

AB 705 Research and Analysis Ideas for Collaboration between Researchers and Faculty

This document provides ideas for collaboration between faculty and institutional research, planning and effectiveness (IRPE) professionals in the California Community Colleges to examine local impacts of AB 705. The ideas from this document were generated and collated from regional workshops and events hosted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges for faculty and related stakeholders in spring 2019 as well as workshops and events hosted by the RP Group. The document begins by sharing opportunities for collaboration identified by faculty and IRPE professionals, followed by commonly-used definitions and terms. The document concludes with a list of considerations for both faculty and IRPE professionals as they work together in the context of AB 705 evaluation.

Opportunities for Collaboration

- Include both faculty and IRPE staff in departmental and college-wide AB 705 implementation and evaluation structures
- Collaboratively review the role of [MIS codes](#) in collecting data and review the re-coding developed to track AB 705 changes with faculty identifying the courses and IRPE professionals working to code them appropriately
 - Jointly identify all English, reading, mathematics, quantitative reasoning, and other appropriately-related discipline courses that satisfy transfer, graduation, and/or local degree requirements and ensure they are correctly [coded](#)¹ and reported to the state Chancellor's Office

¹ At time of publication the MIS DED was located here: <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Digital-Innovation-and-Infrastructure/Management-Information-Systems/Data-Element-Dictionary>
AB 705 Research and Analysis: Ideas For Collaboration Between Researchers And Faculty
The RP Group and ASCCC | September 2019 | Page 1

- Jointly identify coding for support versus target courses in order to determine efficacy of support formats for specific groups and in order to validate whether support courses should be required, optional, embedded or some other modification, as well as to determine the trade-offs among varying types of support
- Faculty invite IRPE colleagues to attend department/division/discipline meetings so they can better understand curricular changes and help to fully evaluate outcomes and comparison coursework
- Jointly develop a research plan and agenda in collaboration with your AB 705 workgroup/steering committee and/or with faculty from each department/discipline to ensure learning is taking place
 - Title 5 requires statistical validation for any required prerequisites or co-requisites. A research plan to evaluate programmatic and placement changes in response to AB 705 should be in place prior to implementation, or as early as possible. Practitioners should be nimble and responsive to the outcomes, adjusting their newly-implemented plans as needed to optimize success for all students.
 - IRPE practitioners should be open to faculty's ideas for data collection and show faculty the data currently available to be included in an analysis, and help them consider the implications of data that are not available.
 - Faculty and IRPE practitioners should consider the idea of an extensive research plan that can be accomplished over the long-term, including both short- (e.g., course success, throughput rates, next course success, enrollment trends, financial aid, academic standing) and long-term outcomes (e.g., degree, transfer and employment).
 - Both quantitative (e.g., success rates) and qualitative (e.g., student and faculty experiences) data should be used to understand the impact of changes that have taken place.
 - IRPE professionals and faculty should collaboratively agree upon a comprehensive research agenda with defined cohorts prior to the analysis to help reduce bias or the perception of bias.
- Faculty and IRPE practitioners should work together to develop surveys and/or focus groups to gather feedback from students and faculty including: reasons for drops or withdraws, perceived appropriate placement, level of support provided, type of support provided, etc. When deciding about the use of surveys and/or focus groups, consider the following:
 - Faculty may choose to be surveyed on their perceptions around student ability, supports, additional needs such as professional development, etc.
 - Part-time faculty may have a different set of needs, concerns, or feedback than full-time faculty

- Focus groups may be a good way to take a deeper dive into those areas where a survey may not provide that opportunity
- Include a variety of disciplines in order to understand the scope across the institution
- Invite IRPE practitioners to present regular updates at AB 705 meetings and/or department/division meetings
- IRPE professionals should share early drafts of findings and reports with faculty leaders to gather feedback and make applicable adjustments.

