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- Funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education and other funders
- Partnership between Teachers College, MDRC, the Curry School at UVA, and faculty and students at Harvard
- Primarily focused on remediation and the high school to college connection
- July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2012
- Second in a series of conferences (last one Sept 2010)
**Dev Ed Basics**

- Most CC students do not complete their dev ed sequences
- Dev ed does not improve student outcomes, especially for stronger students
- The HS/CC connection is weak (high incidence)
- The assessment system needs reform
- Short-term focused reforms have modest positive effects that fade
- Educators are turning to more ambitious and comprehensive reforms
IN-ORDER COURSE COMPLETION AND ENROLLMENT FOR MATH REMEDIATION

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

1 level below
- 22% Enroll
- 29% Pass
- Not completed: 12%

2 levels below
- 41% Enroll
- 57% Pass
- Not completed: 12%

3 levels below
- 82% Enroll
- 57% Pass
- Referred to Lev. 3
  - 46824
- Not enrolled: 16%
- Not completed: 25%

Not enrolled
- 18%
- 16%
- 7%
- 6%

IN-ORDER COURSE COMPLETION AND ENROLLMENT FOR MATH REMEDIATION

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

1 level below
- 22% Enroll
- 29% Pass
- Not completed: 12%

2 levels below
- 41% Enroll
- 57% Pass
- Not completed: 12%

3 levels below
- 82% Enroll
- 57% Pass
- Referred to Lev. 3
  - 46824
- Not enrolled: 16%
- Not completed: 25%

Not enrolled
- 18%
- 16%
- 7%
- 6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred Level</th>
<th>Completed DE Sequence</th>
<th>Complete Gatekeeper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Level Below</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levels Below</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Levels Below</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of DE

- Mostly no or negative effects at the dev ed cutoff (Bettinger and Long; Calcagno and Long; Martorell and McFarlin; Scott-Clayton and Rodriguez)

- Varied but still mostly no or negative effects at lower levels (Boatman and Long; Melguizo et al.; Dadgar; Hodara; Hodara and Jaggars)
CONCEPTIONS OF DE

- Development—Overcomes past academic weaknesses
- Discouragement—Causes students to exit
- Diversion—Consider the intrinsic value of dev ed
SESSION 2: FOCUSED REFORM OF DE

- Learning Communities
- Many models of acceleration
- Integration with college-level courses
- Use of technology—especially for math
SESSION 3: HIGH SCHOOL COLLEGE CONNECTION AND ASSESSMENT

- Most CC entrants are ill-prepared
- Many efforts to strengthen the HS/CC relationship
  - Dual enrollment, high school/CC partnerships, summer bridge programs, early assessment
- Thwarted by lack of a consensus about what constitutes “college ready”
- Problems reflected in the turmoil over assessment
ASSESSMENT

- No consensus (Common Core?)
- No obvious cutoff point
- Weak diagnostic characteristics
- No focus on non-cognitive skills
- Significant misplacement, especially underplacement
THREE TENSIONS IN DE REFORM

- Autonomy versus consistency
- Efficient versus effective assessment
- Supporting progression versus maintaining standards

- Consider negative side effects of DE
SESSION 4: COMPREHENSIVE REFORM

- Scaling up small pilots
- Connecting dev ed to college-level programs—focus on the entire student experience
- Institution-wide reform—“innovating at scale”
- Comprehensive state-wide dev ed redesigns
CONFERENCE AGENDA

- Agenda
  - Discrete Reforms of Developmental Education
  - Assessment and Strengthening the Relationship between High School and College
  - Comprehensive, College-Wide, and State-Wide Reforms
- Research plenary and practical break-outs
Download event materials and learn more at

www.PostsecondaryResearch.org