations as full-time faculty, as part-time faculty who often cobble together a living by teaching at multiple colleges within and outside of our system, they don't often have the option to pass up a course, lest they don't want to pay their bills and afford to take care of themselves and their families. In this way, the pressure to add a f2f course also creates a situation akin to coercion in which we exploit our part-time faculty by potentially placing them harm's way because our leadership who, mind you, have no classrooms full of essential workers to go into, have set an arbitrary goal. Dr. Potter heard our concern and said that he would take that to our VPs. I haven't gotten a follow up on that as it was only last week, but I'm assuming he did. We have many faculty who would love to come back on campus to teach, and I imagine that they possibly outnumber the goal Dr. Potter had or has in mind, we would just prefer that the ask be to survey who wants to teach f2f and let faculty volunteer vs. scheduling a class and creating a situation in which someone may have to teach it who would, if in a different financial situation, chose their health over a course assignment.

Also in our last meeting, we reintroduced the work that we have been engaging in at Cook County Jail. Professor Jennifer Alexander has been teaching a correspondence course and will be entering a new session soon. Thanks to the attentiveness of Dr. Potter and Sarah Lichtenstein, within days of our meeting, Professor Alexander was contacted about legitimizing

the course by offering it as a continuing education class. This is huge and is a welcome step in the right direction concerning our partnership with Cook County Jail. However, reporting this is bittersweet, as while we have been able to swiftly get traction on a correspondence course, we have seen four years go by without the completion of an MOU to begin credit bearing work within the jail. Certainly, this work can't happen right now due to Covid; however, our realities are changing, and at some point we will be able to reenter that space. When that time comes, we would like to be ready. Committee H is our FC4 committee charged with engaging the City College in social justice work through providing educational opportunities to individuals touched by the criminal justice system whether they are returning citizens, currently detained, or are individuals who are tangentially impacted, and we are requesting that before the next Board meeting that General Council provide us with an updated timeline for the completion of an MOU. Just because we can't go in now doesn't mean that preparation should be halted. If General Council would like to schedule a meeting, we welcome a conversation and she may reach out us to schedule it at her convenience.

Finally, at the end of my report last week, I discussed what faculty believe is a conflict of interest in the role Vice-Chair Swanson's positions on both our board and as the chairperson of Partnership for College Completion. As an addendum to my written report, I included the impact of developmental education reforms proposed by PCC; they are numerous and detrimental to our most vulnerable students. I will include it again this month as an addendum. I closed my report by asking the Board to justify Trustee Swanson's ability to serve in both roles. Our policies concerning conflicts of interest generally focus on individuals who directly make decisions, so this situation falls slightly out of those policies. Trustee Swanson does not directly make academic or procedural decisions, nor has she personally made any statement in favor of or against the legislative agenda of PCC on behalf of City Colleges; however, as someone who votes on the contracts of our Chancellor and Provost, even if she never discussed the matter with them, they are aware of her role as PCC's Chairperson and their position concerning developmental education. This power structure, even if unintended, can exert an unspoken pressure on our leadership to not speak against the work of PCC, even when it poses a threat to a large swath of our student body.

Certainly, as an institution we must consider all of the viewpoints on what could be beneficial to our students, and we have a responsibility to listen and investigate them. So we are not trying to silence the voices of those who hold a different philosophical view than is held by faculty, and I want to remind you that FC4 has historically held the position that we were against the agenda purported by PCC. While we welcome engagement with groups like PCC to work toward policies and practices that would be in our students' best interest, what we are discussing in relation to Trustee Swanson is a classic example of a conflict of interest.

I imagine that the board members may have viewed the question I posed at the end of my report as a rhetorical move; however, it was real question to which we would like a thoughtful answer. So, we formally request that the Board respond to this question: **Considering what we believe to be a conflict of interest in Trustee Swanson's role on our board and as the Chairperson of Partnership for college completion, how does the board of trustees justify her**

continuing in her role as a member of our board? I know that we are all busy and that the Board is a volunteer group, so before the next board meeting, we ask that, at minimum, receive communication as to when we can expect a response.

Thank you, and this concludes my report.

Respectfully submitted,
Keith Sprewer on behalf of the Faculty Council of the City Colleges of Chicago

Addendum:

Context & Consequences of Dev Ed Bill HB2170

By CCC English Faculty, Julia Cohen, Susan Grace, and Kim Knutson

Aim: HB2170 contains two key mandates for institutions of higher education in Illinois:

1. to assess traditional Dev Ed programming in both English and mathematics and then to reform it. The English Discipline across CCC has done this important work and has replaced its traditional sequence of Dev Ed courses with both an IRW accelerated course (ARC) and a co-requisite (English 101/097).

