Peralta Community College District
Berkeley City College, College of Alameda, Laney College, Merritt College

2014 Consequential Validity Survey Report

Office of Institutional Research

November 25, 2014

Introduction

This report provides results of the consequential validity survey conducted during the fall 2014 term. Below is a description of the survey process, followed by sections summarizing results for English, math and ESL courses, and a conclusion highlightingfindings which are relevantto institutional processes around matriculation, accreditation and student equity.

For English 269A, 20% of the students thought they were overqualified, whereas instructors perceived that 13.4% of the students were over-prepared. For math, the three lowest level courses had considerable discrepancies in the ratings between the students and instructors. For Math 201, 31.3% of the students thought they were overqualified for the class, whereas the instructors believed that only 5.9% of the students were over-prepared. For Math 250, 25.8% of the students thought they were overqualified, whereas only 4.5% were perceived to be over-prepared by the instructors. Finally, Math 253 exhibited the greatest discrepancy; 51% of the students believed they were overqualified, whereas 0.0% of the students were thought to be over-prepared by the instructors.

Results of the consequential validity survey suggest Peralta's placement process may be systematically misplacing students. A significant proportion of students responded that they were over-prepared for their lower level English and math courses. This pattern agrees with recent research showing that colleges using the COMPASS placement tended to under-place students.[1][2] Under-placement of students is a critical problem as it negatively impacts student outcomes by placing unnecessary hurdles between a student and attainment of a degree, certificate or transfer-ready status.

Assessment Validation Processfor English, Math, and ESL Placement

The four colleges in the Peralta Community College District (PCCD) utilize approved second-party assessment instruments to place students into English, math, and ESL courses. For placement in English courses all4 colleges use ACT COMPASS Reading and Writing tests, and ACT COMPASS Pre-Algebra, Algebra, College Algebra, and Trigonometry tests for placement in math courses. The 4 colleges, however, employ different instruments for placement in ESL courses. For ESL listening and speaking and grammar courses, Laney College uses ACT COMPASS Grammar Usage, Listening, and Reading tests (CESL); whereasCity College of Alameda and Berkeley City College utilizeCombined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA). Berkeleyalso includes a guided selfplacement procedure. For placement in ESL reading and writing courses, all 4 colleges use an approved locally managed ESL writing assessment instrument. In fall 2014, Berkeley implemented the new writing prompts and writing placement rubric to place students into ESL reading and writing courses. Merritt College has a small ESL program and uses Laney College for assessment testing.

A consequential validity study was conducted in fall 2014 to evaluate the accuracy and validity of the placement process (i.e., consequence of placement) at PCCD. During the sixth week of classes, a survey was administered to first time students and instructors in randomly selected English, math, and ESL courses at the four colleges. First time students were chosen because they were most likely to have recently taken the assessment test. Students and instructors are surveyed near the beginning of the semester because at this point students should have been sufficiently exposed to the curriculum to gauge their own preparedness, and instructors should have a reasonable understanding of their students' preparedness for the coursework.

Students were asked about their satisfaction with their placement into their courses by indicating whether the placement was the right level, too difficult, or too easy (see Appendix A). Instructors were asked to assess whether each first time student was appropriately placed in the course (see Appendix B). Specifically, they were asked, "Please indicate the appropriateness of each student's placement by completing the following statement. This student is:

1. Very overprepared, definitely should be in the next level.
2. Somewhat overprepared, perhaps should be in the next level.
3. Well prepared, should pass with reasonable effort.
4. Somewhat underprepared, perhaps should be in previous level.
5. Very underprepared, definitely should be in previous level."

For the instructor ratings, ratings of 2, 3, and 4 were combined as "adequately prepared" (appropriate placement), 1 as "overprepared", and 5 as "underprepared". The standard set by the chancellor's office is at least 75% affirmative endorsement by students and at least 75% judgment of proper placement by instructors. That is, at least 75% of students surveyed need to perceive themselves as properly placed and instructors need to rate at least 75% of students are appropriately placed.

