English 015

Analysis of Placement and Prerequisite Survey and Grade Analysis

Cut-Score Review

The purpose of this report is to refine cut-scores for placing students in English courses by examining placement and prerequisite survey results and course grades over the last three semesters. This study is part of an on-going effort to monitor the validity and efficacy of assessment and placement procedures at SBCV.

Method: Placement and prerequisite surveys were distributed to all sections of English 914 over three semesters: spring 2012, fall 2012, and spring 2013. Every student who attended class on the day of the survey was offered the opportunity to participate. Instructors distributed the surveys and collected them after students were finished. After the student completed the survey, instructors were asked to rate student's skill levels in regard to their readiness for the material covered in class. The Office of Research and Planning distributed the surveys to instructors during the fifth week of class; instructors distributed the surveys to students during a class session mid-way through the term. All surveys were submitted to the Office of Research and Planning where they were sorted and scanned.

> **Comment [GC1]:** 015

A large percentage of completed surveys could not be used because student did not meet specific criteria: 1) the student had taken the course prior to enrolling in the current section of the course, (2) the student had completed more than one placement and prerequisite survey. (3) the student did not complete the survey correctly, e.g., no student ID, no course number, etc.

> **Comment [GC2]:** some students

Student performance data (grades) were downloaded from the Datatel warehouse for all students who completed a survey and met the criteria to be included in the analysis. Grades in this analysis covered the terms in which the survey was completed—spring 2012, fall 2012, and spring 2013.

Findings: Table1 shows the distribution of grades for all students, those who enrolled because of an assessment placement as well as those who completed the prerequisite here or at another campus.   Three hundred-sixty-seven surveys met the criteria for analysis, i.e., students who enrolled for the first time and within two years of being placed in English 015 as a result of their scores on the Accuplacer test. Tables 2 - 4 show the entire range of current assessment scores (79 to 98). Tables 5-7 show the results for students with a score of 79 or 80.

Summary: The current cut-scores for English 015 range from 79 to 98 on the Accuplacer ACCUSENT/Sentence (see the attachment for all current and previous cut-scores). Students who score below 79 are placed in English 914; students who score higher than 98 are placed in

English 101. For grades, a comparison of tables 1 and 2 shows that students recently placed in English 914 have a significantly higher pass rate than those in the general student population—62% compared to 49% for the general student population, 13% points higher. The survey results suggest that students and faculty view the placements as appropriate; 93% of students and 69% of faculty rated student placements as either "Yes, overqualified", "Yes, very much so", or "Yes, but not completely." The other possibilities were, "Yes, but just barely," "No, not at all."

Recommendations: Based on these findings, I recommend no change at the time. An examination of the student at the bottom of the scale with scores of 79 and 80 revealed a pass-rate of 58.6% for this group. With 91.7 of faculty and 72.8 of students indicating a positive response on the survey (see tables 5, 6, 7).

Table 1 – Grade distributions for English 914, 015,101 (All student s --2012 reporting year)								
Course	#Sec	A	B	C	D	F	Pass Rate	W
ENGL-015	**87**	**7%**	**17%**	**22%**	**17%**	**10%**	**46%**	**23%**
ENGL-101	66	13%	21%	21%	8%	8%	55%	25%
ENGL-914	48	12%	21%	25%	10%	12%	57%	19%
	201							

Grade

Table 2 . Distribution of grades			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
79 to 98	Valid	A	70	13.4	13.4	13.4
		B	139	26.7	26.7	40.1
		C	115	22.1	22.1	62.2
		D	102	19.6	19.6	81.8
		F	60	11.5	11.5	93.3
		W	35	6.7	6.7	100.0
		Total	521	100.0	100.0	
under 78	Valid	A	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
		B	7	17.9	17.9	20.5
		C	11	28.2	28.2	48.7
		D	11	28.2	28.2	76.9
		F	9	23.1	23.1	100.0

Grade

Table 2 . Distribution of grades						
cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
79 to 98	Valid	A	70	13.4	13.4	13.4
		B	139	26.7	26.7	40.1
		C	115	22.1	22.1	62.2
		D	102	19.6	19.6	81.8
		F	60	11.5	11.5	93.3
		W	35	6.7	6.7	100.0
		Total	521	100.0	100.0	
under 78	Valid	A	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
		B	7	17.9	17.9	20.5
		C	11	28.2	28.2	48.7
		D	11	28.2	28.2	76.9
		F	9	23.1	23.1	100.0
		Total	39	100.0	100.0	

