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In Defense of Developmental Education

• Good news: Developmental Education and remediation are not as ineffective as people are claiming: Let’s step back and look at data in context

• Forthcoming paper will be entitled “In Defense of Developmental Education”

• Much like Socrates, I question those who claim to know Dev Ed is ineffective; I question some reforms

• Here are six arguments in defense of Dev Ed:
1. Investments in all levels of education pay us back
Early Childhood Education ("30M Word Gap")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Spoken By Parents to their Young Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Early Childhood Education

• High/Scope Perry Study
  • 1962 in Ypsilanti, Michigan
  • 123 randomly selected low-income Af-Am 3-4 yrs. old
  • High-quality daycare
  • Tracked for 40 years

• Abecedarian program
  • 1972 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina
  • Full-time high-quality daycare for low-income African-Americans, infancy to age five (111 total participants)
Early Childhood Education

• Both the High/Scope Perry Study and the Abecedarian programs’ participants showed many positive results:
  • Less likely to need special education
  • Higher reading and math skills
  • More years of school (higher HS grad rate)
  • More likely to attend college
  • More likely to have a skilled job
  • Higher income
  • Half the arrest rate
High School: “HS Dropouts and The Economic Losses from Juvenile Crime” (2009)

Table 10
Possible Interventions to Raise the Rate of High School Graduation in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions demonstrated to raise the graduation rate:</th>
<th>Costs per additional graduate</th>
<th>Percent of intervention costs offset by savings in juvenile crime</th>
<th>Ratio of costs to total benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC Chicago-Child Parent Center program</td>
<td>$36,940</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI Increasing teacher salaries by 10% for the K-12 years</td>
<td>$50,150</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP High/Scope Perry Preschool Program</td>
<td>$56,880</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF First Things First high school reform</td>
<td>$29,720</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR - minorities Reducing class sizes in elementary school for minority students only (Project STAR)</td>
<td>$62,920</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR - population Reducing class sizes in elementary school for all students (Project STAR)</td>
<td>$102,970</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High School: “HS Dropouts and The Economic Losses from Juvenile Crime” (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall in dropout rate:</th>
<th>Method (a)</th>
<th>Method (b)</th>
<th>Method (c)</th>
<th>Average of Methods (a) - (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% (Range)</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td>$1,334</td>
<td>$1,655</td>
<td>$1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($230-$380)</td>
<td>($1,130-$1,540)</td>
<td>($1,400-$1,910)</td>
<td>($960-$1,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (Range)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$667</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($180-$220)</td>
<td>($560-$770)</td>
<td>($700-$960)</td>
<td>($510-$650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% (Range)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>$331</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($80-$120)</td>
<td>($230-$310)</td>
<td>($280-$380)</td>
<td>($190-$260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% (Range)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($40-$60)</td>
<td>($110-$150)</td>
<td>($140-$190)</td>
<td>($100-$140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Method (a) adapts estimates from Levitt and Lochner (2001); Method (b) adapts estimates from Merlo and Wolpin (2009); and Method (c) adapts estimates from Sweeten (2006). Range is plus and minus one standard deviation of cost estimates, rounded to nearest $10 m. Figures in 2008 dollars.
“The Economic Value of Opportunity Youth” (2012), (Cost of Undereducated Youth)

“We calculate the lost earnings, lower economic growth, lower tax revenues and higher government spending associated with opportunity youth” (p. 1).