Only the students who took the assessment test at one of the Peralta colleges were included to evaluate the appropriateness of the placement. Enrollment records were matched with assessment data. Approximately 618 students were enrolled in 41 English courses, 1005students in 69 math courses, and 624 students in 51 ESL courses (see Tables 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13; Appendix C for a description of the courses). Of these, 410 first time students took the English assessment test and completed the survey, 518 students took the math assessment test and completed the survey, and 489 students took the ESL assessment test and completed the survey. Most of the other students in the courses were continuing in the sequence and did not take the placement test, they took the placement test outside Peralta colleges, or successfully challenged the prerequisite.

Student self-ratings were obtained from the students in attendance on the day of the survey. Instructors were asked to rate all first time students in their classes. The student and instructor surveys were conducted in class using paper surveys.

English Assessment Validation Results

Table 1 describes the placement levels for English and number of sections surveyedtoevaluate placement accuracy, as well as the number of ratings from students and instructors. English 204A is an accelerated writing course at Berkeley, and English 252A is abasic skills reading and writing course at Merritt (see Appendix C for a description of the courses).

Table 1: Description of Participating English Courses

Courses English	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
1A	14	240	171	227
201A	11	120	75	113
204A	4	88	64	84
252A	4	40	22	39
269A	8	123	76	107
Total	41	618	410	574

Students were generally satisfied with their placement in all levels ofEnglish courses (see Table 2). A majority of the classes had a higher than 75% agreement rate that the course was the right level (ranged from 79.4% to 92.3%). The only exception was English 269A. Only 74.3% of the students felt they were qualified for the class, whereas 20% believed they were overqualified and 5.7% believed they were underqualifiedfor English 269A. Moreover, the student ratings showed high variability across the 8 sections, the agreement ratingsvaried from 42.9% to 100%. Of the 8 sections, 4sections had ratings lower than 75% agreement (ranged from 42.9% to 69.2%), and 23.1% to 40.0% of the students in these sections believed they were overqualified. Four sectionshad ratings greater than 75% (ranged from 87.5% to 100%).

Table 2: Student Rating of PlacementAccuracy

English		Under Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
1A	n	2	144	10	156
	%	1.3	92.3	6.4	100
201A	n	1	54	13	68
	%	1.5	79.4	19.1	100
204A	n	1	44	10	55

English		Under Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
	%	1.8	80.0	18.2	100
252A	n	0	17	2	19
	%	0	89.5	10.5	100
269A	**n**	**4**	**52**	**14**	**70**
	%	**5.7**	**74.3**	**20.0**	**100**
Total	n	8	313	49	370
	%	2.2	84.6	13.2	100

As can be seen in Table 3, instructors were generally very favorable in the placement of the students. All classes had rates higher than 75% agreement (ranged from 77.3% to 98.0%) that the students were appropriately placed. For English 269A, in contrast to the students' perception, the instructors believed 13% of the students were underprepared and only 9% were overprepared.

Table 3: Instructor Rating of Placement Adequacy

Courses English		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
1A	n	1	201	3	205
	%	0.5	98.0	1.5	100
201A	n	9	90	2	101
	%	8.9	89.1	2.0	100
204A	n	3	61	4	68
	%	4.4	89.7	5.9	100
252A	n	3	32	0	35
	%	8.6	91.4	0	100
269A	n	13	75	9	97
	%	13.4	77.3	9.3	100
Total	n	29	461	18	508
	%	5.7	90.7	3.5	100

Forthe English courses, both students and instructors evidencedacceptable levels of satisfaction with the placement process, with the exception of English 269A for the students. Of the 8 English 269A sections sampled, 4 sectionsdid not meet the placement validity threshold.

Math Assessment Validation Results

Table 4 describes the placement levels for math and number of sections surveyed to assess placement accuracy, as well as the number of ratings from students and instructors (see Appendix C for a description of the courses).

Table 4: Description of Participating Math Courses

Courses Math	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
1	2	35	17	26
13	7	82	24	32
2	3	35	20	26
201	14	206	112	169
202	1	9	3	4
203	10	110	50	67
250	10	172	89	133
253	9	168	96	121
3A	9	117	68	72
50	5	77	39	57
Total	69	1005	518	707

Students were generally satisfied with their placement in the higher level math courses (see Table 5). All higher level courses had a greater than 75% agreement rate that the courses were the right level for the students (ranged from 78.0% to 87.5%). In contrast, the 3lower level courses (Math 201, Math 250, and Math 253) had lower than 75% agreement rate. For Math 201, only 65.2% of the students felt they were qualified for the class, whereas 31.3% believed they were overqualified and 3.6% believed they were underqualified. Of the 14 Math 201 sections sampled, 10 sections evidenced lower than 75% agreement rate (ranged from 25.0% to 73.3%), and 25.0% to 75.0% of the students believed they were overqualified for these classes. Only 4 sections had higher than 75% agreement rate (ranged from 75.0% to 100%).