Common Definitions and Terms for Outcomes Monitoring

- Course success = A+, A, A- B+, B, B-, C+, C, P grades
- Course success rate = successful grades / enrollment
- Course withdrawal rate = students with W grade / enrollment
- Drop rate = students who dropped with no grade / total enrollment including drops
- Throughput rate = Number of students who start at a particular level and successfully complete the degree- or transfer-level course appropriate to their educational goal or program of study in two semesters or three quarters (math and English)
- Volume of successful completions = Total number of students who successfully complete the degree- or transfer-level course appropriate to their educational goal or program of study compared to the total number of students who successfully completed the course prior to the change
- Degree- or transfer-level course enrollment rate = Percent of students who enroll in basic skills courses in a particular term or year / percent of students who enroll in the degree- or transfer-level course
- Volume of enrollments in degree or transfer level course = Total number of students who enroll in the degree- or transfer-level course compared to the total number of students who enrolled in the degree- or transfer-level course prior to the change

Data Considerations

Potential Comparison Groups

- Fall 2019 compared to fall 2018, or 2017-18 academic year compared to 2018-19

- Throughput rates for all first-time students who completed the degree- or transfer-level course within one academic year compared to first-time students who completed the course (or a higher level course) in the fall by starting level (e.g. fall 2017 cohort tracked for one year compared to the fall 2019 cohort tracked for one term)
 - Be sure to include throughput rates based on where the student started in the sequence: number of students who started one level below (CB 21 = A), two levels below (CB 21 = B), three levels below (CB 21 = C)
- Disaggregate outcomes by special population groups to determine disproportionate impacts (e.g., DSPS students compared to non-DSPS students in the same course in the same term)
- Success of students in the degree or transfer course by high school GPA band ([default placement rules](#)) compared to success rates of students in the same GPA band in the corequisite course

Student Variables

Need to disaggregate outcomes, when sample sizes are appropriate, by different student groups to determine disproportionate impacts, including but not limited to:

- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Part-time / full-time
- DSPS, EOPS, CalWorks, Veterans, Foster Youth status
- Course attempts (i.e., first time enrolled in the course, repeating the course the first time, second time, etc.)
- Simultaneous enrollment in regards to rigor and units of other classes
- Enrolled or placed into ESL course prior to enrollment
- By high school GPA band
- By high school attended
- High school courses taken and grades earned
- How long to enrollment in English or math (i.e., did they enroll in math or English in their first term enrolled, second term, etc.)
- Low-income or first-generation status
- PELL or Promise Grant status
- STEM or non-STEM major

- Any other disproportionately-impacted groups as identified in the local equity plan
- Success after first or second repeat – are there differences between completion after the first and second attempt in basic skills courses historically vs. direct placement into degree or transfer level
 - Differences in completion if repeat is with support, without, or one-level below, etc.

Course Characteristics

- Modality (face-to-face, hybrid, online)
- Time of day and/or day of the week
- Embedded supports such as tutors or counselors
- Course units (particularly with high-unit co-requisite course)
- Term (fall, winter, spring, summer)
- Term length (number of weeks)
- Corequisite recommended vs. required
- Stretch or late start course
- Departmental standards or common final vs. each instructor sets own standards and exams
- Type of corequisite course (i.e., lecture vs. lab, taught by the target course instructor or another instructor, contextualized or embedded across disciplines, cohort, integrated)
- Students self-select or recommended into corequisite courses
- Early alert systems

Instructor Effects

Ensure faculty anonymity in the results by aggregating terms until 10 or more sections are available for analysis

- Success rates by section
- Distribution of letter grades by section
- Equity gaps by section
- Type of innovation or strategies used in the classroom (i.e., flipped class, just-in-time remediation, lab or lecture, etc.)
- Student success in next course in the sequence or other General Education (GE) courses

Long-term Outcomes

Compare a cohort of students prior to AB 705 implementation to a cohort post-implementation on the following outcomes:

- Success in next course in the sequence (i.e., Precalculus 1 to Precalculus 2 or Calculus, ENGL1A to ENGL 1B or 2)
- Complete a degree or certificate
- Transfer to a four-year institution
- Did not pass after multiple attempts
- Completion of degree- or transfer-level English AND math within first year of enrollment
- Loss of financial aid eligibility or placed on academic probation
- Enrollment in and completion of other GE courses and timing of enrollment (e.g. were students able to take other GE courses in their first year at a higher rate than in the past)
- Impacts of additional corequisite units (i.e., heavier unit loads)

Questions or comments: ASCCC contact: info@asccc.org or RP contact: research@rpgroup.org