“Considered over the full lifetime of a cohort of 6.7 million opportunity youth who are aged 16-24 [in the nation], the aggregate taxpayer burden amounts to $1.56 trillion in present value terms. The aggregate social burden is $4.75 trillion” (p. 2).
### TABLE 3

**The Economic Consequences of Improving U.S. Educational Outcomes Over the Next 35 and 60 Years**

Changes in economic growth due to rising educational achievement under three scenarios, 2015 to 2050 and 2015 to 2075.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Scenario 1:</th>
<th>Scenario 2:</th>
<th>Scenario 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Matching OECD average PISA score</td>
<td>Matching Canadian PISA score</td>
<td>Matching top quatrile U.S. PISA score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2050 in %</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in GDP in 2050</td>
<td>$678 billion</td>
<td>$2.7 trillion</td>
<td>$4.0 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative increase of present value GDP growth* 2015-2050</td>
<td>$2.5 trillion</td>
<td>$10.0 trillion</td>
<td>$14.7 trillion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The Rising Cost of Not Going to College" (2014)

Rising Earnings Disparity Between Young Adults with And Without a College Degree

Median annual earnings among full-time workers ages 25 to 32, in 2012 dollars
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Notes: Median annual earnings are based on earnings and work status during the calendar year prior to interview and limited to 25- to 32-year-olds who worked full time during the previous calendar year and reported positive earnings. “Full time” refers to those who usually worked at least 35 hours a week last year.


Pew Research Center
“Is It Still Worth Going to College?” (2014)

Figure 1. Earnings premium over high school education
“The College Payoff” (2009)
Investments in Education Pay Us Back

• *Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)* \(^4_3\) (New book on Guided Pathways by Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins):

“...evidence from studies...shows very large returns on many health measures, even after controlling for income, health insurance, and family background. Other benefits from higher education include less involvement in the criminal justice system and less reliance on welfare” (p. 192).
Investments in Education Pay Us Back

• *Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)* (New book on Guided Pathways by Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins):

“Community colleges produce favorable returns for taxpayers as well. One analysis from 2010 found that for each associate degree from a community college, taxpayers gain an additional $142,000 in revenue” (p. 192).
Investments in Education Pay Us Back

• To recap:
  • Pre-K: Relatively small investments in education pay off greatly in the long-term
  • 9-12 grades: More investments would pay back greatly in long-term and short-term
  • College pays back over a lifetime and immediately, and some college is better than no college
  • All of these are well-established facts
Investments in Education Pay Us Back

• By simply participating in the education of college students, you are directly improving the quality of life for your students, your community, and the nation
• Proven by return on investment (ROI) data
• But money isn’t everything
• You have improved the social and emotional well-being of thousands of students: No data on that yet!
Investments in Education Pay Us Back

In Defense of Developmental Education:

1. An investment in any education pays us back
   
   • Even teaching traditional remediation, you are contributing to an ROI of tens of millions of dollars, and you are improving citizens’ lives, communities, and our country: All shown with hard data

   • But could remediation in particular not be helpful?
2. Remediation is indeed effective
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• Researchers claim remediation is ineffective primarily due to three theories:
  1. Remediation itself is ineffective (not helping)
  2. Remediation is simply a barrier or diversion
  3. Most students underplaced

• Most of these claims originate from the Community College Research Center, headed by Dr. Thomas Bailey
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Bailey (2008)\textsuperscript{11}:

“...on average, developmental education as it is now practiced is not very effective in overcoming academic weaknesses, partly because the majority of students referred to developmental education do not finish the sequences to which they are referred” (abstract).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Bailey (2008): 11

“I suggest a broad developmental education reform agenda based on a comprehensive approach to assessment...and strategies to streamline developmental programs and accelerate students’ progress toward engagement in college-level work” (abstract).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Bailey, Jeong, & Cho (2009) (cited by 493 papers)

“As it stands now, developmental education sequences must appear confusing, intimidating, and boring to many students entering community colleges. And so far, developmental education has at best shown limited success” (p. 28).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Bailey (2009):  
  “...on average, developmental education is not very effective in overcoming student weaknesses” (p. 1).  
  “If particular practices really are effective, the disappointing research on the overall effects of remediation suggests that they have not so far been widely adopted” (p. 2).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Bailey, Jeong, & Cho (2010) (cited by 493 papers)\textsuperscript{19}: “Given the confusion and ineffectiveness of the developmental system, one possible objective would be to reduce the length of time before a student can start college courses—to accelerate the remediation process” (p. 6).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Jenkins et al. (2010):