Similarly, for Math 250, only 67.4% of the students thought they were qualified for the course, whereas 25.8% believed they were overqualified and 6.7% believed they were underqualified. Of the 10 sections sampled, 8 sections had lower than 75% agreement rate (ranged from 0.0% to 71.4%), and 14.3% to 100% of the students believed they were overqualified for these classes. Only two sections had higher than 75% agreement ratings (77.8% and 81.8%).

The lowest level of satisfaction was for Math 253, only 49.0% of the student believed they were qualified for the class and 51.0% thought they were overqualified. None of the students believed they were underqualified. Of the 9 sections sampled, 7 sectionsexhibited lower than 75% agreement ratings (ranged from 33.3% to 50.0%), and 50.0% to 66.7% of the students believed they were overqualified. Only two sections had higher than 75% agreement ratings (76.9% and 88.9%).

Table 5: Student Rating of PlacementAccuracy

Courses Math		Under Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
1	n	1	14	2	17
	%	5.9	82.4	11.8	100
13	n	1	21	2	24
	%	4.2	87.5	8.3	100
2	n	1	16	3	20
	%	5.0	80.0	15.0	100
201	n	4	73	35	112
	%	3.6	65.2	31.3	100
202	n	0	2	1	3
	%	0	66.7	33.3	100
203	n	1	39	10	50
	%	2.0	78.0	20.0	100
250	n	6	60	23	89
	%	6.7	67.4	25.8	100
253	n	0	47	49	96
	%	0	49.0	51.0	100
3A	n	3	56	9	68
	%	4.4	82.4	13.2	100
50	n	0	31	8	39
	%	0	79.5	20.5	100
Total	n	17	359	142	518
	%	3.3	69.3	27.4	100

Note:For Math 202, the sample size is too small (n = 3) to interpret the results.

In contrast to the student ratings, instructors were generally very favorable in the placement of the students. All classes had rates higher than 75% agreement (ranged from 75.0% to 98.2%) that the students were appropriately placed (see Table 6).

Table 6: Instructor Rating of Placement Adequacy

Courses Math		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
1	n	2	23	1	26
	%	7.7	88.5	3.8	100
13	n	2	28	2	32
	%	6.3	87.5	6.3	100
2	n	0	25	1	26
	%	0	96.2	3.8	100
201	n	13	146	10	169
	%	7.7	86.4	5.9	100
202	n	1	3	0	4
	%	25.0	75.0	0	100
203	n	1	63	3	67
	%	1.5	94.0	4.5	100
250	n	11	116	6	133
	%	8.3	87.2	4.5	100
253	n	11	110	0	121
	%	9.1	90.9	0	100
3A	n	3	68	1	72
	%	4.2	94.4	1.4	100
50	n	1	56	0	57
	%	1.8	98.2	0	100
Total	n	45	638	24	707
	%	6.4	90.2	3.4	100

While both students and instructors displayed acceptable levels of satisfaction with the placement process for the higher level math courses, they disagreed on the 3 lower level courses. Specifically, students in 25 sections, out of the 33 lower level math sections sampled, expressed lower than the recommended threshold level of satisfaction in their placement.

ESL Assessment Validation Results

Because each college utilizes different ESL assessment instruments to evaluate students' proficiency in grammar, listening and speaking, and reading and writing, separate analysis was conducted for each college. Merritt College is not included in the report because they have a small ESL program.

Laney College

Laney College utilized CESL to place students into grammar and listening and speaking courses in fall 2014, and used the locally managed reading and writing assessment testto place students in the reading and writing courses.In spring 2015, Laney will be implementing the new ESL writing prompts and placement rubric to place students in the reading and writing courses.

Table 7 describes the placement levels for ESLby category (listening/speaking, grammar, reading/writing) and number of sections surveyed to assess the placement accuracy, as well as the number of ratings from students and instructors (see Appendix C for a description of the courses).

