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The Problem:
The Looming Shortage of Educated Workers

Who will fill the demand?
The Challenge

College Entry Rates for High School Graduates by Ethnicity

- Hispanic: 50%
- African American: 44%
- White: 72%
An Economic Imperative

Raise college graduation rates among minorities and the disadvantaged.

Reduce inequities in education.
An Economic Imperative

Economic Productivity Requires

EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY
Educational Productivity

Begin at the end

What do employers need?

What does student success look like?

What do students need to succeed?
Momentum Points

- Momentum points in the education-to-workforce pipeline are key to student success
- Lack of alignment in the pipeline perpetuates these choke points
- We can and must eliminate the choke points in the system
What does ERP do?
ERP: Structure & Leadership

• A 501(c)3 nonprofit
• Board comprised of business and education leaders
• Close and cooperative relationships: K-12 school systems; colleges and universities; thought leaders
• President and Founder Jim Lanich, PhD, national leader in educational systems/outcomes
• 2015-16 goal: Make ERP’s work available to more educators/districts
What does ERP do?

Maintains the nation’s largest database on student achievement.
What does ERP do?

Applies data analytics to uncover bright spots and find out why
What does ERP do?

Documents and disseminates **best practices** to educators (for free!)
What does ERP do?

Learn what works

And copy it.
Welcome to Cal-PASS Plus, California's actionable system of data linking student performance from pre-K through 12, to college and the workplace.

Explore Data and Collaborate

- Pre K-12 Schools
- Community Colleges
- Universities
- Regional Learning Councils

Public Student Achievement Data

Workforce Pipeline

- Select Your Economic Region
- OR
- Select Your County

Member List
Join/Manage MOU
Upload Data
Download Data
STEM Dashboard
Summary for Allendale Elementary, Oakland Unified 2013

CDS: 01-61259-6001630
School Type: Elementary School
Grade Span: K-5
Student Enrollment: 425
Free/Reduced School Lunch: 0.0%
Socioeconomic Disadvantaged: 97.0%
English Language Learners: 41.2%
Students with Disabilities: 9.7%
Census Characterization: City, Large Territory

Ethnic Breakdown:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native: 0.2%
- Asian: 9.4%
- Pacific Islander: 1.4%
- Filipino: 3.5%
- Hispanic/Latino: 43.8%
- African American: 36.5%
- White: 2.8%
- Multiple Races: 1.6%
- Declined to State: 0.0%

School Address:
3670 Penniman Avenue
Oakland CA 94619-1116
Find it on MapQuest.com!

Year: 2013

Grade Level Charts:

Grade Level Reports:
Select Test/Grade/Subject  Select Chart

School Level Charts:

Performance Snapshot

Beating/Lagging Expectations Chart

Adequate Yearly Progress Reports:

Language Arts  Mathematics

Subgroup Summary Charts:

Language Arts  Mathematics

Multi-Grade Summary Charts:

Language Arts  Mathematics

District Level Charts:

District Dashboard

District Adequate Yearly Progress Summary:

Language Arts  Mathematics

District Subgroup Summary:

Language Arts  Mathematics

Beating/Lagging Expectations Chart

District Scatterplot

District EAP (College Readiness) Data
Public K-12 Data

Allendale Elementary, Oakland Unified
Grade 5 Mathematics 2013 Results

Socioeconomically
Disadvantaged: 97.0%
English Learners: 41.2%
Grade Enrollment: 62
Students Tested: 56
Statewide Comparable Schools Found: 723

Click on Top Comparables bar below to see a breakdown of the schools which make...
# Public K-12 Data

## Allendale Elementary, Oakland Unified
Countywide Top Comparable Schools for
Grade 5 Mathematics 2013 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name (Grade Span) District Name</th>
<th>Census Zone</th>
<th>% Proficient and Above</th>
<th>% Basic and Above</th>
<th>% Low Income</th>
<th>% EL</th>
<th>Met 2013 AYP</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students Taking CST</th>
<th>% of Students Taking CST</th>
<th>Distance to Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Elementary (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf Elementary (K-6) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita SEED (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire ERES Academy (K-8) Aspire Public Schools</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think College Now (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred T. Korematsu Discovery Academy (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Academy (K-5) Alameda County Office of Education</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza Elementary (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire Monarch Academy (K-5) Aspire Public Schools</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Family (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACORN Woodland Elementary (K-5) Oakland Unified</td>
<td>Lg City</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average of Top Comparable Schools | 72.4 | 89.2 |
| Opportunity Gap | -56.4 | -34.2 |
| Number in Pool | 22 |