“These studies generally show little positive effects for developmental education, although their results are most reliable for students at the upper end of the developmental range... (Bettinger & Long, 2005; Calcagno & Long, 2008; Martorell & McFarlin, 2007)” (p. 1).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Edgecombe (2011)\textsuperscript{21}: 

“There is mounting evidence that following the traditional sequence of developmental education courses is hindering community college students from progressing to college-level coursework and ultimately earning a credential” (p. 1).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Hughes & Scott-Clayton (2011):22

“More than half of entering students at community colleges are placed into developmental education in at least one subject, based primarily on scores from these assessments, yet recent research fails to find evidence that placement into remediation improves student outcomes” (abstract).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Scott-Clayton, Crosta, & Belfield (2012)\textsuperscript{23}:

“Indeed, several studies using regression-discontinuity (RD) analysis to compare students just above and just below remedial test score cutoffs have generally found null to negative impacts of remediation for these ‘marginal’ students” (p. 2).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Scott-Clayton & Rodriguez (2012)\textsuperscript{24}: Article entitled, “Development, Discouragement, or Diversion? New Evidence on the Effects of College Remediation”: “The primary effect of remediation appears to be diversionary: students simply take remedial courses instead of college-level courses. These diversionary effects are largest for the lowest-risk students” (abstract).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Scott-Clayton & Rodriguez (2012):"Remedial education, or ‘developmental’ education as it is called in the field, may be the most widespread and costly intervention aimed at addressing a perceived lack of preparation among incoming college students” (p. 1).

Copyright A. Goudas 2016
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Edgecombe, Baker, & Bailey (2013): 25:

“One potential reason for the disappointing results of the traditional developmental system is the length of time required for most students to complete it” (p. 2).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• CCRC Research Overview on Dev Ed (2014)\textsuperscript{26} (Compilation of all research they chose to consider):

  “Research evidence suggests that, for the most part, the traditional system of developmental education is not achieving its intended purpose: to improve outcomes for underprepared students” (p. 5).
What Researchers are Saying About DE

• Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)\textsuperscript{43} (New book on Guided Pathways by Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins):

  “The current system of developmental education is hampered by inadequate placement information, lengthy prerequisite sequences, and, in many cases, uninspiring instruction. As a result, most students who enter [DE] never successfully emerge from it…” (pp. 14-15).
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What Researchers are Saying About DE

• The repetition of these words by reputable and well-funded institutions has had and will have some negative effects ("Legislative Fixes," 2015):  
  • Florida, Connecticut, Tennessee, North Carolina, Minnesota, Colorado, Georgia, and Ohio
• Many more are looking into changes to decrease or eliminate remedial courses and/or funding, or restructuring them significantly based on little research from essentially ONE institution
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Remediation is Indeed Effective

• CCRC definition of remediation: Null = failure

  Calcagno and Long (2008): “It would be expected that after successfully learning the skills needed for college-level work, a remedial student would be more likely than an academically-equivalent nonremedial student to complete [college-level] courses” (p. 16).

• Traditional definition of remedial courses:

  Designed to get students to college-level starting line
Figure 4a: Reading – College-Level vs. Developmental Course (RD #1)

No statistically significant effect

Statistically significant effect
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• Out of 79 separate RDD analyses of math, reading, and writing Dev Ed outcomes by the CCRC_{26}:
  • 7 Positive
  • 52 Null
  • 20 Negative
## CCRC “What We Know About Dev Ed” (2014)  

### DEVELOPMENTAL MATH STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Passed College-Level Math</th>
<th>Grade in College-Level Math</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>College-Level Credits Earned</th>
<th>Credential and/or Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL (credential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL (credential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL (credential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCCS</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NEG (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>POS (transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL (credential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA 1</td>
<td>LOWER vs. MIDDLE</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NEG (credential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>LOWER vs. MIDDLE</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
<td>POS (credential)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## CCRC “What We Know About Dev Ed” (2014)