2. to determine appropriate placement policies that meet the needs of the local institution and that employ some version of “multiple measures.” This is what needs to be addressed and what carries great import for students across the system.

1. Our Shared Mission and Guiding Principles:

- **Desire to support *all* students holistically to be successful in their academic pursuits**
This is why we are here. It’s our mission as educators to provide the best programs, curriculum, pedagogy, practices, and support services so that all of our students experience truly engaging, challenging, and transformative education. And this “real education” happens “one call slip at a time.” (Ta-Nehisi Coates in *Between the World and Me*)
- **Real equity for all students**
All students in Illinois have a right to higher education, to robust, exciting curriculum, and to an array of opportunities no matter their race, socio-economic background, or level of preparedness.

Access, equity, and student success are paramount in all curricular and programmatic decisions. The gaps in completion rates between white and Black and brown students

are not acceptable. They demand creative, thoughtful solutions based on valid, rigorous research so that all students can grow, follow the dreams of their choosing, and be thoughtful active participants in our democratic society.

- **Pedagogy of empathy and empowerment**

We aspire to see our students with open clear eyes, meet them where they are with the appropriate level of culturally-responsive and engaging content, provide strategies for metacognitive and personal awareness and for agency over their learning, guide their development of voice and clear critical thinking and expression, and facilitate the imagining of all possibilities for their lives and communities.

- **Adherence to HLC Guidelines**

HLC has very **clear criteria** for accurate placement: The HLC standard for placement as stipulated in Criterion 3.D. 2 of the Criteria for Accreditation:

*“The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are **adequately prepared.**”*

- **Recognition of diversity of needs and of differentiated programming**

Diverse students in diverse contexts need differentiated programming. There is no quick fix, one-size fits all solution for the myriad of students that come our way as an open access institution. It is simplistic and harmful, especially to our most marginalized and historically under-served students to embrace policy governed by such ill-advised and imprudent thinking.

“For every complex problem there is an answer that is clear, simple, and wrong.” -- H.L. Menchen

“It is either idiotic or deceitful to misrepresent developmental education and then blame it for the complexity of student attrition and assume the problem is solved by getting rid of it.”

-Hunter R. Boylan, in a 2017 interview published in The Journal of Developmental Education

2. Brief History of Dev Ed Reform Movement:

Overall Context & Influence of Outside Entities

This is a complex, interrelated, and economic-driven agenda. The quick and simple version is this: the stated aims of DE reform are

- to eliminate barriers of “problematic” remedial education and place students directly into college-level courses
- with clearly structured course offerings and prescribed defined “Pathways” so as to help students overcome barriers and navigate the many challenging choices of academia

- in order to increase the completion/certificate rates.

While the seeds of reform began after the 2000 census, the effort became more defined by those who are leading it and who are in control of the narrative (Gates, Lumina, Complete College America, Jobs for the Future, Partners for College Completion, CCRC) around 2010, and it is now in full swing.

It is important to note here that these are all **outside entities** (not local researchers or practitioners), **who wield unchecked influence**. Researcher Megan E. Tompkins-Strange in *Policy Patrons: Philanthropy, Education Reform, and the Politics of Influence* reveals: “Gates attitude toward grantees is described as one of employer/employee: We’ll hire [grantees] the way you hire a contractor, and we’ll specify exactly what we want from them” (70).

And, as one would expect, the Gates Foundation Policy on Developmental Education is “Enrollment in college-level math and English courses ... is the default placement for the vast majority of students.”

If one does due diligence by briefly searching on the websites of all the above-stated groups, the same templates and messages can be found nearly verbatim. This is of great import particularly when public funds are being used for public institutions for the purported common good of the communities and human beings that they serve.

What are the original, primary aims of DE reforms?

a) 60% College Degrees by 2025 (originally 2020)

The United States no longer ranks number one of citizens with a college degree out of OCED countries. In 2008, 39% of young people (or a ranking of 15) had a postsecondary credential – a bachelor’s degree, an associate’s degree or a certificate. In response, Gates, former President Obama, Lumina, and Complete College America and others made increasing this statistic a national goal, and in 2009, the Obama administration announced the “60% by 2020” college completion initiative: “60% of the young U.S. adult population Americans should have a postsecondary degree by 2020.”

In *Getting to Graduation: The Completion Agenda in Higher Education*, Bailey explains that the most viable strategy to attain this completion goal focuses on community colleges because with their low graduation rates (39% in six years for full- and part-time students), they provide an *available* pool of students who simply need help *completing* their degree and not in recruiting, enrolling *and* completing. It is the most “feasible and economically realistic” tactic to take (76-77). Therefore, if the increased graduation rate depends on community colleges, then these low rates must be addressed.

b) Increase the Economic Efficiency of Publicly Funded Higher Education

In addition to the completion agenda, the DE reform is guided by a cost efficiency paradigm. According to KcKinsey & Company, a college's effectiveness is measured by dividing the total expenditures by the total number of degrees and certificates completed. **To be clear, success = cost / # of degrees/certificates awarded** (*Winning by Degrees, 2010*). Therefore, in order to be successful, an institution must figure out how to produce more graduates with a set amount of resources.