**Met AYP column:** Click on the No to get more details on why the school did not meet AYP.
Scatterplot for Shasta High,
Shasta Union High
Grade 11 Language Arts 2013

Schoolwide % Socioeconomic Disadvantaged vs All Students Percent Proficient and Above
College-Readiness Charts

Washington Academic Middle, Sanger Unified
Grade 7 Mathematics 2013 College Readiness Results

Socioeconomically
Disadvantaged: 97.8%
English Learners: 13.1%
Grade Enrollment: 583
Students Tested: 507
Statewide Comparable Schools Found: 61

![Bar chart showing percent of students](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington Academic Middle CST</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle College Ready</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Comparables Statewide</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chart represents a framework of success factors found to be prevalent in higher performing schools. Click through district, school and classroom columns for detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizing Theme</th>
<th>District/System</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness Curriculum &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>Provide clear, specific learning objectives aligned to college and career readiness, along with evidence-based instructional practices, materials and resources.</td>
<td>Implement the system’s rigorous instructional program so that all students master the content knowledge and 21st century skills needed for post-secondary education and career success.</td>
<td>Implement evidence-based, engaging instructional practices and effective lesson design to ensure that all students meet rigorous expectations for content knowledge, critical thinking, and self-direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Achievement</td>
<td>Establish system-wide mission of college and career readiness for all students; provide schools with leadership and resources to support a culture of achievement.</td>
<td>Develop a collaborative school community that fosters a college-bound mindset, scholarship, and self-directed learning for achievement at the highest levels.</td>
<td>Promote the school’s academic community by maintaining college and career expectations, a collaborative professional culture, and a growth mindset among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Hire and cultivate effective school leaders and highly qualified teachers; build systems for monitoring school performance, recognizing staff contributions, and providing ongoing supports.</td>
<td>Provide instructional leadership, a coherent program for professional development, and on-going feedback of teachers’ classroom practice; empower teachers to collaborate and own their professional growth.</td>
<td>Actively pursue personal and staff professional growth opportunities aligned to fostering college and career readiness; collaborate with colleagues and school leaders to create an environment of transparency and continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Maintain data and assessment systems to monitor school and student performance; provide resources for using data to support academic achievement.</td>
<td>Use a variety of data, including college-ready metrics, to monitor instructional practices and student achievement; support teachers in using data to improve instruction.</td>
<td>Draw on multiple forms of authentic assessment to monitor student achievement and use results to respond to individual and collective learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Learning</td>
<td>Deploy resources and guidance to support schools’ efforts to prepare all students for college; explore innovations in personalizing instruction to meet students’ varied needs.</td>
<td>Develop systems for identifying student needs and strengths, monitoring student progress, and customizing individualized learning experiences, including multi-tiered systems of support.</td>
<td>Collaborate with specialists and colleagues to personalize curriculum, instructional practices, and evidence-based learning support strategies to effectively meet the specialized academic needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Less Effective Practices</td>
<td>Success Factors for Meeting State Standards</td>
<td>Success Factors for College and Career Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Goals and Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Curriculum documents are vague and highly negotiable. Teachers modify the system's</td>
<td>Teachers have a clear understanding of the standards-based curriculum, especially the</td>
<td>Teachers have detailed knowledge of current career demands, college and career-ready skills,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum for their own classroom based on tradition, materials at hand, and personal</td>
<td>learning objectives for their grade and subject; they can also articulate the relationship between their</td>
<td>and their curricular program to be mastered throughout the year. Teachers have clear road maps for student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preference, rather than on the objectives required for the next grade.</td>
<td>level and the grades that precede and follow.</td>
<td>learning for each reporting period, as well as curriculum guides and other materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of Effective Instructional Practices</td>
<td>Classroom materials and activities are largely chosen or developed by individual</td>
<td>Classroom materials and activities are selected based on their connection to academic standards. Teachers</td>
<td>Classroom materials and activities are collaboratively selected by teachers and school leaders based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers, with little collaboration, sharing with colleagues, or explicit connection to</td>
<td>routinely work in grade/subject level teams or with schools leaders to create a consistent instructional</td>
<td>their effectiveness for mastering college and career-ready content and skills with students representing a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student mastery of standards.</td>
<td>program and to supplement or modify their program to meet stated learning goals and differentiated student</td>
<td>range of learning needs. Teachers within departments utilize shared road maps for student learning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent, Meaningful Grades</td>
<td>Teachers’ grading systems are difficult to interpret because they are not based on</td>
<td>Teachers’ grading and progress reporting systems provide meaningful information regarding students’</td>
<td>curriculum guides and other materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreed-upon standards, assessment targets, or expectations. The meaning of a grade</td>
<td>achievement of the objectives for that grade level and subject. Students are not promoted to the next level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>varies considerably across classrooms. Promotion may hinge upon a variety of factors,</td>
<td>of study without mastering essential skills and content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as age or effort.</td>
<td>Teachers’ systems for grading and reporting of student progress are consistent, clear, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Career-Ready Skills &amp; Content</td>
<td>Teachers take ownership for teaching their own curriculum to the students currently in</td>
<td>meaningful to students, families, as well as colleges. A student’s grade accurately reflects—and can be</td>
<td>Teachers take responsibility for all students’ progress toward college readiness. In addition to subject-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their classroom. Although they may share teaching tips or materials with colleagues,</td>
<td>readily interpreted as—an indication of the student’s level of achievement toward mastering the college and</td>
<td>area skills and content, teachers work together to teach college and career-ready skills such as critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration is not an expectation, and supports may feel evaluative. Closed</td>
<td>career-ready curriculum.</td>
<td>thinking, problem solving, oral and written communication, and technology, as well as to support elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classrooms are the norm.</td>
<td>Teachers share a sense of responsibility for guiding all students toward mastery of the school system’s</td>
<td>of the “college knowledge” program. Open, transparent classrooms are the norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standards for their grade and subject area. Teachers seek out opportunities to observe one another, share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>materials and approaches, and refine their practice in response to feedback from colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “How”

