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A Framework: Increasing college completion

- AACC/League: 50% more by 2020
- Gates: Double the percentage of students who earn a postsecondary degree by age 26
- MHEC: Increase by 20% the number of certificates and degrees by 2012
Why is this so important?

Annual Earnings

- No high school diploma - $18,734
- High school diploma - $27,915
- Associates degree - $38,200
- Bachelors degrees - $51,206
- Advanced degree - $74,602

Source: 2004 Census
Another angle on Economic Equity

Education pays

Unemployment rate in 2009:
- Average, all workers: 7.9%
- High school graduate: 5.2%
- Some college, no degree: 8.6%
- Associate degree: 9.7%
- Bachelor's degree: 6.8%
- Master's degree: 3.9%
- Professional degree: 2.3%
- Doctoral degree: 2.5%

Median weekly earnings in 2009:
- Average, all workers: $774
- Less than a high school diploma: $454
- High school graduate: $626
- Some college, no degree: $699
- Associate degree: $761
- Bachelor's degree: $1,025
- Master's degree: $1,257
- Professional degree: $1,529
- Doctoral degree: $1,532

The Developmental Education Connection

- Nearly 60% of all community college students place in developmental education

- And how do they do?
A National Focus on Developmental Education

- Began with AtD
- Has resulted in increased research on outcomes
- Cost of developmental education
- Is developmental education broken?
Referrals to Levels of Dev. Ed.

Math - Full Sample

- Not referred: 41%
- 3 levels below: 19%
- 2 levels below: 16%
- 1 level below: 24%

Reading - Full Sample

- Not referred: 67%
- 3 levels below: 3%
- 2 levels below: 7%
- 1 level below: 23%
Outcomes for remedial students

Outcomes for college ready students

Local treatment effect
Completion of First College-Level Course and Retention by CPT Score and Subject

Outcome: Completion of First College-Level Course
Estimated Discontinuity (Math ITT Table 4) = -0.061(0.013)

Outcome: Fall-to-Fall Retention
Estimated Discontinuity (Reading ITT Table 4) = -0.068(0.008)
Transfer to State University System and Degree Completion by CPT Score and Subject

Outcome: Transfer to SUS

Estimated Discontinuity (Math ITT Table 5) = -0.019(0.008)

Outcome: Degree Completion

Estimated Discontinuity (Math ITT Table 5) = -0.030(0.008)

Estimated Discontinuity (Reading ITT Table 5) = -0.019(0.004)

Estimated Discontinuity (Reading ITT Table 5) = -0.029(0.004)
Performance in First College-level Course

Once enrolled in gatekeeper, students who had skipped developmental education did about as well as those who took dev ed.

See Table 13. Excludes those with missing recommendations.
What Does This Say About Assessment?

- No obvious cutoff point
- Confusion about what it means to be “college ready”
- Assessments are not good predictors of future success in college
- Do not provide enough diagnostic information?
Implications for Effectiveness

- Dev ed does not improve outcomes for students who score just below the cutoff.
- Some students who skip dev ed do as well in college courses as those who don’t skip.
- We know little about the effectiveness of services for students far from the cutoff scores, but few complete the sequence.
- Current system neglects the academic needs of weaker “college level” students.
Achieving the Dream Database

- 250,000 students
- All first time (in the college) degree seeking students (full or part time)
- 57 colleges in CT, FL, NC, NM, OH, PA, TX, VA, WA
- Not representative of all CCs—similar to large, urban institutions with lower funding per student
In-Order Course Completion and Enrollment for Math Remediation

- **Completed**: 16%
- **Not completed**: 6%
- **Not enrolled**: 7%
- **Not completed**: 12%

- **3 levels below**
  - **Enroll**: 82%
  - **Pass**: 57%
  - **Enroll**: 41%
  - **Pass**: 29%
  - **Enroll**: 22%

- **Not completed**: 25%
- **Not enrolled**: 18%
- **Not enrolled**: 12%

- **Referred to Lev. 3 46824**
In-Order Course Completion and Enrollment for Reading Remediation

- Not enrolled: 31%
- Not completed: 13%
- Completed: 22%
- Not completed: 4%
- Not enrolled: 10%
- Not completed: 13%
- Not enrolled: 4%
- Not enrolled: 17%
- Not completed: 4%
- Referral to Level 3: 31%
- Enroll
- Pass
- Referred to Level 3

Levels:
- 3 levels below: 39% Enroll, 35% Pass
- 2 levels below: 25% Enroll
- 1 level below
- Not completed: 4%
- Not enrolled: 10%
- Not enrolled: 4%
- Not completed: 4%

Course Completion and Enrollment for Reading Remediation: 39%
Enrollment and Progression Patterns Among Achieving the Dream Students

![Bar Chart]

Math

- **Total**: 40% Not Enrolled, 29% Not Passed, 33% Completed
- **1 level below**: 38% Not Enrolled, 18% Not Passed, 44% Completed
- **2 levels below**: 40% Not Enrolled, 31% Not Passed, 29% Completed
- **3 levels below**: 42% Not Enrolled, 42% Not Passed, 16% Completed

Legend:
- Purple: Not Enrolled
- Red: Not Passed
- Green: Completed
Enrollment and Progression Patterns Among Achieving the Dream Students

The chart below illustrates the enrollment and progression patterns for students with varying levels of reading proficiency.