Additionally, a leading DE reformer unabashedly captures this cost efficiency in the following statement:

“CCRC research associate Davis Jenkins states, “ **Students who first enter into remediation are less likely to complete and more likely to drop out. ... If students are to ultimately drop out, it is better that they do so earlier – before the college has allocated substantial resources to them – that later.**” (Belfield et al. 2013, p.12)

c) Reform/Eliminate Remedial Education & Enroll Directly in College-Level Classes

Enter the attack on developmental education and its accompanying “abysmal” rates of success, which hold the completion rates down and whose students provide a ready pool of potential degree/certificate completers. It is posited that DE is too costly and ineffective, and that there are superior program options: “Enrollment in college-level math and English courses [should be] the default placement for the vast majority of students” (Gates Foundation, CCA, AACC, Achieving the Dream, Jobs for the Future).

d) Implement GPS, or Guided Pathways to Success

Another means to facilitate completion is to make the process more transparent and navigable for students. Guided Pathways to Success aims to do just this. As the Complete College America website explains, GPS provides students with clear structured programs and course sequences, eliminates too much overwhelming choice, and minimizes mistakes and wasted credits - all resulting in better chances in completion.

Equity

Dev Ed is disparaged as a primary threat to equity in higher education. The claim is made that all of the major components of Dev Ed reform, including default placement into college-level courses, use of co-requisite courses and Guided Pathways, will facilitate more equitable outcomes for at-risk students and students of color.

Or Is it?

This national and statewide Dev Ed effort is pushing for economic efficiencies in higher education by weeding out those deemed 'less likely' to succeed. This is not equity.

3. Two Key False Claims about the Dev Ed Reform Movement:

False Claim #1: Developmental education is not only ineffective, but it is the reason students do not complete; otherwise known as the "remediation as barrier" claim.

This is a classic confusion of causation, but correlation IS NOT causation. Dev Ed course work is not the reason students fail to complete a degree.

Poor academic preparation and known risk factors:

Students requiring Dev Ed classes have *known risk factors*: minority, low-income, first-generation, under-resourced schools, poor academic preparation, systemic racism, and it is these very risk factors that impair their success, *not* the Dev Ed course itself.

"College remediation ceases to predict graduation" after students' incoming level of academic preparation is controlled for. This means that it is the inadequate preparation of students placed into remedial classes, and not the coursework itself, that 'reduces students' chances of graduating from college."

"[A]fter we add controls for family background and academic performance in high school," the graduation rate of two-year college students who took remedial classes was essentially the same as that of students who did not take remedial coursework. This means 'that taking one or more remedial courses in a two-year college does not, in itself, lower a student's chances of graduation. Causal factors that do reduce one's chances of graduating include low family SES, poor high school preparation, and being Black,' all of which are risk factors for requiring remediation in the first place.

(Attwell, Paul, Lavin, David, Domina, Thurston and Tania Levy. "New Evidence on College Remediation" *The Journal of Higher Education*. Vol 77 No 5. Sept/Oct. 2006.)

Positive contributions of remediation:

Developmental education is *not* a barrier; it is a catapult that gives the students with the greatest needs a fair shot at higher education and pursuing their dreams.

National Center on Educational Statistics at the U.S. Department of Education

Numerous studies have found that developmental education is effective in helping less prepared students achieve academically, including most notably a rigorous statistical analysis performed by the National Center on Educational Statistics at the U.S. Department of Education and published in 2016. (“Developmental Education Coursework: Critical Findings on Key Positive Outcomes for Students.”)

Summary of Key Findings:

- **College-level English enrollment and success:**
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to enroll** in a college-level English class than nonremedial students.
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to successfully complete a college-level English class** than nonremedial students.

- **Attrition rate:**
 - Remedial completers are **less likely to drop out of college** in any given year than nonremedial students.

- **Degree or certificate attainment:**
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to attain an associate’s degree or certificate** than nonremedial students.
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to transfer** to a four-year college than nonremedial students.
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to attain a bachelor’s degree** than nonremedial students.

- **Student persistence:**
 - Remedial completers are **more likely to continue to be enrolled in college** (if no degree or certificate is attained) than nonremedial students.
 - Remedial completers **earn more total college-level course credits** than nonremedial students.

ARC Dev Ed Redesign: Our own Dev Ed Program offers the resources and support students need to succeed: an accelerated course completed in a single semester, small class sizes, integrated reading and writing curriculum, culturally-responsive pedagogy, and college-level material.