Evidence

Curriculum Goals and Learning Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Network</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>Aspire planning checklist to ensure units have identified standards, big ideas, essential questions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>Aspire unit planning template to identify standards, big ideas, essential questions, skills to be assessed, performance tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>Aspire’s year at a glance planning template listing units, dates, core texts, reading/writing expectations, and assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>Sample unit planner with standards, essential questions, assessments, weekly planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>Unit planning template with learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiwanda School District</td>
<td>Sample California Go Math! lesson outline w/standards, objectives, essential question, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiwanda School District</td>
<td>Sample unit on environment with themes, learning goals, essential Qs, performance task, connected learning opps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Magnet Academy</td>
<td>Coursework progression for academies, graduation requirements, honors/distinctions info, college admissions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Public Schools</td>
<td>Sample annotated Algebra lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Remedial Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Math Course</th>
<th>Chancellors Office Certificate</th>
<th>Associates Degree</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Transferred with Associates Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Level</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Attempt</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remedial English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First English Course</th>
<th>Chancellors Office Certificate</th>
<th>Associates Degree</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Transferred with Associates Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Level</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Attempt</td>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Initiatives

- Multiple Measures
- Common Assessment
- Foster Youth and Financial Aid Dashboards
- CTE Career Pathways Trust
Momentum Points

Early Childhood Education  Third Grade Literacy  8th Grade Algebra  College Ready Coursework  Non-Remedial Placement  College Success  Labor Market Alignment