Table 7: Description of Participating ESL Courses- Laney

Courses ESL	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
Listening/Speaking				
283A	1	17	15	15
232A	3	26	22	23
233A	2	17	12	13
50A	1	12	10	12
Grammar				
284A	3	49	41	45
215A	2	24	18	21
216A	2	17	15	16
217A	3	27	23	25
Reading/Writing				
285A	3	52	43	49
222A	3	39	34	35
223A	1	19	6	9
52A	2	9	5	8

Courses ESL	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
Total	26	299	244	271

Students were generally satisfied with their placement in the ESL courses (see Table 8). A majority of the classes had a higher than 75% agreement rate that the course was the right level for the students (ranged from 79.4% to 100%). The two exceptions were ESL 285A and ESL 223A. For ESL 285A, 74.4% of the students felt they were qualified for the class, whereas 11.5% believed they were overqualified and 14% believed they were underqualified. Of the 3 sections of ESL 285A, two had lower than 75% agreement rating (61.5% and 69.2%), and 23.1% of the students in both sections believed they were underqualified for the classes. In contrast, 88.2% of the students in the third section believed they were appropriately placed, and 11.8% thought they were overqualified.

For the oneESL 223Asection, only 50% of the students thought they were qualified for the class, whereas 50% believed they were underqualified. These numbers, however, should be interpreted with caution given the small sample size (n = 6).

Table 8: Student Rating of Placement Accuracy - Laney

Courses ESL		Under Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
283A	n	2	12	1	15
	%	13.3	80.0	6.7	100
232A	n	2	19	1	22
	%	9.1	86.4	4.5	100
233A	n	1	10	1	12
	%	8.3	83.3	8.3	100
50A	n	1	9	0	10
	%	10.0	90.0	0	100
284A	n	1	40	0	41
	%	2.4	97.6	0	100
215A	n	0	17	1	18
	%	0	94.4	5.6	100
216A	n	0	14	1	15

Courses ESL		Under Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
	%	0	93.3	6.7	100
217A	n	0	23	0	23
	%	0	100.0	0	100
285A	**n**	**6**	**32**	**5**	**43**
	%	**14.0**	**74.4**	**11.5**	**100**
222A	n	2	27	5	34
	%	5.9	79.4	14.7	100
223A	**n**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**6**
	%	**50.0**	**50.0**	**0**	**100**
52A	n	0	5	0	5
	%	0	100.0	0	100
Total	n	18	211	15	244
	%	7.4	86.5	6.1	100

As can be seen in Table 9, instructors were generally very favorable in the placement of the students (ranged from 77.8% to 100%), except for ESL 215A. The instructors in the two sections of ESL 215A believed 67% of the students were adequately prepared, whereas 29% were underprepared and 5% overprepared. Specifically, one instructor felt 50% of the students were underprepared.

Table 9: Instructor Rating of Placement Adequacy - Laney

Courses ESL		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
283A	n	2	12	1	15
	%	13.3	80.0	6.7	100
232A	n	0	23	0	23
	%	0	100.0	0	100
233A	n	0	13	0	13
	%	0	100.0	0	100
50A	n	1	10	1	12

Courses ESL		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
	%	8.3	83.3	8.3	100
284A	n	3	41	1	45
	%	6.7	91.1	2.2	100
215A	**n**	**6**	**14**	**1**	**21**
	%	**28.6**	**66.7**	**4.8**	**100**
216A	n	0	16	0	16
	%	0	100.0	0	100
217A	n	0	25	0	25
	%	0	100.0	0	100
285A	n	9	39	1	49
	%	18.4	79.6	2.0	100
222A	n	1	34	0	35
	%	2.9	97.1	0	100
223A	n	2	7	0	9
	%	22.2	77.8	0	100
52A	n	2	6	0	8
	%	25.0	75.0	0	100
Total	n	27	240	4	271
	%	10.0	88.6	1.5	100

For ESL 285A and ESL215A, both students and instructors expressed lower levels of satisfaction with the placement because students were generally perceived to be underprepared for these classes.

