

Consequential Validity: Reedley College Assessment Tests

David Waring, Matriculation Coordinator

Steven Jones, Assessment Coordinator

Rhea Riegel, Institutional Research Coordinator

**Prepared by
Reedley College Office of Institutional Research
January 21, 2004**

Table of Contents

<i>Methodology</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>English Composition.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>English Reading.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>English as a Second Language.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Mathematics.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Appendices</i>	
<i> Appendix A: Consequential Validity Study Forms</i>	<i>6</i>
<i> Appendix B: Data</i>	<i>8</i>
<i> Appendix C:.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i> Comparison of Appropriate Placement by Means of Placement</i> <i> (Assessment Test, Prerequisite, Recommendation, or Individual Choice)</i>	

Consequential Validity: Reedley College Assessment Tests

This study on the consequential validity of all assessment tests used at Reedley College (RC) was conducted during the Spring 2003 term. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the appropriateness of placements into specific English, English as a Second Language, and mathematics courses based on assessment test scores.

Methodology

Consequential-related validity evidence was collected from both instructors and students, including perceptions on the appropriateness of placements into specific courses. Survey forms were distributed to instructors and students during the eight (8th) week of the Spring 2003 term (see appendix A). Student forms gathered information on how the student placed into the course and the student's satisfaction with his or her placement into the course. Instructor forms gathered information on the instructor's satisfaction with each student's placement and the instructor's rating of each student's ability for the specific course level. The survey was not anonymous, in order to allow matching of student data to instructor data.

English: Composition (COMPANION Sentence Skills Test)

Students and instructors in ENGL-262, ENGL-125, and ENGL-1A were asked to participate in the study. 64 out of 88 sections (73%) responded.

The table below summarizes the findings. Although the consequential validity forms were distributed to many students, the table below displays information drawn only from students who reported that they were placed in the course based on their score on the assessment test. Complete data is included in appendix B.

Percent of Satisfaction with Course Placement*

	ENGL-252		ENGL-125		ENGL-1A		Average	
	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%
Student	72	83.3%	236	87.3%	155	94.2%	463	89.0%
Instructor	72	81.9%	229	86.0%	146	95.9%	447	88.6%

* Satisfaction is defined as those students who responded that the course was the right level or for whom the instructor responded that the student was appropriately placed.

As shown in the table, students and instructors were generally satisfied with the placement process for English composition, with an average of approximately 89%. The standard is at least 75% judgment of proper placement.

English: Reading (COMPANION Reading Comprehension Test)

Students and instructors in ENGL-262 and ENGL-126 were asked to participate in the study. 22 out of 26 sections (85%) responded.

The table below summarizes the findings. Although the consequential validity forms were distributed to many students, the table below displays information drawn only from students who reported that they were placed in the course based on their score on the assessment test. Complete data is included in appendix B.

Percent of Satisfaction with Course Placement*						
	ENGL-262		ENGL-126		Average	
	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%
Student	49	93.9%	132	91.7%	181	92.3%
Instructor	48	87.5%	129	93.0%	177	91.5%

* Satisfaction is defined as those students who responded that the course was the right level or for whom the instructor responded that the student was appropriately placed.

As shown in the table, students and instructors were generally satisfied with the placement process for English reading, with an average of approximately 92%. The standard is at least 75% judgment of proper placement. Placement in all English reading courses surveyed met this standard.

Too few students were judged to be inappropriately placed to draw any conclusions on whether the courses were too difficult or too easy.

ESL (CELSA Test of English as a Second Language)

Students and instructors in ESL-260, ESL-264, ESL-265, ESL-266, and ESL-269 were asked to participate in the study. 18 out of 18 sections (100%) responded.

The table below summarizes the findings. Although the consequential validity forms were distributed to many students, the table below displays information drawn only from students who reported that they were placed in the course based on their score on the assessment test. Although data was collected from multiple courses, the summary only shows courses with over ten (10) students placed through the assessment test. However, averages include all ESL courses surveyed, including those courses with too few students placed through the assessment test to evaluate individually. Complete data is included in appendix B.

Percent of Satisfaction with Course Placement*

	ESL-260		ESL-264		ESL-269A, B, C		Average	
	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%
Student	17	82.4%	17	82.4%	22	95.5%	65	87.7%
Instructor	17	94.1%	18	82.4%	22	100.0%	65	87.7%

* Satisfaction is defined as those students who responded that the course was the right level or for whom the instructor responded that the student was appropriately placed.