### Developmental Reading Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Short-Term Impacts</th>
<th>Medium- &amp; Long-Term Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Passed College-Level English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCCS</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA 2</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA 2</td>
<td>LOWER vs. UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>LOWER vs. MIDDLE</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CCRC “What We Know About Dev Ed” (2014)

#### Developmental Writing Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Short-Term Impacts</th>
<th>Medium- &amp; Long-Term Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Passed College-Level English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA 2</td>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCCS</td>
<td>Writing &amp; Reading vs. Reading Only</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA 2</td>
<td>LOWER vs. UPPER</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>NULL (conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>LOWER vs. UPPER</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>POS (conditional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. “Conditional” signifies that only outcomes for students who enrolled in college-level courses, or persisted in college, were compared. LUCCS stands for large urban community college system.*
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• If the accepted definition of the purpose of remediation applies, meaning that a “null” result is the intended goal, then 75% of these studies show positive results
• This is the CCRC’s own data, yet they interpret it vastly differently than experts in the field
• Most CCRC researchers have PhDs in economics and public policy, which may explain misunderstandings
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• Dr. Peter Bahr from the University of Michigan interprets “null” scores traditional way (2010):  
  “...skill deficient students who attain college-level English and math skill experience the various academic outcomes at rates very similar to those of college-prepared students who attain college-level competency in English and math. Thus, the results of this study demonstrate that postsecondary remediation is highly efficacious...” (p. 199).
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• Dr. Paul Attewell from CUNY (2006): 

“In two-year colleges, we found that taking remedial classes was not associated at all with lower chances of academic success, even for students who took three or more remedial courses” (p. 915).
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• Dr. Bridget Terry Long from Harvard (2007)\textsuperscript{53}:

“Students in remediation had better subsequent outcomes in comparison to students with similar backgrounds and preparation who were not required to take the courses...[Remediation] reduced the likelihood of dropping out and increases the likelihood of completing a degree” (p. 9).
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• ACT study on effectiveness of Dev Ed (2013):30:
  “Particular subgroups of developmental students... benefited from taking the developmental course. In particular, students who received an A (or sometimes a B) grade in the developmental course appeared to benefit from taking it. Moreover, part-time students appeared to derive more benefit from taking developmental courses than full-time students did” (p. iii).
Remediation is Indeed Effective

• ACT study on effectiveness of Dev Ed (2013): 30:

“Further consideration of time to degree, however, showed that developmental students typically completed a Bachelor’s degree in six years at a rate similar to or higher than that of non-developmental students in five years” (p. ii).
Remediation is Indeed Effective

In Defense of Developmental Education:

1. Any investment in education pays us back

2. With a change in definition, current research shows remediation is functioning as intended: to get students to the gateway starting line and to perform the same as nonremedial students

• CCRC/CCA: But most students don’t even get there!
3. Low retention and success rates not caused by remedial courses
Interpreting Remedial Data

The Dead Grandmother/Exam Syndrome

by Mike Adams
Department of Biology
Eastern Connecticut State University
Willimantic, Connecticut

It has long been theorized that the week prior to an exam is an extremely dangerous time for the relatives of college students. Ever since I began my teaching career, I heard vague comments, incomplete references and unfinished remarks, all alluding to the “Dead Grandmother Problem.” Few colleagues would ever be explicit in their description of what they knew, but I quickly discovered that anyone who was involved in teaching at the college level would react to any mention of the concept. In my travels I found that a similar phenomenon is known in other countries. In England it is called the “Graveyard Grannies” problem, in France the “Chere Grand’mere,” while in Bulgaria it is inexplicably known as “The Toadstool Waxing Plan” (I may have had some
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• *Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)* (New book on Guided Pathways by Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins):