City College of Alameda

AlamedautilizedCELSA and a locally managed reading and writing assessment test to place student in ESL courses in fall 2014. Table 10 describes the placement levels for ESL by category (listening/speaking, grammar, reading/writing) and number of sections surveyed to

assess the placement accuracy, as well as the number of ratings from students and instructors (see Appendix C for a description of the courses).

Table 10: Description of Participating ESL Courses- **Alameda**

Courses ESL	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
Listening/Speaking				
283A	1	22	21	22
232A	1	9	7	9
233A	1	11	10	11
Grammar				
284A	1	23	23	23
215A	2	10	9	10
216A	1	3	3	3
Reading/Writing				
285A	2	32	28	32
222A	3	19	15	17
223A	1	14	13	14
52A	1	5	5	5
Total	14	148	134	146

Students were generally satisfied with their placement in the ESL courses (see Table 11). All classes had a higher than 75% agreement rate that the course was the right level (ranged from 77.8% to 100%), except for ESL 232A. Only 71.4% of the students in ESL 232A felt they were qualified for the class, whereas 28.6% believed they were overqualified.

Table 11: Student Rating of Placement Accuracy - Alameda

Courses ESL		Not Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
283A	n	1	20	0	21
	%	4.8	95.2	0	100
232A	n	0	5	2	7
	%	0	**71.4**	28.6	100
233A	n	0	10	0	10
	%	0	100.0	0	100
284A	n	1	22	0	23
	%	4.3	95.7	0	100

Courses ESL		Not Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
215A	n	0	7	2	9
	%	0	77.8	22.2	100
216A	n	0	3	0	3
	%	0	100.0	0	100
285A	n	1	23	4	28
	%	3.6	82.1	14.3	100
222A	n	0	12	3	15
	%	0	80.0	20.0	100
223A	n	0	11	2	13
	%	0	84.6	15.4	100
52A	n	0	5	0	5
	%	0	100.0	0	100
Total	n	3	118	13	134
	%	2.2	88.1	971	100

As can be seen in Table 12, instructors were very favorable in the placement of the students. All levels of ESL classes had rates higher than 75% agreement that the students were adequately prepared (ranged from 88.9% to 100%).

Table 12: Instructor Rating of Placement Adequacy - Alameda

Courses ESL		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
283A	n	1	21	0	22
	%	4.5	95.5	0	100
232A	n	1	8	0	9
	%	11.1	88.9	0	100
233A	n	0	11	0	11
	%	0	100.0	0	100
284A	n	1	22	0	23
	%	4.3	95.7	0	100

Courses ESL		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
215A	n	0	10	0	10
	%	0	100.0	0	100
216A	n	0	3	0	3
	%	0	100.0	0	100
285A	n	1	31	0	32
	%	3.1	96.9	0	100
222A	n	0	16	1	17
	%	0	94.1	5.9	100
223A	n	0	14	0	14
	%	0	100.0	0	100
52A	n	0	5	0	5
	%	0	100.0	0	100
Total	n	4	141	1	146
	%	2.7	96.6	0.7	100

Both students and instructors were generally satisfied with the placement of students in various levels of ESL courses. The only exception was student ratings for ESL 232A, which included only 7 students.

Berkeley City College

Berkeleyemploys multiple methods to place their students into ESL courses. For placement into listening and speaking and grammar courses, CELSA and a guided self placement procedure are used. For reading and writing courses, the new writing prompts and placement rubric were utilized for assessment in fall 2014.Table 13 describes the placement levels for ESL by category (listening/speaking, grammar, reading/writing) and number of sections surveyed to assess the placement accuracy, as well as the number of ratings from students and instructors. Only two upper level ESL courses are offered for each category because of high English proficiency students at Berkeley.

Table 13: Description of Participating ESL Courses- Berkeley

Courses	Sections Surveyed	Enrolled	Student Ratings	Instructor Ratings
Listening/Speaking				
233A	2	26	15	18
50A	2	25	16	20
Grammar				
216A	1	18	10	14
217A	1	20	16	17
Reading/Writing				
223A	2	55	25	33
52A	3	76	29	46
Total	11	177	111	148

Students were generally very satisfied with their placement (See Table 14). All ESL classes had a higher than 75% agreement rate that the course was the right level (ranged from 75% to 100%).