Placement
Momentum Point: Placement

- Testing and placement practice vary widely
- Inaccurate and inefficient placement
- High rate of unnecessary remediation
- Students inconsistently understanding and preparing for the test
- Testing and remediation is expensive
- Multiple Measures inconsistently or inappropriately used
Common Assessment Goal

• To develop a comprehensive, common assessment system that will:
  – align to state legislation
  – reduce unnecessary remediation
  – provide statewide efficiencies
  – effectively support faculty and staff to ensure accurate student placement, resulting in more successful student outcomes
Key Objectives

• A test that covers curricular areas of
  – Math, English, English as a second language (ESL)
• Multiple Measures (with MMAP)
• Assessment Preparation (with EPI/OEI)
• Professional Development
• Integrate data across the system
• Align where possible with Common Core/SBAC
Reimagining Student Capacity
Predictive Analytics and Multiple Measures
Overview

• Over-reliance on standardized assessment has led us to systematically and substantially underestimate student capacity
  • Particularly for students of color, low income students, first generation college students, women
  • Evidence-based, multiple measures is a key cornerstone on which to rebuild the foundations of community college education
    • Demonstrates fundamental capacity of far more of our students to succeed if given the chance
    • Powerful completion, equity, and real world implications
    • Based powerfully both on basic principles of assessment and measurement as well as strong evidence
But first, I digress
A little classics
Daedalus and Icarus

- Daedalus crafted the labyrinth of inescapable complexity for King Minos

- To escape from Minos, Daedalus built wings of feather and wax for his son Icarus and himself

- Don’t fly too high, lest sun melt the wax and you plummet to your doom
  - Dangers of innovation/invention, hubris,
  - Importance of knowing your limits, listening to your wiser elders

- But most of us forget the rest of that story...
Transition to College: Assessment and Placement

• Community colleges are open enrollment institutions
  • Requires assessing and planning for educational needs of students.

• Goal
  • Effectively place student at most appropriate level for their skill
  • Ensure that all students complete their courses, persist to the next academic term, and achieve their educational objective(s) in a timely manner.
What we are actually doing: Community college student transition to college

- Community colleges rely nearly entirely on standardized assessment (WestEd, 2011)

- Most CC students placed below college-level
  - Significant barrier (Bailey, Jeong, and Cho, 2010)

- What does this mean?
  - First interaction is to tell students they don’t belong
  - Imply that most students are not ready for college and are likely to fail
What if?

• What if the problem is not primarily with our students but with limitations in how we have assessed and understood their capacity to do college-level work?
LBCC Multiple Measures Research

• Five cohorts tracking more than 7,000 HS grads who matriculate to LBCC directly

• Examined predictive utility of wide range of high school achievement data

• For predicting:
  • How students are assessed and placed
  • How students perform in those classes
  • (and alignment between them)
Alignment in English

Predicting Placement

Ordinal Regression Coefficients

Predicting Performance

Logistic Regression Coefficients

* p < .05 **, p < .01, *** p < .001, x = p < 1 x 10^{-10}
Alignment in Math

Predicting Placement

Ordinal Regression Coefficients

CST Math (z)  | Last Math Grade  | HSGPA
---|---|---
.75* | .20 | .00

Predicting Performance

Logistic Regression Coefficients

CST Math (z)  | Last Math Grade  | HSGPA
---|---|---
.20* | .25** | .73*
Key Takeaways

• Assessment should predict how students will perform at our colleges

• Instead:
  • Current standardized tests predict standardized tests
  • Classroom performance predicts classroom performance
  • More info tells us more about student capacity than less info
Re-imagined student capacity

• Starting in Fall 2012, students from LBUSD (now 6 districts covering >30 high schools and growing) were provided an alternative assessment
  • Reverse engineered the analysis to place students using:
    • Last high school course in discipline
    • Grade in last course in discipline
    • Overall HSGPA
    • Last standardized test in discipline (and level)
  • Placed students in highest course where projected success rate higher than average success rate for that course.
Implementing Multiple Measures Placement:
Transfer-level Placement Rates F2012

F2011 First time students
F2011 LBUSD
F2012 Promise Pathways - Accuplacer Only
F2012 Promise Pathways - Multiple Measures
But …
... didn’t that just flood transfer-level courses with unqualified students?
Comparison against traditional sequence: Success rates in transfer-level courses