Quantitative Data From Wright College (Fall 2015 through Fall 2018)

- **ARC Course Success Rates: 68.4% of new students enrolling in ARC complete successfully (pass with an A, B, or C).**

Total number of new students enrolled in ARC at Wright College: 3,574

Of those enrolled, number who completed ARC successfully: 2,445

- **ARC Students' Enrollment and Success Rates in English 101:**

84% of students who complete ARC enroll in English 101 within one year.

Of these, 72.2% successfully complete.

In comparison, data from a comparable time period show that new students who place directly into English 101 have a success rate of 69.6%.

- **ARC Students' Enrollment and Success Rate in English 102:**

69.1% of ARC students who complete English 101 go on to enroll in English 102; of these, 73.9% successfully complete.

In comparison, 70.6% of students who place directly into and complete English 101 go on to enroll in English 102; of these, 69% successfully complete.

Comments:

*The transition and success of ARC students, students who start at a disadvantage and are often at-risk, in English 101 is remarkable. The fact that these same students outperformed those students who placed directly into English 101 speaks volumes: developmental English is NOT a barrier and in fact does serve as a very strong foundation that positions students for long-term success. ARC is arguably the strongest possible platform for postsecondary remediation that will lead to **long-term** success. This is evidenced by the continued retention and success of ARC students in English 102 (73.9%) – a course that challenges all students district-wide.*

False Claim #2: Co-reqs are the best and only solution (one-size-fits-all claim).

The two CCRC articles that are repeatedly cited as evidence for implementing the ALP Co-req Model at Baltimore Community College:

“ A Model for accelerating academic success of community college remedial English students: Is the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) effective and affordable?” by Jenkins, Belfield, Jaggars, and Edgecombe (2010)

“New evidence on the success for community college remedial English students: Tracking the outcomes of students in the Accelerated Learning Program.” by Cho, Kopko, Jenkins and Jaggars (2012)

The essential claim of these two CCRC studies is that ALP students’ pass rates in college-level English dramatically improve – there was a 31.1% increase in DE (developmental English) students passing English 101 compared to non-ALP DE students. If valid, this is impressive indeed.

There are several important components of the studied ALP co-req model that are essential to these stated results:

- All ALP students have **increased instruction and time** on task, from 3 (for the non-ALP DE students in English 101) to 6 (for the ALP students in English 101) credit hours. This is double the classroom time spent together.
- In the ALP co-req model, all ALP students receive *more individual attention* in the supplemental support course that has a student teacher **ratio of 8:1**. This more than halves the typical number of students in a class.
- The above-two points also translate into **greater cost**, and so if cost is used as an argument against DE, this is negated.

The Unmentioned Results in the SAME Two Repeated CCRC articles:

What is essential to the counter narrative of the co-req movement is what is NOT reiterated in countless articles. This concerns the negative impact of co-reqs on a large number of students – those students who have the most to lose from an elimination of developmental courses, and the failure of the co-req model to improve college completion rates.

Unacknowledged Result #1: DOUBLE FAILURE RATES

The raw data in CCRC’s 2012 article show that the ALP model ALSO increases the college-level fail rates (from 14 – 25 %) of DE students. In other words, twice as many ALP DE students fail the college-level English course. This failure rate gets worse in English 102. 42% of ALP DE students failed both English 101 and 102, while 19% of non-ALP DE did. Again – this is a doubling of the failure rate with the co-req model. This pattern continues in other college-level courses.

Unacknowledged Result #2: Outcomes in college courses are not better.

ALP students did **no better** than non-ALP [traditional DE] students in the outcomes of course grades, persistence, and success rates in college courses. Furthermore, there is no evidence of an “increased likelihood to take and pass other college-level course.”

Unacknowledged Result #3: Completion and transfer rates are not better.

“ALP and non-ALP [traditional DE] students were *equally likely* to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate degree, or transfer to a four-year college. Note: The study followed a 2007 ALP cohort and was written in 2012 allowing for five years to measure completion or transfer.

Unacknowledged Result #4: Those who benefit are white, richer, full-time, high-scoring on placement exams.

ALP students were whiter, more likely to receive financial aid, more likely to be enrolled full-time, and had higher placement scores on all three placement tests in English, reading, and math. These are not the demographics for the majority of CCC students.

Unacknowledged Result #5: There is a negative impact on students who placed directly into English 101:

“ For ... college-ready students, there was a negative relationship between taking ENGL 101 with ALP students and certain outcomes, such as attempting and completing college courses and credits after ENGL 101.” This leads to a downward spiraling of expectations and standards – impacting all college-level courses as students’ reading, writing and critical thinking skills are insufficient to meet the course demands.