“...the conventional developmental education does not increase an underprepared student’s probability of succeeding in relevant college-level courses [and transfer, graduation]...in large part because most students referred to developmental education never finish their developmental sequence” (p. 121).
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• What this means is that researchers are blaming remedial courses for their low retention rates, gateway pass rates, and completion rates.
• For many students in CCs, remediation just happens to be their first-year, first-semester course.
• What about nonremedial students’ first-year, first-semester courses?
• If remediation is a barrier, then are gateway courses not a barrier?
### Table 6: Success Rates in the First Three Mathematics Courses at the University of Alabama Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math 005</th>
<th>Math 100</th>
<th>Math 110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Drop-Rate</td>
<td>Failure-Rate</td>
<td>Withdrawal-Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado Community College</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri–St. Louis</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC–Greensboro</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC–Chapel Hill</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delta College Retention Data 2005-2014

Average Retention Delta College Fall-to-Winter, Fall-to-Fall 2005-2014

Dev Ed Students

FA - WI

77%

FA - FA

51%

Non Dev Ed Students

FA - WI

74%

FA - FA

48%
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• Any course students take first will cause 25%+ fail or w-rate
• College classes are a barrier to college success!
• Barrier effect is primarily due to other factors, and it is normal in college (and it is unfortunate)
• The CCRC and others blame remediation for low retention and passrates (do not generalize problem)
• CCRC is not focused on gateway passrates and gateway acceleration (Alg. I to Alg. II)—only recently did I hear CCRC say low success is a “gen ed” problem
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• Again, despite being economists and policy experts trained at MIT, Harvard, and Columbia, many researchers almost solely blame remedial courses and their poorly designed pathways for low retention, passrates, and graduation rates.

• Could there be more powerful and well-documented links explaining remedial students’ (and nonremedial, first-year, first-semester) low success rates?
SAT Cutoffs are around 470-500 for college-level in Community Colleges.
Figure 2: Grade Point Average by Family Income, Dependent Students

- 3.50 or higher
- 3.00 - 3.49
- 2.50 - 2.99
- Lower than 2.50

Annual Family Income:
- Less than $10,000
- $10,000-$19,999
- $20,000-$29,999
- $30,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$49,999
- $50,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$69,999
- $70,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$89,999
- $100,000 or more
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Association of American Colleges and Unis (2010)\textsuperscript{42}

![Figure 1: Grade Point Average by Parents’ Highest Education Level](image)
“Examining the Links Between Grade 12 Math and Remediation” (2008)
“The Pell Partnership” (2015)

Figure 5: Enrollment and Graduation Rates Within SAT Quartile

- **Total Students: 418,868**
  - **Average Institutional Graduation Rates:** 74%
    - Pell: 17%
    - Non-Pell: 83%

- **Total Students: 290,425**
  - **Graduation Rates:** 79%
    - Pell: 23%
    - Non-Pell: 77%

- **Total Students: 242,737**
  - **Graduation Rates:** 62%
    - Pell: 28%
    - Non-Pell: 72%

- **Total Students: 171,973**
  - **Graduation Rates:** 42%
    - Pell: 58%
    - Non-Pell: 42%
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“Childhood Environment And Gender Gaps in Adulthood” (2016)

Study of children born in the 1980s.

C. College Attendance

- Percent who attend college
- Parent Household Income Percentile
- Male-Female Difference
  - Parent p10: -16.1%
  - Parent p50: -13.5%
  - Parent p90: -4.7%
“Measure Twice” (2013)
Pell Institute “Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States” (2015)
Pell Institute “Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States” (2015)
National Student Clearinghouse data (2014)
Figure 3. Percentage of students seeking a bachelor’s degree at 4-year degree-granting institutions who completed a bachelor’s degree within 6 years, by institutional applicant acceptance rate: Starting cohort year 2006

- Open admissions: 33%
- 90 percent or more accepted: 48%
- 75.0 to 89.9 percent accepted: 56%
- 50.0 to 74.9 percent accepted: 60%
- 25.0 to 49.9 percent accepted: 72%
- Less than 25.0 percent accepted: 86%
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• CCRC Research Overview “What We Know” (2014):

“Only [emphasis added] 28 percent of community college students who take a developmental education course go on to earn a degree within eight years, and many students assigned to developmental courses drop out before completing their sequence and enrolling in college-level courses” (p. 1).
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• The data show that completion rates of remedial students in community colleges, while low in number, are in line with all higher education data currently and historically, when demographics are controlled for.