Table 14: Student Rating of PlacementAccuracy - Berkeley

Courses ESL		Not Qualified	Qualified	Overqualified	Total
233A	n	0	15	0	15
	%	0	100.0	0	100
50A	n	0	13	3	16
	%	0	81.3	18.8	100
216A	n	0	10	0	10
	%	0	100.0	0	100
217A	n	1	12	3	16
	%	6.3	75.0	18.8	100
223A	n	1	21	3	25
	%	4.0	84.0	12.0	100
52A	n	1	27	1	29
	%	3.4	93.1	3.4	100
Total	n	3	98	10	111
	%	2.7	88.3	9.0	100

As can be seen in Table 15, instructors were generally very favorable in the placement of the students. All ESL classes had rates higher than 75% agreement that the students were adequately prepared (ranged from 90% 100%).

Table 15: Instructor Rating of Placement Adequacy - Berkeley

Courses ESL		Underprepared	Adequately Prepared	Overprepared	Total
233A	n	0	17	1	18
	%	0	94.4	5.6	100
50A	n	1	18	1	20
	%	5.0	90.0	5.0	100
216A	n	0	14	0	14
	%	0	100.0	0	100
217A	n	1	16	0	17
	%	5.9	94.1	0	100
223A	n	2	31	0	33
	%	6.1	93.9	0	100
52A	n	2	44	0	46
	%	4.3	95.7	0	100
Total	n	6	140	2	148
	%	4.1	94.6	1.4	100

Conclusion

English

Both students and instructors generally expressed satisfaction with the placement of students into various levels of English. However, 20.0% of students in English 269A reported that the course was too easy, and instructors reported that 13.4% of students in this course were over-prepared. This suggests that up to one-fifth of students in 269A may have benefited from placement into a higher level course.

Math

Both students and instructors generally expressed satisfaction with the placement of students into various levels of math, however, there were a few notable exceptions in lower level courses. In Math 201, 31.3% believed they were overqualified; in Math 250, 25.8%; in Math 253, 51.0%. These are very high proportions relative to other courses, and such response patterns indicate dissatisfaction with the placement process.

Another notable pattern in these three math courses is the discrepancy between student and instructor ratings, which are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16: Student and Instructor Ratings in Three Low Level Math Courses

Course	% of students reporting they were overqualified	% of students rated by instructors as overqualified
Math 201	31.3%	5.9%
Math 250	25.8%	4.5%
Math 253	51.0%	0.0%

Further inquiry will be conducted as to the reasons for such a wide divergence in perceptions between the students and instructors.

ESL

The small number of students we were able to surveylimits what conclusions we draw. In contrast to those surveyed in lower level English and math courses, students surveyed in ESL writing classes generally reported feeling under-prepared; however, the small sample size suggests that these results should be interpreted with caution. All four colleges will be implementing the new ESL assessment instruments (CESL and writing assessment) in spring 2015 for placement of students into various levels of ESL listening and speaking, grammar, and reading and writing courses. A follow-up study is needed to evaluate the accuracy and validity of this placement process.

Implications

Results of the consequential validity survey suggest Peralta's placement process may be systematically misplacing students. A significant proportion of students responded that they were over-prepared for their lower level English and math courses. This pattern agrees with recent research showing that colleges using the COMPASS placement tended to under-place students.[1][2] Under-placement of students is a critical problem as it negatively impacts student outcomes by placing unnecessary hurdles between a student and attainment of a degree, certificate or transfer-ready status.

Evidence from several sources demonstrates that it is possible to design placement systems which increase the proportion of students starting in higher level courses while maintaining the same completion rates.[3]Locally, Berkeley City College utilizes accelerated courses in English and Statistics to boost student progression. Promise Pathways program at Long Beach City College places students into college level courses based on high school grades.[3]   Informationon other innovative placement strategies, and supporting evidence, can be found in the report "Successful Programs that Help Close Achievement Gaps" released by the Peralta Office of Institutional Research spring 2014.[4]

State guidelines require at least 75% of students and teachers rate initial placements as matching a student's level of preparedness.[5] Therefore, courses in which less than 75% agreement is observed are taken as signaling that adjustments are needed to the placement pathway. Disproportionate impact to student subgroups is also a concern. A follow up analysis will be conducted taking into account student demographics and socio-economic indicators and the amount of agreement between placement assessment score and initial placement in a subject area, as well the success rates in courses corresponding to placement recommendation from assessments.