As shown in the table, students and instructors were generally satisfied with the placement process for English composition, with an average of approximately 88%. The standard is at least 75% judgment of proper placement. Placement in most ESL courses met this standard.

ESL-265 and ESL-266 showed ratings of appropriate placement lower than the standard, however, the sample returned was too small (fewer than ten) to be of use. Due to the relatively low numbers of students placed into ESL courses through the assessment test, additional data will be collected in subsequent terms to increase the base of respondents and ensure the continued validity of the placement process.

Too few students were judged to be inappropriately placed to draw any conclusions on whether the courses were too difficult or too easy.

Mathematics (COMPANION: Mathematics Tests)

Students and instructors in MATH-256, MATH-101, and MATH-103 were asked to participate in the study. 53 out of 56 sections (95%) responded.

The table below summarizes the findings. Although the consequential validity forms were distributed to many students, the table below displays information drawn only from students who reported that they were placed in the course based on their score on the assessment test. Complete data is included in appendix B.

Percent of Satisfaction with Course Placement*						
	MATH-101		MATH-103		Average	
	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%
Student	238	82.4%	122	79.5%	360	81.4%
Instructor	94	83.0%	116	82.8%	210	82.9%

* Satisfaction is defined as those students who responded that the course was the right level or for whom the instructor responded that the student was appropriately placed.

As shown in the table, students and instructors were generally satisfied with the placement process for mathematics, with an average of approximately 82%. The standard is at least 75% judgment of proper placement. Both MATH-101 and MATH-103 met this standard.

Of the students who were judged to be inappropriately placed, instructors tended to feel that the course was too difficult for the students, while more students indicated that they thought the course was too easy.

No students responded that they were placed into MATH-256 based on the assessment test. Due to the lack of students placed into MATH-256 courses through the assessment test, additional data will be collected in subsequent terms to increase the base of respondents and ensure the continued validity of the placement process.

Appendix A: Consequential Validity Survey Forms

Example: Instructor Letter



March 3, 2003

Dear Instructor:

Matriculation regulations and the recent site review by the State Chancellors Office require Reedley College and the North Centers to conduct a "consequential validity study" of our placement tests this semester.

This requires you to answer two (2) questions per student in selected class(es), and requires each student to answer two (2) questions relating to their preparedness for the same class. Enclosed you will find a class roster / instructor form for each of your classes included in the study, along with enough student forms for the students in those classes.

Please hand each student 1 student form and request them to fill in their name, social security or student ID number, class, and section in the spaces provided before they answer the two questions. We will match them with your responses after you turn everything in. This is NOT an anonymous process, we must be able to match each student's information to your response.

Please note that some students may be in more than one class included in this study; **students must answer the questions for every class where the information is requested.**

This study must be completed by March 17, 2003.

Return all completed forms to Rhea Riegel, Institutional Research Coordinator, either through inter-campus mail or at the Reedley College Admissions and Records windows.

Thank you for your participation.

Steve Jones

Assessment Center Coordinator
ext. #3367

Example: Student Form



Name: _____

SSN or ID #: _____

Course: _____

Section: _____

Which of the following statements is most true of your placement in this course?

(Check one)

- ☐ This course is too difficult for me
- ☐ This course is the right level for me
- ☐ This course is too easy for me

I placed into this course by: (Check one)

- ☐ My score on the placement exam
- ☐ Completing the prerequisite course
- ☐ Recommendation by an instructor or counselor
- ☐ Deciding on my own to take this course

Example: Instructor Form

Instructor: Please complete

Course: **TITLE**

Section: **#####**

Class Roster		Level of Student Work (check one box for each student)					Appropriate Placement (check one box for each student)		
Name	STID	Exceptional work compared to others typically enrolled in this course	Better than many students work	Average for a student in this course	Marginal	Deficient in many ways	Inappropriately placed – student's level is too LOW (should have enrolled in a lower level class)	Appropriately placed	Inappropriately placed – student's level is too HIGH (should have enrolled in a higher level class)
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Name	#####	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please return this instructor form along with all student forms to Rhea Riegel, Reedley College Office of Institutional Research, either through inter-campus mail or at the Reedley Admissions and Records windows. Thank you.

Appendix B: Data