Early Assessment Program
Goal of the CSU Board of Trustees:

Reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics to 10% by 2007

Progress has been elusive
Percentage of First-Time Freshmen Entering with College Level English Proficiency

Reported
Trustee Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Trustee Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EAP Program in English

- Diagnostic Assessment in 11th grade
  - Enhanced California Standards Test
  - Students are ‘exempt’ or ‘non-exempt’
- 12th grade Expository Reading and Writing Course for non-exempt students
- Professional Development for High School Teachers
12th Grade Expository Reading & Writing Course Objectives:

- Enable students to read and write academic prose effectively and strategically
- Increase students’ mastery of academic language
- Emphasize in-depth study of expository, analytical, and argumentative writing
- Deepen students’ critical reading, writing, and thinking skills
Professional Development

- CSU provides 4-day development for high school teachers to prepare to teach the ERWC
  - In partnership with County Offices of Education statewide
  - EAP awareness sessions/strategies for school administrators
  - Training of trainers for CSU faculty, county office and high school leaders
- READING INSTITUTES FOR ACADEMIC PREPARATION
  - Ongoing CSU-funded program since 2001-2002
  - Focus is to improve capacity to teach reading/academic literacy across the curriculum
  - Additional focus is to prepare K-12 teachers to lead high school EAP reading assistance
Current Status

Approximately 650 high school English teachers participated in the ERWC professional development in 2004-05.

Approximately 1,765 individuals have participated in RIAP since 2002.

We don’t know yet how the students have done with respect to being fully proficient in English at entry to CSU.

In March 2006 we anticipate a report that will track how they did on the CSU’s English Placement Test (EPT).
Pilot Study Evaluation of ERWC 2004-05

- Does the ERWC have an impact on proficiency of students who experienced at least two modules of this curriculum as compared to those who experienced a traditional course?
- What are the characteristics of ERWC implementation in 12th grade classrooms?
- Carried out a descriptive study – examines what we can see: does not look at “cause and effect”
Study

- Surveyed the 600 teachers who participated in the professional development
- Studied a sample of ten teachers
  - Interviews
  - Student focus groups
  - Student Assessment: compared proficiency of students who had experienced the curriculum and another class using a test that tracks the EPT
Sample

- Ten teachers from across the state
  - Bay Area, Los Angeles, Riverside, North Coast, Bakersfield
  - Teaching experience: 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21 years
- School characteristics
  - Diversity: up to 43% English Learners; inclusive of all ethnic groups
  - Poverty: from 15% to 81% Free or reduced lunch eligible
  - API Range – 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10
  - Rural, suburban, urban
- Compared students of teachers who used the ERWC and students who got a traditional course at the same school.
Findings

- Strong and positive differences
- Students who experienced the new curriculum scored statistically significantly higher as compared to those who experienced a traditional curriculum on an EPT-comparable assessment
- Increases were especially encouraging in areas often resistant to change: very rural and very urban areas.
Student scores by county
Student assessment results

- Statewide students who experienced the curriculum had higher test scores.
  - Study students: Mean = 26.74 (40 is high)
  - Comparison students: Mean = 24.53
  - Probability that less that 2.95 % of the difference in scores was due to chance alone.
Interview findings

- Expanded teaching repertoire and reshaped practice
- Increased student proficiency in reading, writing, and independent thinking; increased metacognition
- Effectiveness of specific evidence-based strategies – depth, content and rigor
- Effective with English Learners
- Materials held student interest
Conclusions so far.

- ERWC appears to have a positive impact on student performance
- The effective instructional design contributes to positive experiences of students and teachers
- K – 16 collaboration can work
- This work is moving in the right direction
Evaluation Plan

- 2005-2006 Academic Year
  - Examine student success:
    - compare 11th grade EAP scores and EPT scores for a sample of CSU students who experienced the course and a comparison group who did not.
  - Examine implementation and context:
    - Follow a sample of teachers implementing for the first time and a sample implementing a second time.
  - Examine effectiveness of professional development:
    - Survey teachers attending sessions
    - Survey and interview leadership (trainers and trainers-of-trainers)
Evaluation Plan

- 2006 –2007 Academic Year
  - Continue student success studies
  - Assess scope and depth of implementation
    - Number and distribution of teachers and schools statewide
    - District adoptions of full course
  - Professional Development:
    - Transfer from CSU to districts and COE
  - ERWC : assess effectiveness with 3 years of data