References

1. Scott-Clayton, Judith (2012). *Do High-Stakes Placement Exams Predict College Success?*New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
2. Belfield, Clive, & Crosta, Peter(2012). Predicting Success in College: The Importance of Placement tests and high school transcripts. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
3. Long Beach City College. LBCC promise pathways. http://lbcc.edu/promisepathways/
4. Rhee, E., Pellegrin, N., Orkin, M. (2014). Successful Programs that Help Close Achievement Gaps. Oakland, CA: Peralta Community College District, Office of Institutional Research.
5. California Community College Chancellor's Office (2001). *Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges.*

Appendix A: Consequential Validity Survey – Student Survey

PCCD **ESL** Placement Validation Student Survey - Fall 2014
To be completed by the student

Please take a few minutes to provide feedback on this course. Your judgment will help
Peralta CCD to improve course placement processes.

Date _____   Birthdate _____

Name _____

Course Section (circle one): 50A   52A   215A   216A   217A   222A   223A   232A   233A
                              283A   284A   285A   Other _____

1. Which **ONE** of the following statements is most true about your placement in this
    course?
    _____ This course is the right level for me.
    _____ This course is too difficult for me.

    _____ This course is too easy for me.

2. How did you get placed into this course?
    _____ Placement test at one of the Peralta colleges (Alameda, Berkeley, Laney, Merritt)

    _____ Placement test outside Peralta colleges

    _____ Completed prerequisite course

    _____ Successfully challenged the prerequisite

    _____ Other _____

3. If you took the placement test at one of the Peralta colleges, did you prepare for the test
    by studying?
    _____ Yes   _____ No

4. To what extent are personal reasons (illness, job/family responsibilities, personal
    problems, etc.) interfering with your performance in this course?
    _____ Not at all

    _____ Somewhat

    _____ Very much

5. Do you have enough time to meet the studying/homework demands of this course?
    _____ Yes   _____ No

Appendix B: Consequential Validity Survey – Instructor Survey

PCCD Placement Validation Survey - Fall 2014

To be completed by the instructor

Date _____   Class section _____

Instructor's name _____

As part of the revalidation process for Peralta Community Colleges' assessment placement tool, we need data from you about the students in your class.

Please indicate the appropriateness of each student's placement by completing the following statement. This student is:

1 = Very overprepared, definitely should be in the next level.

2 = Somewhat overprepared, perhaps should be in the next level.

3 = Well prepared, should pass with reasonable effort.

4 = Somewhat underprepared, perhaps should be in previous level.

5 = Very underprepared, definitely should be in previous level.

Student Name	SID	Rating

Appendix C: Description of Courses Surveyed

English	Description	CB21	CB08
1A	Composition and reading	Transfer	Not basic skills
201A	Prep for Composition and Reading	1 level below	Not basic skills
204A	Prep for composition, reading, and research	2 levels below	Basic skills
252A	Integrated reading and writing	2-4 levels below	Basic skills
269A	Foundations in reading and writing	2-4 levels below	Basic skills

Math	Description	CB21	CB08
1	Pre-calculus	Transfer	Not basic skills
13	Intro to statistics	Transfer	Not basic skills
2	Pre-calculus/geometry	Transfer	Not basic skills
201	Elementary algebra	2 levels below	Not basic skills
202	Geometry	1-2 levels below	Not basic skills
203	Intermediate algebra	1 level below	Not basic skills
250	Arithmetic	3-4 levels below	Basic skills
253	Pre-algebra	3 levels below	Basic skills
3A	Calculus 1	Transfer	Not basic skills
50	Trigonometry	Transfer (CSU)	Not basic skills

ESL	Description	CB21	CB08
Listening& Speaking			
283A	High beginning	2 levels below	Basic skills
232A	Intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
233A	High intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
50A	Advanced	Credit (CSU)	Not basic skills

Grammar

284A	High beginning	2 levels below	Basic skills
215A	Intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
216A	High intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
217A	Advanced	1 level below	Not basic skills

Reading & Writing

285A	High beginning	2 levels below	Basic skills
222A	Intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
223A	High intermediate	1 level below	Not basic skills
52A	Advanced	Credit (CSU, UC)	Not basic skills