SJR 41 Panel – Illinois Exemplars

Stephanie Bernoteit, IBHE
Panel Moderator
Panelists

- Susan Grace – Wilbur Wright College, CCC
- Meera Komarraju – Southern Illinois University
- Alison Ready – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Jill O’Shea Lane and Dennis Krieb - Lewis and Clark College
Susan Grace & Keith Sprewer
Wilbur Wright College and Truman College
City Colleges of Chicago
**CCC: Goals of Our Reform**

*For every complex problem there is an answer that is clear, simple, and wrong.*  
– H.L. Mencken

- To revisit and refine our placement tool - as the means of placement cannot be separated from any Developmental English (DE) reform

- To reflect on our DE courses and identify strengths and weaknesses in order to figure out how to better serve our students

- To understand the DE trends, motives, and narratives sweeping the country

- To ground our decision-making in rigorous, peer-reviewed research on all DE models of reform, best practices, and pedagogy

- To find the best fit of reforms for our local CCC community that serves the needs of all of our students and that stays true to our open-access higher education mission

- To commit to students’ long term academic and personal success
Reform Approach - Key Elements

ARC: Aligned Reading and Composition (6 credit hours)

- Local, holistic placement that reflects CCC curriculum and meets students where they are, optimizing their long-term success.

- Accelerates two levels of developmental education: compresses up to two years of coursework into one semester, simplifies pathways, and reduces “exit points.”

- Integrates reading and writing → mirrors rigorous college-level coursework with sustained reading of multiple texts on a theme but with intentional scaffolding, modeling, and support for student success and confidence.

- Nurtures student engagement and collaboration through shared, sustained experience in a six-hour supportive learning community and with institutional supports (advising, Writing Center, embedded tutors).

- Transforms developmental education culture for both students and faculty with exciting curricula, high expectations, a reflective pedagogy and ongoing professional development for faculty.
Results – What is Working?

- **RTW: Read to Write Placement Exam:** accurately places students into classes that meet their needs

- **Aligned district-wide CCC English course sequence (unprecedented!)** with FSL, ARC, English 101 OR English 101/097, and English 102

- **Full-scale adoption of ARC (Aligned Reading and Composition) across the district replacing previous 4 -6 DE courses**

- **At Wright College (Fall 2015- 2018):**
  - ARC success rates on average 70%
  - Greatly improved transition into English 101 compared to previous DE course sequence: on average 80% transition in one term and 86% in three terms
  - Greatly improved success in English 101 and 102: of these transitioned students, on average 73% successful in 101 and within three terms of completing 101, on average, 69% of these students are retained into English 102 and 74% are successful.
  - Similar success rates at Truman College for the 2017-2018 academic year.
  - We are making progress at attaining one of the primary goals of the revised program, ARC: facilitating students’ long-term academic and personal growth.
  - 85% students perceive ARC as a good fit and a valuable learning experience
  - 60% improvement in student perception of self as good reader and writer
  - Transformed culture of DE program and English faculty cohesiveness and collaboration across the district
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Goals of the Reform: Improving Math 108 – College Algebra

- STEM and Business majors take Math 107-108-109-111-139-140-150 courses.
- Others take Math 101.
- With a longer gap between completion of prerequisites and enrollment in the next course, success generally drops off. Completing prerequisite courses with A or B greatly improves the likelihood of success in the next course. Completing prerequisites with a C is almost as unhelpful as a D, F or W in the prerequisite course. Completion of prerequisite course material in high school often seems linked to greater success in these introductory SIU math courses. Math 108 improved after we used more rigorous placement and once we got EWIP in place.
Reform Approach - Key Elements – Math 106

- Started in fall 2015 with Math 106 (College Algebra Enhanced)
- Collaborative learning with higher participation in discussion, worksheets, videos, etc.
- **Math 108 (current structure)**
- Higher placement score
- traditional lecture-based
- 2 lecture + 2 labs
- Same common final
- No extra fees
- From fall 2015:
  - **Math 108**
    - Green: 82.5%
    - Yellow: 37.3%
    - Orange: 36.6%
    - Red: 73.3%
  - **Math 106**
    - Green: 93.1%
    - Yellow: 51.6%
    - Orange: 43.8%
    - Red: 57.6%

- Math 106 students performed as well as Math 108 students even with lower placement scores.
Results – What is Working?

- **Co-remediation**: The ABC percentages in Fall 2017
  - College Algebra (co-remediation): 54.5%
  - College Algebra (traditional, coming from Intermediate Algebra): 32.4%
  - College Algebra (traditional, no Intermediate Algebra): 61.8%
  - Combined with the 27.0% ABC percentage in Intermediate algebra from the same semester, that suggests that students entering the coremediation college algebra class in Fall 17 had 54.5% chance of go-ahead (C or better) credit in one semester, and those entering the traditional intermediate algebra-college algebra sequence had a 8.7% (=27%x32.4%) chance.

