Overview of AB 705 2019 Adoption Plans

Purpose

In 2019, California Community Colleges completed initial AB 705 Adoption Plan forms indicating that they were using either the “default placement rules” or a localized placement method. Two-thirds (66%, 59 plans) of districts and/or colleges reported using the default placement rules and were not required to submit any additional information.

Thirty-one districts and/or colleges indicated the use of a localized placement method in English, math, or both and submitted additional information. That information serves as the basis of this summary. Review of the 31 localized adoption plans revealed that 21 districts and/or colleges were using localized placement rules. Districts and colleges that reported using a localized placement method were asked to provide three additional pieces of information: (1) the localized method being used, (2) the college’s retroactive placement plan, and (3) the college’s local process validation plan.

While many colleges have updated their AB 705 processes and practices over the past year to best meet student needs, this document provides an overview of the 31 adoption plans that include the information outlined above. This overview concludes with a list of promising practices identified from the analysis.

Use of Localized Placement Models Which Require Validation

Of the districts and/or colleges using localized placement models, it was found that districts and/or colleges were least likely to use the default placement rules for B-STEM placement (Business - Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) compared to SLAM and English placement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway Course Pathways</th>
<th># of Colleges/Districts NOT using default placement rules in a given pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-STEM</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, fourteen of the districts and/or colleges using a localized placement model reported placing students in the lowest high school performance band into English or math courses one-level below transfer level.

**Retroactive Placement Plans**

Of the 31 districts/colleges that submitted additional information about their adoption plans, only 29 reported having a retroactive placement process. The following characteristics were commonly identified for retroactive placement plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retroactive Placement Plan Characteristics</th>
<th># of Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Contacting current students asking them to use the local guided or self-placement tool to update their placement levels</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Advising students to meet with a counselor to update their placement level</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Automatically updating placement levels using high school data</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Automatically placing all students into transfer level courses and removing all enrollment blocks regardless of high school performance data</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the retroactive placement plans included campus-wide campaigns letting all students know about placement changed under AB 705. It is important to note that the two most common characteristics used (#1 and #2) are more burdensome to students as they navigate the retroactive placement process, while the two less common (#3 and #4) reduce the burden on students.

**Guided and Self-Placement and Support Models**

Twenty-three (23) plans described using guided or self-placement for students who did not have high school performance data available. Of those, 21 reported creating new co-requisite support courses to address students' needs. Twenty-eight (28) plans reported offering different forms of co-requisite support, for example: embedded support, linked co-requisite credit courses, unlinked credit courses, noncredit support courses, drop-in tutoring, just-in-time remediation, supplemental instruction, and peer study leaders.

**Promising Practices Identified in the Adoption Plans**

Outlined below is an overview of some of the promising practices colleges engaged in to support AB 705 implementation.

**Support Intended to Maximize Completion of Transfer-Level Math and English in the First Year**

- Instituted a co-requisite support model as a credit course with the same instructor and peers in both sections, scheduled immediately before/after lecture
- Embedded tutors
- Embedded a support course by adding units to the lecture section
• Created late-start 8-week or 12-week co-requisite support options for students enrolled in lecture sections without support

Retroactive Placement Plans
• Considered the needs of different student populations:
  o Students currently in pre-transfer English and math sequences now placing into transfer with support
  o Current and returning students who received pre-transfer placements prior to AB 705 but have not started the English and/or math sequences
  o Former students who need transfer level math or English to complete degree/transfer requirements
• Maximized the opportunity to auto-place new and current students for whom the college had high school GPA data
• Directed current students without high school GPA data to complete the guided or self-placement process

Communications
• Provided information to students in an asset-minded and encouraging rather than deficit-minded manner
• Made sure students understood processes, practices, and the options available to them
• Provided faculty and counselors with the resources they need to talk to students about the reform in an asset-minded and empowering way

Other Policies
• Instituted a process for students to challenge/opt-out of support
• When using localized placement rules, created a detailed plan to evaluate throughput rates and request technical assistance as needed
• Had a plan to improve placement processes and student supports based on looking at what maximizes throughput