And there is the very misleading data: Cho et al. claim, “Results suggest that ALP students were much more likely to attempt ENGL 101.” Since ALP students are *directly* placed into ENGL 101, this is simply true by design and is quite misleading.

The lack of rigor of the CCRC studies and the questionable research design:

The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) of the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) (the statistics, research and evaluation arm of the Department of Education), has **not classified the research done on ALP as meeting “rigorous research standards”** and has **“minimal evidence” to support its use** (Bailey et al, 90-92).

Further, even CCRC in *Is Co-Requisite Remediation Cost Effective?* has more recently acknowledged that **“the co-requisite model has not yet been subjected to rigorous evaluation”** (Belfield, Jenkins, & Lahr 2016).

Alexandros Goudas in “The Co-Requisite Reform Movement: An Education Bait and Switch” elaborates on **numerous flaws in the studies** and the bait and switch strategies used to push the completion and co-req agenda. They include:

- the small sample study on which all claims are made;
- the apples to oranges comparisons between ALP and non-ALP DE students that artificially exaggerate success rates;
- the classic correlation versus causation confusion – as if participation in DE courses causes lower completion rates in college;
- the selection bias since students self-selected for the ALP cohort that was followed and were not randomly assigned – and thus positive results could be attributed to non-cognitive abilities of motivation and confidence that this choice exhibits;
- the fact that Complete College America repeatedly touts ALP success rates by comparing dissimilar pools of students across institutions;
- **the alarming fact that Complete College America provides no original data.**

Changing of the goal post: As it is becoming more apparent that co-reqs are NOT increasing college completion rates, this purported original goal is no longer the metric used as a measure of success. It is now simply *passing the gateway college-English course* in the 2017 Bailey and Jenkins studies.

Nearly Ten Years Later: College completion rates are not increasing with co-reqs.

CCRC researchers themselves in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* are now conceding that **co-requisites “are unlikely to substantially improve graduation rates”** (Jaggars & Bickerstaff, 2018).

Hunter Boylan contends in *College Completion: Focus on the Finish Line* that the 60% college completion goal is highly unlikely to be reached with any quick fix approach without looking more broadly at the real lives and academic needs of at-risk students. He posits that DE reform needs to focus more on pedagogy, institutional support, and connections to the larger community of community colleges.

Bonus! One More Flawed Argument about Dev Ed and Equity!

It runs like this: Students who enroll in Dev Ed classes are on average less likely to graduate. Since low-income students of color are disproportionately represented in these classes, equity demands they be eliminated or limited to a co-req model. The problem with this interpretation appears to be a variant of the “correlation is not causation” problem discussed above, or it’s an unarticulated belief that effective remediation is an impossibility.

The real problem with the equity argument, however, is not merely that it is based on faulty premises, but that *it may lead to systemic policy change that will harm the very people it purports to help.*

We need well-designed Dev Ed models and accurate placement methods in order to mitigate REAL equity concerns.

Dev Ed is a scapegoat.

Look at the drop in enrollment in CCC since “Reinvention” and the consolidation of programs. (Note: While drop enrollment is a statewide problem, it is significantly higher at CCC than other two-year colleges.)

City Colleges of Chicago (IPEDS data from 10-15-18)

IPEDS Data: 12-month enrollment

FY2010 vs. FY2017 (Reinvention was launched in 2010.)

	FY2010	FY2017
DA	15,773	12,625
HW*	15,672	12,669
KK	12,224	5,793
MX	14,653	9,858
OH*	8,360	5,494
TR	21,558	14,740
WR	19,938	16,534
CCC	108,178	77,713

Change in enrollment by race and ethnicity:

Race/ethnicity	FY2010	FY2017
Black (non-Hispanic)	40,247	22,798
Hispanic	40,105	36,299
White (non-Hispanic)	17,302	10,517
Asian	7,917	6,184
Other	2,617	1,513
TOTAL	108,178	73,513

4. Timeline of Dev Ed Reform Bill in IL

- 2018 via SB446 (funded by Partnership for College Completion)
 - Reform meant completely eliminating Dev Ed courses and only replacing them with Co-Reqs mandated by percentages over time
 - Mandated implementation of multiple “single” measures so as to directly place students into college level courses
 - Wide-spread opposition from two and four-year institutions to the bill and it was pulled
- 2019-20 via SJR 41
 - A taskforce was convened to research Dev Ed and Placement and reevaluate the bill.
 - ICCB wrote final report that was still grounded in false claims about Dev Ed and the use of multiple SINGLE measures
 - Opposition by faculty on taskforce wrote their own Minority Report, despite great efforts to suppress it.
- January 2021 Lame Duck Session in IL General Assembly via HB2170 and SB 0458
 - Current Bill was buried in TWO lengthy bills and was pushed through lame duck session of the GA while faculty across the state were on break, all during a chaotic pandemic.
 - PCC circumvented the task force and went directly to Black Caucus with the purported aim of equity to get it proposed.
 - Resorted to devious tactics as knew it would receive widespread pushback and could not pass muster on its merits alone.
- However, some gains made from original SB446:
 - Institutions have to reform Dev Ed programs, but the co-req model, while obliquely privileged, is NOT mandated.
 - While the language of multiple “single” measures is included, the language of bill ALSO allows for the authentic implementation of multiple measures IF institutions CHOOSE such policy, including locally-designed placement models.