- **Total**: 41% Not Enrolled, 16% Not Passed, 44% Completed
- **1 level below**: 38% Not Enrolled, 13% Not Passed, 48% Completed
- **2 levels below**: 42% Not Enrolled, 21% Not Passed, 36% Completed
- **3 levels below**: 57% Not Enrolled, 21% Not Passed, 22% Completed
Student Progression by Enrollment and Gatekeeper in Math

Math - Full Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 level below</th>
<th>2 levels below</th>
<th>3 levels below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Never enrolled
- Not re-enrolled
- Not completed dev
- GK Not enrolled
- GK Not passed
- GK Passed
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Student Progression by Enrollment and Gatekeeper in Reading

Reading - Full Sample

- **Total**:
  - Never enrolled: 35%
  - Not re-enrolled: 6%
  - Not completed: 16%
  - GK Not enrolled: 12%
  - GK Not passed: 8%
  - GK Passed: 24%

- **1 level below**:
  - Never enrolled: 37%
  - Not re-enrolled: 13%
  - Not completed: 13%
  - GK Not enrolled: 9%
  - GK Not passed: 28%

- **2 levels below**:
  - Never enrolled: 28%
  - Not re-enrolled: 15%
  - Not completed: 21%
  - GK Not enrolled: 11%
  - GK Not passed: 6%
  - GK Passed: 18%

- **3 levels below**:
  - Never enrolled: 31%
  - Not re-enrolled: 26%
  - Not completed: 21%
  - GK Not enrolled: 7%
  - GK Not passed: 3%
  - GK Passed: 12%

Legend:
- Never enrolled
- Not re-enrolled
- Not completed
- GK Not enrolled
- GK Not passed
- GK Passed
Conclusions about Sequences

- Fewer than 50% complete their referred sequences in 3 years
- Many leave without failing courses
- Many sequence completers do not enroll in gatekeeper courses
- Success rates in college level courses of developed completers is misleadingly positive
Accelerate Remediation

• Too many opportunities to leave
• Improved diagnostic power of assessments will allow more efficient interventions
• Distinction between developmental and “college ready” students is arbitrary and based on a dubious system of assessment and placement
• Combine college level and developmental instruction (help “college ready” students as well)—ALP
• Compressed schedules—CCD
• Summer bridge programs—Texas and CUNY
National Initiatives: Developmental Education Initiative

- Funded by Gates and Lumina
- 15 community colleges, all from Achieving the Dream
- [http://www.deionline.org/about/](http://www.deionline.org/about/)

  - The aim of this project is to determine the mix of policy and practices—and the level of resources required—to generate large improvements in outcomes in a significant portion of the student body.
National Initiatives:
Developmental Education Initiative

- Strategies
National Initiatives: Complete College America


- Founded to focus *solely* on dramatically increasing the nation’s college completion rate through state policy change, and to build consensus for change among state leaders, higher education, and the national education policy community.

- “Targeting, Tailoring, Time.”
National Initiatives: Getting Past Go

- Part of The Education Commission of the States


- seeks to leverage developmental education at postsecondary institutions as a critical component of state efforts to increase college attainment rates
Other Players

- Community College Research Center - Transforming Community Colleges to Accelerate Success for Low-Income Young Adults- Gates funded
- MDRC– Learning Communities Demonstration Project
- National Center for Post-Secondary Research – assessment and college readiness
- MDC- Achieving the Dream
- Jobs for the Future- working with the Developmental Education Initiative
Acceleration

- A more direct, efficient, and effective pathways to the credit course experience
- Does not necessarily mean less instruction or less time
- A more intense experience
- Focus on priorities
- A more flexible approach for students who are borderline developmental
Contextualization

- Content more directly related to the college or training experience
- An approach that encourages transfer
- An approach that is meaningful and that motivates the learner
Personal Support

- Addresses the whole learner
- Recognizes that the non-cognitive, affective domain is critical for effective developmental education: motivation, executive functioning, self-efficacy
- Recognizes the social dimension of learning
- Is intrusive
Models

- Blended levels
- Seven plus seven- sequential compressed
- Mainstreaming
- Learning communities
- Restructured courses
- Adjunct courses
- Critical thinking courses
What We All Need to Understand

- Nothing happens without correct placement
  - Definition of college readiness
  - Multiple measures
  - Content validity and connection to instruction
  - Predictive validity
  - Reliability
What We All Need to Understand

- We must be careful with our placement policies
  - Understand both the positive effects
  - Balance with the negative effects
What We All Need to Understand

• The curriculum must be useful and meaningful
  ◦ We can’t afford to teach skills and strategies in isolation
  ◦ The world knowledge deficit
  ◦ A topsy-turvy curriculum?
What We All Need to Understand

- Boutique models will not change the face of developmental education
  - Simplicity
  - Scalability
  - Best options for the greatest number of students
What We All Need to Understand

- Pedagogy counts
  - The most perfect model taught by the unskilled teacher will not work
  - Chickering’s seven principles
  - Global Skills for College Completion
What We All Need to Understand

Skills are only half of the game

- The roles of motivation, executive functioning, and self-efficacy are critical to success
- Brain research
What We All Need to Understand

- Passing developmental courses is not enough
  - Students must pass sequences
  - Students must gateway courses
  - The role of retention
There is no silver bullet for the majority of developmental students

- Complexity of situation
- Differentiated instruction
What We All Need to Understand

- It is rocket science!
  - Diverse students
    - Demographics, skills, backgrounds
  - Faculty have challenges
    - Time and money to research
    - Adjunct faculty
    - Respect
What We All Need to Understand

- All students begin hoping to finish
- Many students begin with a belief that something is wrong with themselves or wrong with the system
What We All Need to Understand

- Institutions must work together to form solutions
- If we don’t, others will find solutions for us