Review of Self-Placement
There was a brief review of the previous meetings’ examples of guided self-placement from Fullerton and Mesa College, and participants identified a number of challenges and questions that still need to be determined:

- Guided self-placement can mean multiple things—the student being given information and then given freedom to select whatever class they believe is best for them, or students self-reporting data and then being assigned a course to take. This is going to require clarification.
- Can “little” assessment tests be a part of the process that helps guide students? There needs to be clarity around what “guided” means and what it can and can’t entail. It was emphasized that from the legislature’s perspective, if a test leads to under-placement, the legislature will challenge its use.
- It is worth noting that the discussion so far has been about the floor of placement, but it’s also worth considering how students are placed above transfer-level courses.
- More consideration is needed around a situation in which students without transcript data have the option to self-place, but students who do have transcript data are not given the same options.
- No model has been discussed (and likely one doesn’t yet exist) for guided self-placement that incorporates ESL.

Feedback from Academic Senate Spring Plenary and Chief Instructional Officers
The Academic Senate passed a number of AB 705-related resolutions at their Spring Plenary. A crosswalk was distributed of the relevant resolutions and the direction that the implementation team is moving for guidance to the field. No significant divergences between the Academic Senate’s resolutions and the direction of the AB 705 Implementation Team were brought up. It was noted that, based on feedback from the Plenary, there is a need to share more widely that colleges will be able to utilize local data demonstrating effectiveness of their own programs to navigate around default recommendations, and what data colleges will need to collect in order to demonstrate that effectiveness. There already exist resources on the MMAP website to support colleges in the collection of this data, though the specifics of what must be demonstrated is still being determined.

Feedback from the CIOs conference was that the CIOs agree with the general concept of AB 705, but are concerned about some of the nuances and vagueness around implementation of it. Two primary concerns were shared: 1) some faculty have been proactive in trying to guess the direction that the guidance is going to go, and then find that their work is at odds with that guidance and their energy is
wasted. 2) many are concerned about the signal being sent to reading departments, and what AB 705 means for them. Some CIOs were talking about converging reading and English departments, but others were not, so it remains a messy situation.

Review of MMAP Data for Math Placement and Questions from the Academic Senate
The results of a survey on the practices that have followed the MMAP were discussed, and two issues in particular were highlighted: 1) an agreement with CDE for high school transcript data will be finalized in the next couple of weeks. 2) a meeting with Ellucian is set up to centrally deal with issues related to registration into co-requisite enrollments for colleges with DataTel and Banner systems.

Language from the UC Office of the President (UCOP) was distributed about the expectations of transferable mathematics and statistics/probability courses. Laura Hope spoke to the UCOP about intermediate algebra as a requirement for some majors. They are going to convene a group to look at the issue, but feel that there is a lot flexibility in the language around statistics in particular, and that the use of pre- and co-requisites supports it.

Data was presented on the success rates of students whose high school GPA was less than 2.3 and were placed into transfer-level statistics. These students had an overall 39.8% success rate. A concern was previously brought up that of the students that had a high school GPA under 2.3, those placed directly into transfer-level statistics are probably the most likely to succeed, as some factor led them to be placed in transfer-level statistics. A statistical analysis was conducted to control for those possible factors, and it predicted that if all students with a high school GPA of less than 2.3 were placed into transfer-level statistics with no additional support, 29% would be successful. This compares with a 10% throughput success rate of students with a high school GPA under 2.3 who are placed one level below. There was agreement that though 29% is an unacceptably low success rate, it is a marked improvement over 10% and that the addition of further supports would be liable to increase the number of successful students. More work is certainly necessary in order to ensure that more than 29% of those students are successful, though.

Further data was presented on the variability colleges saw in differences in success rates for students with a high school GPA of less than 2.3 placed directly into transfer-level statistics vs. one level below. In no cases did students placed directly into transfer-level statistics succeed less often, though there was variance. The average difference between success rates of those placed directly into transfer-level statistics vs. one level below was 30%. It was reiterated that local data can be used to navigate around default guidance if it shows that alternative placement measures improve students’ ability to pass the relevant transfer-level course within one year.

Data was not presented, but various studies were discussed that purportedly showed that many students who do not succeed in transfer-level courses would also have struggled to succeed in courses below transfer level, and that the difficulty of the course is not the primary impediment. To best support these students, attention needs to be paid toward how to help them successfully transition to being college students.
The following recommendations were made for guidelines with respect to statistics, but were not put up for formal endorsement:

- High school GPA of at least a 3.0 OR High school GPA of at least a 2.3 and a C or better in precalculus: placement into transfer-level statistics without additional academic or concurrent support required.
- High school GPA between 2.3 and 3.0 (and not a C or better in precalculus): placement into transfer-level statistics with additional academic and concurrent support recommended.
- High school GPA less than 2.3: direct placement into transfer-level statistics with additional academic and concurrent support strongly recommended.

For students with a high school GPA of at least 3.0, it was suggested that completion of Algebra II also be added as a requirement due to articulation agreement requirements.

A concern was expressed that the guidance being discussed and distributed for AB 705 is such that colleges will be unable to develop the capacity to meet the demands. There was widespread agreement that there is a significant need for professional development to support the colleges. It was noted that the legislature is closely watching how AB 705 is implemented and that they would be much more responsive to a request for further resources than an assertion that it cannot be done, as they have visited colleges who have made significant changes and been told that it can be done if people are willing to do it.