

## Foothill College Assessment/Placement Ad Hoc Taskforce Agenda

June 9, 2015, 1:00 – 3:00 pm

Altos Room

Members: Carolyn Holcroft; Thomas Shepard; *Elaine Kuo*; *Victor Tam*; Paul Starer; Katie Ha; *Eric Reed*; *Kathy Perino*; *Hilda Fernandez*; *Valerie Fong*; *Allison Herman*, Patrick Morriss; Andrew LaManque; Debbie Lee

*\*absent*

- 1) Final version of retest policy - vetting/approval process
  - a) Discussed what approval process should be. Who needs to “vet”? In this case since the decision is broader than one department/division, important to bring to PaRC.
  - b) Plan to ask PaRC to make an exception to Robert’s rules and take action on first read at their next meeting, with “reconfirm” at first meeting in fall. Thom would like to implement new policy ASAP.
  - c) Discussion of possible unintended consequences – encouraging students to test first at Foothill and then go to De Anza? This already happens. Effect of policy is to increased clarity/transparency.
  - d) Plan to collect data over the summer, look for evidence of impact of our policy implementation, report out in fall both the ad hoc committee and to PaRC
  - e) Brief discussion of how CAI implementation might affect our retest policy – will most likely obviate our policy. All colleges may be using same retest policy after CAI launches.
  - f) Group adopted final draft of policy by consent. Andrew to follow up with Casie to get the document on PaRC’s upcoming agenda.
- 2) Use of EAP results for placement:
  - a) Debbie reported on math department’s approval to using EAP scores for placement. If student received “standards exceeded” result on their EAP, student will place OUT of Math 105 and is eligible for any of the college-level math courses. I.e. is equivalent of having completed Math 105.
  - b) Paul confirmed this already in place for English (if student receives “standards exceeded” result on English portion of EAP, the student is eligible for English 1A.
  - c) Andrew inquired how long EAP scores are valid? Liz unsure, will check CSU policy and report back.
- 3) Multiple measures: discuss importance (with emphasis on equity perspective), identify current barriers to implementation (ranging from misinformation, inadequate information about what is feasible and appropriate, etc.), make game plan for overcoming these
  - a) Liz to model using STEPs data (from CalPASS) for Foothill. What would implementing high school GPA as a MM mean for Foothill? Liz to follow up with Craig Hayward and/or Terrence Willet re: getting our accuplacer data for modeling.
  - b) DeAnza piloting several different models for MM this fall
  - c) Carolyn reported out from MM Work Group meeting last week

- d) "MM questions" already asked to determine which math test a student should take.
- e) Patrick reported out from the CAI Math Work Group meeting last week. Taking the CAI data and determining how to use it for placement will be challenging, time consuming.
- f) Paul – most frequently asked to consider IB test, TOEFEL scores, some English instruction, as mitigating circumstances for test result.
- g) How to continue conversations about MM here next year? How can we pilot?
  - i) Liz thinking about how to identify an appropriate group of student to do pilot work? E.g. athletes, EOPS, etc. some identifiable cohort. Ideally a group that already has some additional support services in place.
  - ii) Would be beneficial to have some more concrete information, detail about how it might be implemented at Foothill – idea still nebulous.
- 4) Review of assessment/placement portion of the 3SP plan
  - a) Pages 8 – 12 of the '14-'15 SSSP Plan were distributed (the "Assessment and Placement" section of the plan)
  - b) Validation of cut scores: Liz will work with Thom/assessment office to work on validation. Fall '15 plan to do second half of chemistry placement exam, and English; Winter '16 will validate ESL, Spring '16 will validate math scores
  - c) Anticipate that the revised 3SP plan will be due very quickly in fall. Will plan to keep in communication over the summer, request ad hoc feedback about the assessment/placement part of plan. Potential meeting of ad hoc group in July? Early September. Andrew will ask Justin to schedule.