• While low completion is a cause for concern, it should not be used to blame a few sequential courses which happen to be at the beginning of college.

• This effectively causes less access and lower quality.
Low Success Rates Not Caused by Remediation

• In Florida, where they made remediation optional, some results of their experiment are in:
  • Remedial students allowed to choose to enter college-level courses unprepared fail at a higher rate:
    • ENG college-level pass-rates: Down 4% points
    • MTH college-level pass-rates: Down 9% points
  • Higher math fail rate because more students opted into college-level math
## Developmental Education Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 to 2014-15</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College-level Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 to 2014-15</td>
<td>+30%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Pass Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Remediation isn’t perfect, but poor implementation = worse outcomes
Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

• Again, researchers claim remediation is ineffective due to three main theories:
  1. Remediation itself is ineffective (not helping)
  2. Remediation is simply a barrier or diversion
  3. Many students underplaced
Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

• While these claims may be true for some courses and institutions, recent implementations of some reforms are extreme and may decrease access for poor and minority students, and relegate remediation to a very limited or non-existent role in higher education.

• The “right to fail” is coming back in many places.

• Remember, Complete College America and some other organizations’ goal is to remove remediation completely.
Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

• Here are a few of the most recent reforms:
  • Guided Pathways (from CCRC book, 2015)
  • Corequisite designs: ALP (Accelerated Learning Program, CCBC) and similar models
  • HSGPA to place students into college-level courses
  • Acceleration (paired, linked, compressed)
  • Integrated reading and writing
  • Modularization, esp. for math
Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

- Guided Pathways = restricting programs and options
- Corequisites = removing trad. remediation (ALP will)
- HSGPA to place students = lowering the standards for college-level courses (2.6! 3.0 is avg.)
- Acceleration = too fast for many students
- Integrated R&W = not enough time on both
- Modularization = only students with high personal qualities (Duckworth) are successful
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Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

• Some of these reforms have relatively little research supporting them (some just a few years, most not randomly assigned\textsuperscript{19,20,44})

• Have been adopted quickly (not always thoroughly)

• Unintended consequences are not clear yet

• Even when they work, individual changes will not move the needle greatly (CCRC admits this in 2015 book, pp. 10-11\textsuperscript{43})
Flawed Research in Developmental Education

• Ioannidis (2005) and Nosek et al. (2015) both find that within medical and psychology journals, 60-90% of peer-reviewed, published studies cannot be reproduced due to errors in methodology, p-hacking, and improper analyses of results.

• Read “Science Isn’t Broken” on Fivethirtyeight.com for more about methodological problems in studies.

• Remedial research not immune
Poor Implementation = Worse Outcomes

In Defense of Developmental Education:

1. An investment in any education pays
2. Remediation works, even in traditional form
3. Largest barrier is SES, not remediation
4. Poor implementation = worse outcomes

• If small reforms are at best helping a little, and also harming some, what actually works, then?
5. Actual Developmental Education model is most effective
Developmental Education is Most Effective

• Given that remedial students are currently graduating at an expected rate, how do we actually move the needle in response to the completion agenda, without unnecessarily restricting or removing access?

• What works best is if we follow the original definition of Developmental Education, as outlined by Dr. Boylan and others, which is a system of support including remedial courses (Boylan & Bonham, 2014) \(^{31}\):
Developmental Education is Most Effective

• Boylan & Bonham (2014): 31

“The concept of developmental education grew from the realization that remedial courses needed to be accompanied by a variety of student support services if colleges and universities were to effectively provide true educational opportunity” (p. 59).
Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

• City University of New York (CUNY) Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP)\textsuperscript{32, 33, 34, 35}

• The ASAP program implemented a randomized, controlled study, and the intervention was a comprehensive overhaul of Dev Ed (and non-Dev Ed) community college participation, including the infusion of a great deal of time and resources ($4,000 to $6,800 per student per year)
Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