First Cohort, F2012
- English: Non-Pathways 64%, Promise Pathways 62%
- Math: Non-Pathways 55%, Promise Pathways 51%

Most recent cohort, F2014
- English: Non-Pathways 67%, Promise Pathways 79%
- Math: Non-Pathways 49%, Promise Pathways 49%

Neither of these differences approach significance, $p > .30$

English difference, $p < .001$
F2012 Promise Pathways vs. Fall 2011 2-year rates of achievement

Successfully Completed Transfer Math: 13%, F2011 LBUSD (N=1654) vs. 23%, F2012 Promise Pathways (N=933)

Successfully Completed Transfer English: 24%, F2011 LBUSD (N=1654) vs. 52%, F2012 Promise Pathways (N=933)

Successful Completion of English 3: 3%, F2011 LBUSD (N=1654) vs. 20%, F2012 Promise Pathways (N=933)

Behavioral Intent to Transfer: 31%, F2011 LBUSD (N=1654) vs. 54%, F2012 Promise Pathways (N=933)
Conservative statewide projection of MMAP impact on transfer-level courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math TL Placement</th>
<th>Math TL Success Rates</th>
<th>Math TL Cohort Completion</th>
<th>English TL Placement</th>
<th>English TL Success Rates</th>
<th>English TL Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Red: Traditional Placement
- Gray: Multiple Measures
Multiple Measures means: Additional first time transfer-level students each year in CA

- Math: AT&T Park (~40,000)
- English: Dodger Stadium (~60,000)
Equity impact: F2011 Baseline Equity Gaps for 2-year rates of achievement

- Transfer Math Successful Completion:
  - F11 African Americans: 4%
  - F11 Hispanic: 12%
  - F11 Asian: 21%
  - F11 White: 18%

- Transfer English Successful Completion:
  - F11 African Americans: 13%
  - F11 Hispanic: 25%
  - F11 Asian: 24%
  - F11 White: 18%

- English 3 Successful Completion:
  - F11 African Americans: 2%
  - F11 Hispanic: 3%
  - F11 Asian: 1%
  - F11 White: 6%

- Behavioral Intent to Transfer:
  - F11 African Americans: 15%
  - F11 Hispanic: 32%
  - F11 Asian: 34%
  - F11 White: 41%
Equity impact: F2012 2-year rates of achievement

- Transfer Math Successful Completion
  - F12 African American: 12%
  - F12 Hispanic: 21%
  - F12 Asian: 26%
  - F12 White: 36%

- Transfer English Successful Completion
  - F12 African American: 39%
  - F12 Hispanic: 51%
  - F12 Asian: 58%
  - F12 White: 64%

- English 3 Success
  - F12 African American: 18%
  - F12 Hispanic: 23%
  - F12 Asian: 28%
  - F12 White: 52%

- Behavioral Intent to Transfer
  - F12 African American: 42%
  - F12 Hispanic: 52%
  - F12 Asian: 59%
  - F12 White: 66%
What might this mean for students?

- LBCC saved students >10,000 semesters (5000 years) of unneeded remediation in first three years.
  - ~$250 per course for student (plus books!), $750 per course for state
- Bakersfield College saved 860 semesters for 370 students in one year.
- Dramatic opportunity costs of college reduced
  - Median 2012 salary of “some college” is ~$30,000/year
  - Don’t lose their first year or median salary though, they lose their last year.
What is gained through reimagining student capacity

• The ability to transform student outcomes
• Powerful levers to address student equity gaps
• A clarion call to reassess our understanding of student capacity
  • An opportunity to stop meeting students at the front door to work so very hard to convince them that they’re not college material
  • A renewed opportunity to collaborate with our K-12 educational partners
• A critical reminder of Daedalus’ second instruction to Icarus
  • It’s just as important not to fly too low.
Your Thoughts!

Questions?
Learn What Works
And copy it.
We’re learning what works.

LET’S CHANGE THE CONVERSATION

From pointing out failure to Promoting Success