5. Placement: Best Practices As Equity & How Dev Ed Reform Undermines Placement Equity

False Claim #3: MANY students are being UNDER placed into Dev Ed.

In order to justify eliminating Dev Ed, The Ed Reform movement accuses most placement models of misplacing capable students into lower level Dev Ed courses. Thus, reformers claim

that placement at large is inequitable and is a barrier to the coveted words “college access.” In their arguments, though, they only focus on placement models that do not meet best practices:

- Historically, Dev Ed Reform has blamed machine-scored testing like SAT and ACT for underplacing students. It is true, for instance, that SAT is not an equitable exam, biased in favor of white, middle-class students with college-educated parents. (Note:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280232788_Race_Poverty_and_SAT_Scores_Modeling_the_Influences_of_Family_Income_on_Black_and_White_High_School_Students'_SAT_Performance)
- Additionally, research consistently shows that machine-scored assessment is not valid or efficient. These studies clearly argue that machine-scoring methods do not have internal validity because machines cannot score what they claim to score: machines cannot read. The National Council of Teachers of English quotes seminal research by Perleman: "the whole enterprise of automated essay scoring claims various kinds of construct validity, the measures it employs substantially fail to represent any reasonable real-world construct of writing ability" (pg 121, 2014).

By focusing solely on machine-scored testing, the Dev Ed reform movement made a case for getting rid of all placement. **The misguided logic here is: placement creates the need for Dev Ed.**

However, following the national best practices in placement reveals the truth: students do need Developmental Education and that holistic, human-scored placement accurately places students into the course sequence they will most likely succeed in. Both Dev Ed and accurate placement are equitable tools and resources for historically underserved communities.

6 National Best Placement Practices & Our English RTW Exam at CCC:

There are 6 best practices for placement, which are supported by organizations like The US Department of Education, The National Council of Teachers of English, The Higher Learning Commission, and the Conference on Composition and Communication. **Our CCC English RTW meets ALL best practices.** They are:

a. Multiple Measures

This practice means using *more than one* measure to capture statistically the most accurate placement for students. This offers a holistic assessment of various soft and hard skills. The US Department of Education lists the first recommendation for assessment as: “Use multiple measures to assess postsecondary readiness and place students.”

b. Literacy Based Assessment

c. Assessment by Faculty at Institution & Assessment Correlating to Course Sequence

“Placement criteria in the most responsible programs will be clearly connected to any differences in the available courses. Experienced instructor-evaluators can

most effectively make a judgment regarding which course would best serve each student's needs and assign each student to the appropriate course. If scoring systems are used, scores should derive from criteria that grow out of the work of the courses into which students are being placed" (position statement, NCTE)

- d. Multiple Opportunities for Writing
- e. Respect for & Identification of ESL Students

"Standardized tests that rely more on identifying grammatical and stylistic errors than authentic rhetorical choices disadvantage students whose home dialect is not the dominant dialect. Assessing authentic acts of writing simultaneously raises performance standards and provides multiple avenues to success" (position statement, NCTE)

- e. Diagnostic Tests Post-Placement
- "Instructors of record should create an opportunity early in the semester to review and change students' placement assignments, and uniform procedures should be established to facilitate the easy re-placement of improperly placed students." (position statement, NCTE)

The ACT/SAT (and obviously, a GPA) do not come with post-placement diagnostics for the classroom and it's important to remember that in fact, **the lowest "college readiness" score for the SAT of 480 actually anticipates 30% of those students failing their English 101 or college level courses.**

False Claim #4: Passing Single Measures off as Multiple Measures

When organizations trying to pass legislation eliminating Dev Ed courses fail to do so, these organizations revise the legislative language to:

- 1) enable institutions to potentially lower college readiness scores (GPA, SAT, ACT);
- 2) use single measures instead of multiple measures; and
- 3) ****select whichever of the low single measures now qualifies students for college level courses.