- This is an improvement of a factor a little over six!!

- College-ready are still at an advantage, but for a non-college-ready student, the co-remediation way is an overwhelming advantage. Inspired by the success of Math 106, initiated a co-remediation for calculus I (Math 151) in spring 2017. This also has been successful so far.

- **Math 150 (current)**
  - Higher placement score
  - traditional lecture-based
  - 4 lecture
  - Same common final
  - No extra fees

- **Math 151 (enhanced)**
  - Lower placement score
  - More worksheets
  - 4 lecture + 1 labs
  - Same common final
  - Course fees
Student Success in Co-Requisite College Algebra at Illinois
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Goals of the Illinois Co-Requisite College Algebra Reform

- Improve the transition and shorten the timeline to college-level mathematics courses.

- Implement a corequisite support model to maximize student outcomes within the context of a single-semester College Algebra course.

- Ensure students remain on track for their areas of study without having to repeat prior coursework.

- Matriculate students on schedule with their peers into advancing courses with no loss of rigor or curricular content and with comparable success rates.

- Take equity into consideration for both access and outcomes.

- Create corequisite courses by design, not default.

- Contribute to institutional and state initiatives to increase success rates in mathematics courses and to national initiatives to increase STEM majors.
Reform Approach - Key Elements for a Successful Implementation

- **Identifying** what is the appropriate corequisite course and who will be successful in it. (An equally important, and harder, problem to determine.)

- Develop placement policies and design courses based on local data.

- ALEKS PPL for mathematics course placement (120,00+ assessments since 2007).

- ALEKS for technology-mediated support in an Accelerated Learning Program corequisite course model.

- Creation of Math 101 to serve as an alternative to College Algebra for students who do not need mathematics coursework beyond the level of Precalculus / Business Calculus.

- Evaluating placement policies and corequisite support models (conducting rigorous and ongoing institutional research for evidence of effectiveness and best practices).
  - Research shows that success in a student’s first math course is the best predictor of degree attainment.

- **Challenges**: Logistics of course redesigns, institutional research, increased enrollments and contact hours, and costs to the institution.
Results – What is Working?

Counts, Preparedness, and Pass Rates of MATH 112 First-Time Freshmen

Counts and Pass Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FTF</th>
<th>% Passed (All)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Prepared and Pass Rates by Preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Prepared</th>
<th>% Passed (Below Cutoff)</th>
<th>% Passed (Above Cutoff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% 1st Gen / URM and Pass Rates vs. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% 1st Gen / URM</th>
<th>% Passed (1st Gen / URM)</th>
<th>% Passed (Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pass Rates in Subsequent Coursework, Fall 2016-2018 to Spring 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>1st Gen / URM</th>
<th>Passed (1st Gen / URM)</th>
<th>Passed (Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 115</td>
<td>106/126</td>
<td>(84.1%)</td>
<td>(76.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 124</td>
<td>42/48</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
<td>(92.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 234</td>
<td>112/144</td>
<td>(77.8%)</td>
<td>(84.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed MATH 112 (All)</td>
<td>95/111 (85.6%)</td>
<td>28/33 (84.8%)</td>
<td>103/131 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed MATH 112, Met ALEKS Cutoff</td>
<td>11/15 (73.3%)</td>
<td>14/15 (93.3%)</td>
<td>9/13 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>235/307 (76.5%)</td>
<td>309/335 (92.2%)</td>
<td>1,117/1,320 (84.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goals of the Reform

Primary Goals

- Increased Retention
- Accelerate Non-College Ready Students Through College-Level Courses in Math and English
Reform Approach - Key Elements

- Placement Directly into College-Level Course with Co-Enrollment in the Support Course.
- Four Math Pathways and Two English Pathways.
- Cost Neutral Because Students Pay Tuition for Both Courses.
- The College-Level Course Outcomes Guide the “Just In Time” Remediation in the Support Course.
- Same Instructor for Both Courses is Most Effective.
Results – What is Working?

First-Year English
Number of Students Accelerated with a College-Level Completion

- Fall 2016: 50
- Spring 2017: 44
- Total Academic Year 2017: 94

College Algebra
Number of Students Accelerated with a College-Level Completion

- Fall 2016: 38
- Spring 2017: 35
- Total Academic Year 2017: 73

Retention – CCA Students and Developmental Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016 to Fall 2017</td>
<td>All CCA Math Students</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 – Fall 2017</td>
<td>All Developmental Math Students (No CCA)</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016 to Fall 2017</td>
<td>All CCA English Students</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 – Fall 2017</td>
<td>All Developmental English Students (No CCA)</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Questions and Thoughts?