Skill-f

Table 3.						
cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
79 to 98	Valid	Yes, overqualified	10	1.9	2.2	2.2
		Yes, very much so	144	27.6	32.4	34.6
		Yes, but not completely	152	29.2	34.2	68.8
		Yes, but just barely	94	18.0	21.1	89.9
		No, not at all	45	8.6	10.1	100.0
		Total	445	85.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	76	14.6		
		Total	521	100.0		
under 78	Valid	Yes, overqualified	1	2.6	2.7	2.7
		Yes, very much so	3	7.7	8.1	10.8
		Yes, but not completely	16	41.0	43.2	54.1
		Yes, but just barely	17	43.6	45.9	100.0
		Total	37	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	5.1		

Skill-f

cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Table 3.				
79 to 98	Valid	Yes, overqualified	10	1.9	2.2	2.2
		Yes, very much so	144	27.6	32.4	34.6
		Yes, but not completely	152	29.2	34.2	68.8
		Yes, but just barely	94	18.0	21.1	89.9
		No, not at all	45	8.6	10.1	100.0
		Total	445	85.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	76	14.6		
		Total	521	100.0		
under 78	Valid	Yes, overqualified	1	2.6	2.7	2.7
		Yes, very much so	3	7.7	8.1	10.8
		Yes, but not completely	16	41.0	43.2	54.1
		Yes, but just barely	17	43.6	45.9	100.0
		Total	37	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	5.1		
		Total	39	100.0		

Skill-s

cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Table 4						
79 to 98	Valid	Yes, overqualified	33	6.3	6.6	6.6
		Yes, very much so	266	51.1	53.1	59.7
		Yes, but not completely	166	31.9	33.1	92.8
		Yes, but just barely	32	6.1	6.4	99.2
		No, not at all	4	.8	.8	100.0
		Total	501	96.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	20	3.8		
	Total		521	100.0		
under 78	Valid	Yes, overqualified	3	7.7	8.1	8.1
		Yes, very much so	17	43.6	45.9	54.1
		Yes, but not completely	12	30.8	32.4	86.5
		Yes, but just barely	5	12.8	13.5	100.0
		Total	37	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	5.1		

Skill-f

cut-group			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Table 3.				
79 to 98	Valid	Yes, overqualified	10	1.9	2.2	2.2
		Yes, very much so	144	27.6	32.4	34.6
		Yes, but not completely	152	29.2	34.2	68.8
		Yes, but just barely	94	18.0	21.1	89.9
		No, not at all	45	8.6	10.1	100.0
		Total	445	85.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	76	14.6		
		Total	521	100.0		
under 78	Valid	Yes, overqualified	1	2.6	2.7	2.7
		Yes, very much so	3	7.7	8.1	10.8
		Yes, but not completely	16	41.0	43.2	54.1
		Yes, but just barely	17	43.6	45.9	100.0
		Total	37	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	5.1		
	Total		39	100.0		

015 lower 5 points (32% of the total)

Assessment scores (79 to 80, n=140, (140/521=27%)

Grade

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Table 5					
Valid	A	16	11.4	11.4	11.4
	B	30	21.4	21.4	32.9
	C	36	25.7	25.7	58.6
	D	26	18.6	18.6	77.1
	F	20	14.3	14.3	91.4
	W	12	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	140	100.0	100.0	

Skill-f

Table 6					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, overqualified	3	2.1	2.4	2.4
	Yes, very much so	42	30.0	33.6	36.0
	Yes, but not completely	46	32.9	36.8	72.8
	Yes, but just barely	23	16.4	18.4	91.2
	No, not at all	11	7.9	8.8	100.0
	Total	125	89.3	100.0	
Missing	System	15	10.7		
Total		140	100.0		

Skill-s

Table 7					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, overqualified	14	10.0	10.5	10.5
	Yes, very much so	64	45.7	48.1	58.6
	Yes, but not completely	44	31.4	33.1	91.7
	Yes, but just barely	10	7.1	7.5	99.2
	No, not at all	1	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	133	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.0		
Total		140	100.0		