This is exactly what the HB 2170 bill tries to do. This agenda purposefully manipulates the first recommendation for best assessment practices of multiple measures by calling it "multiple single measures" or "multiple stand-alone measures." The Partnership for College Completion, sponsoring this bill, advocates: "State policy should call on institutions to: Employ multiple stand-alone measures for placement, including cumulative high school GPA, **to better place students in college-level courses**"

(http://partnershipfcc.org/images/Policy/Final_Remediation_Brief.pdf)

Bait & Switch: Note that the language here implies that the goal is to maximize the number of students directly rolled in college-level courses, as opposed to **accurately assess** and place students into courses that reflect their reading, writing, and critical thinking skills.

Consequence: The result is placing a significant number of students in inappropriate classes and setting them up for failure. Instead of directly eliminating Dev Ed, the “single multiple measures” tries to circumvent this equitable support. It’s irresponsible and unsound policy making.

However, this language of multiple single measures in HB 2170 is NOT mandated, so we CAN still implement true multiple measures if we advocate for this best practice.

The New Push For GPA as a Single Measure

It’s important to note that while Ed Reformers harp on how placement is a barrier to college access and how placement models under-place students, they then advocate for **single measures** of these very same placement models (SAT/ ACT) when the college-readiness scores are set low enough to let most students into English 101.

Recently, the argument for using the single measure GPA has come to the forefront of their agenda. However:

- GPA, SAT, ACT are all proxies: Grades and the use of standardized tests are only ever a proxy of a student’s reading and writing (or math) ability. Standardized test scores aren’t even that: at best, such a score claims to show correlation with a proxy (e.g., an SAT score band correlates to first-year GPA). Why deliberately choose a placement method that uses proxies (or proxies to proxies) instead of the thing itself? In other words, to assess a student’s ability to read and write at a college level, why not actually look at an example of a student’s ability to read and write at a college level? We know that the gold standard to measure a student’s reading and writing abilities *is* an essay written by the student in response to a college-level text.
- Given the enormous variation across CPS high schools, HSGPA on its own is not a sufficient placement measure. In an article by Allensworth and Clarke, “High School GPAs and ACT Scores as Predictors of College Completion: Examining Assumptions About Consistency Across High Schools” the findings note that there is “considerable variation in college graduation rates by high school for students with the same HSGPA.”
- The study’s results on CPS high school grading can be summarized as follows: On average, an A is better than a B. And within a school, an A is better than a B. **But across schools, an A is not necessarily better than a B.**
- For example, a GPA of 3.00-3.24 at one high school predicts a college success rate of 21%, whereas the same GPA at another high school predicts an 81% rate of college success (Allensworth & Clark, 2020, p. 8). This is not a reliable placement method.

- To point out the obvious, a GPA does not meet many of the best practices as a stand alone measure: GPA does not reflect evaluation of a current writing sample, the courses that compose the GPA are not evaluated by CCC faculty, and the GPA does not allow anyone to identify ESL students who may need ESL support.
- At CPS, it's possible to graduate high school with a 4.0 GPA on an ESL track and to place into FS or ARC ESL at CCC. At CPS, it's possible to graduate with a 3.5 GPA in which a student took mostly math and science classes and hasn't written an essay since sophomore year.

To be clear: no one is actually arguing that GPA/SAT/ACT should not be considered as multiple measures, but they factually do not meet best practices or accurately place students when used as single measures or when they are hierarchically prioritized as low college readiness cut off scores, when the RTW can only be used for students who fall below these cut-offs.

Sample Essay of current CPS student who, with SAT or GPA, might be placed directly into 101:

CPS student; PSAT 490; GPA 2.7; RTW 3 ARC

I agree with the author's most important idea from the passage that is, arts participation is related to behaviors that contribute to the health of society for these reasons. Art has been around for many of years, art has given many people in today's society a job. Art allows you to express your emotion, whether is a good emotion or a bad one. In my personal experience art allows me to express emotions that I am unable to express physically and verbally. It helps someone like me with anxiety to be able to draw or color when i am experiencing high levels of anxiety. Art brings many creative people together which is a plus to the health of society. Friendships are built, jobs are offered allowing people to make a living based of their talent. Art allows people to have different opinions or points of view on how it is preserved . Art is a form of communication for some people, for example drawing a heart and a flower is a form of expressing and communicating their love for a person. Art I believe also helps a person be more creative making them a better learner/problem solver. In the text it states "We find that a substantial increase in arts educational experiences has remarkable impacts on students' academic, social, and emotional outcomes". Based on this statement it proves to me that my claim was correct. In conclusion, this is why I believe art participation is related to behaviors that contribute to the health of society