- ASAP Comprehensiveness
  - Dev Ed courses first
  - Full time
  - Block scheduling
  - Learning communities for first year
  - Group advising sessions every week (60-80 caseload)
- Meetings with adviser at least twice per month
- Mandatory tutoring
- Career specialist meeting once per semester
Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

• ASAP Comprehensiveness
  • Tuition waiver
  • Free MetroCards
  • Free books
  • Free social events
  • Consistent and repeated messages
• Out of pocket costs for institution are about $5K-$7K more per student per year
• Good model for “free community college” discussion
Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

• Dev Ed ASAP results:
  • 896 students in total sample
  • 44% Hispanic, 34% Black, 10% White, 8% Asian
  • Increased credits over control group by 25%
  • Increased retention second semester (80 to 90%)
Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

• Dev Ed ASAP graduation rates after 3 Years:
  • Control Group (no ASAP): 22%
  • ASAP Intervention Group: 40%
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Comprehensive Reform: What Works Best

• Non Dev Ed ASAP graduation rates after 3 Years:
  • Control Group (no ASAP): 28%
  • ASAP Intervention Group: 56%

• Three community colleges in Ohio are starting this program; others looking into it
6. Act to support education: Invest in Dev Ed
Act to Support Education: Invest in Dev Ed

• How can we support investment in Dev Ed?
  • Vote for officials who support education
  • Contact elected officials and urge them on issues
  • Participate in thoughtful college reform
  • Confront researchers, administrators, and board members when necessary, and use data!
  • Provide research to them showing alternative data and interpretations of CCRC data
Act to Support Education: Invest in Dev Ed

• Remember you have a measureable effect on well-being of students, colleges, communities, and nation

• Speak about “investment” when talking to decision-makers: $5K to $7K more per student per year with a well-organized system will double graduation rates (We spend $12K on public school students per year)\textsuperscript{36}

• Thoughtful, comprehensive changes and funding add up to large effects
Act to Support Education: Invest in Dev Ed

- Read and refer to Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins (2015) Redesigning America’s Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success
- Use their ethos to argue for holistic, well-funded, thoughtful, and well-supported reforms
- If you’re forced to have some reforms of the book, you should argue to have other reforms as well
- Here are some select quotes from the book to help you get started:
• *Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)*:

“...guided pathways reforms typically require additional upfront and transitional costs [and will affect ongoing costs]...common transitional costs include: (1) faculty and staff time to review and redesign programs, instruction, and support services; (2) professional development in key areas...” (p. 182).
Quote Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins (2015):  

• *Redesigning America’s CCs (2015)*:  

“...Miami Dade College...launched the new intake system...who reached out to the approximately 9,000 students entering directly from high school. [S]tudents who met with advisors and developed plans were 8 percentage points more likely to persist...” (p. 183).
Quote Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins (2015):

- Redesigning America’s CCs (2015):

“...positive results persuaded college’s senior leadership to approve the hiring of twenty-five new full-time professional (master’s degree-level) advisors...[which] required an additional annual investment of $1 million...,which the college incorporated into its operating budget” (p. 184).
“...community colleges are experiencing fiscal pressure and continue to look for ways to lower costs. Yet the ways in which they typically cut spending—by increased reliance on part-time instructors, increased student-teacher ratios, and growing use of fully online instruction—reduce completion rates and likely hurt quality” (p. 197).
IN DEFENSE OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

1. An investment in any education pays us all back
2. Remediation works, even in its traditional form
3. Low success rates not caused by remediation, but SES
4. Remediation is not perfect, but poor implementation of reforms may be harmful
5. Actual Developmental Education is most effective
6. We should act to support thoughtful investments and redesign in Dev Ed; and quote that book!
IN DEFENSE OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Most importantly, what all this means is that you do make a difference, regardless of whether others recognize the facts, so...

Keep up the hard work for our fellow citizens!

Questions welcome during follow-up session