

Foothill College Assessment/Placement Ad Hoc Taskforce Minutes

April 14, 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; Mariel Estrada Bonilla

Italicized names were not present

1. Minutes from previous meeting approved by consensus.
2. Retest Policy Draft Discussion
 - a. Discussion about how long are test scores valid for? Recency? 3 years is the shortest possible recency per Title 5 regs, should test scores be consistent with that? Debbie will go back to Math to discuss this. Potential policy-valid for three years? Require “bootcamp” class? Non-credit options?
 - b. Can students take ESLL, retest, and then take ENG and retest, essentially allowing 4 chances at the test? ESSLL to ENG equals a challenge?
 - i. Liz and Thom agreed that since they are different tests testing different things, they should have an option to take each one with a retest. (I.e. this is just as students are not precluded from taking the math test if they’ve taken the English test – two different subjects.)
 - c. Do we need to include summer bridge programs in retest policy?
 - i. Mid-term or mid-year bridge-is that an option? If we were to go this route and add an additional bridge, what timing would make the most sense? Late fall so student could begin coursework in Winter quarter?
 - d. High-end retake on MATH? We would need to establish cut scores?
 - i. “If your results on your initial placement test suggest you are eligible to take a higher level math test, that will not count as a retest.”
 - e. Replace language in retest policy with “as long as they have not begun the course sequence at Foothill”
 - f. Questions raised about whether we want to propose a district-wide retest policy?
 - g. Thom will incorporate the suggested revisions and send to committee for distribution to constituents for discussion.
3. Multiple Measures
 - a. Intro to the High School Variable Models document-uses HS info, (accessed through CalPASS) for placement
 - i. Some models use just HS GPA, others use GPA and other factors.
 - b. Should we be using EAP as a multiple measure since all CA HS students complete the test? How many students come to us at CCC rather than going straight to CSU/UC?

- i. How would this be validated? State? Locally? Liz will look at what is data is already available for this.
 - c. Should we be using EAP scores?
 - d. Other options include self-reported data.
 - i. Possibility to bring in Terrence for explanation to faculty (of validity of self-reported data as well as to better explain the HS GPA research)
 - e. Agenda item for next meeting to explore further: look at the many other potential multiple measures and begin discussion of which makes the most sense to try, with special focus on more accurate placements for disproportionately impacted student groups (E.g. not all will have HS GPA data or EAP results. How to best implement multiple measures for these students?)
4. Validation Schedule on next agenda. Should we be validating if we are moving towards to common assessment? Liz estimated it will demand her full attention for approximately eight months.
- a. Consensus of group is that we should not given that by the time the validations are completed we would have little time to implement any meaningful changes before the common assessment rolls out. Researcher's time would be better spent on other projects.
 - b. Agenda item for next meeting to finalize a recommendation to PaRC about this.