6. What Is at Stake Across CCC:

- Many underprepared students would be eligible for other college-level courses in other disciplines (psychology, history, biology, etc.) via first-year writing eligibility.
- With single measures like GPA, SAT, and ACT scores, we cannot identify ESL students and meet their needs. Many ESL students would end up in 101-eligible courses across disciplines and not receive the ESL resources they need.
- Open Floodgates to Gen Ed courses with misplaced, unprepared students
 - Higher fail rates across all disciplines
 - Students either drop out or are forced to retake a course that does not offer the resources they need to succeed
 - Trend of lowering standards of college readiness and passing college level courses
- **“Right to fail” policy that does not support our open access mission.** This *right to fail* ethos is fundamentally racist and classist since those most likely to ‘exercise’ this right — those most likely to fail and drop out — will be precisely those for whom Dev Ed is a necessary first step: first-generation students, working students, immigrants, students of color. These students, like all entering college students, deserve more than a one-shot, sink-or-swim chance to succeed in college.
- Students are NOT more likely to succeed if they are given fewer opportunities in which to do so.
- Students’ academic options are LIMITED when unprepared students fail English 101 and are pushed into certificate programs -- thwarting students hopes and dreams and relegating them to low-paying, low- and semi-skilled work

7. The Placement Language of the Bill Can Accommodate the Use of the RTW:

Use of True Multiple Measures:

There IS room for true multiple measures, including our RTW. To be clear, the inappropriate and unsubstantiated use of “multiple SINGLE measure” is NOT mandated in this bill.

The language of the bill states:

Section 100-15: Placement Measures

1. “On or before May 1, 2022, a community college **shall use each** of the following measures, **as appropriate**, to determine the placement of a student in introductory

college-level English language or mathematics coursework and shall use the scores set forth in recommendations approved by the Illinois Council of Community College Presidents on June 1, 2018.

Notes: “As appropriate” is left undefined and this gives local institutions leverage to determine policy that best fits the needs of their community and context. This is in contrast with the original bill (SB 446), which included the language, “A postsecondary institution must apply each measure to each student enrolled in the institution, and a student who meets the performance standard of one or more must be allowed to bypass remediation.” This language has been removed.

2. “In addition, a community college **is encouraged** to use the scores set forth in recommendations approved by the Illinois Council of Community College Presidents on June 1, 2018 and should also **consider other individual measures for placement** in an introductory college-level English language or mathematics course.”

Notes: This part (is encouraged) contradicts and thus nullifies the language above (shall use). This also provides allowances for “other measures” such as our RTW.

3. “If a student qualifies for placement in an introductory college-level English language or mathematics course using a single measure under subsection (a) or (b), no additional measures **need to be** considered for placement of the student in the introductory college-level English language or mathematics course.”

Notes: “Need to be” means is not required but does not mean is prohibited.

Recommend Policy that:

- **Prioritizes RTW scores as the primary placement tool, which meets ALL best practices and includes multiple measures.**
- **Uses GPA/SAT score as additional measures to boost placement (as with the intended use of “multiple measures).**
- Is grounded in best practices of the English field and discipline.
- Is not a proxy of a student’s reading and writing ability, but is **an accurate assessment of actual writing.**
- Aims to provide thoughtful, accurate assessment that privileges long-term student success over a “right to fail” move.
- **Does not use lowest possible cut-off scores for SAT/GPA.**
- **Allow us to identify ESL students. (cannot do so with SAT/GPA/ACT as stand-alone measures).**
- Acknowledges Dev Ed as a catalyst for success, not a barrier.

8. Swift Next Steps:

Let’s support institutional strategies identified by ILEA (Illinois Equity in Attainment) to eliminate inequities in degree completion, including:

1. First year mentoring programs (peer; faculty)
2. New financial supports for students (emergency scholarships, completion/reengagement grants; population specific grants)
3. Addressing basic needs and non-academic supports (food pantries, textbook reform, social-emotional learning, social belonging)
4. Creating or better supporting student organizations related to student identity/belonging/culture (Black student unions, Spanish clubs)
5. Reforming first year courses & sequences (gateway courses; college success courses, orientation; bridge programs)
6. TRIO programs and additional targeted wraparound supports (McNair Scholars; Male Success Initiatives; Latino Success)
7. Academic advising reforms (early alerts; targeted advising)
8. Reforming developmental education courses/placement: **Good news: We've already done this with ARC, English 101/097, and the RTW!**
9. Creating population specific success committees and councils
10. Providing faculty professional development (high impact teaching practices and cultural competency/responsiveness)

Review of Key Points:

- Dev Ed is not a barrier. It gives the most marginalized students a shot at success in college.
- Co-reqs won't improve graduation rates. Differentiated Dev Ed programming is essential to meet the needs of *all* of our students.
- Multiple "single" measures is not about the accuracy of placing students. It is not sound policy and should not be employed.
- This is not about equity; it is about the allocation of resources and tracking of students. We must stand up for the true open-access mission of CCC.

*Researched and Presented by Julia Cohen, Susan Grace, and Kim Knutson
at Wright College, January 27, 2021*