



Rider 50 and Rider 59 Reports

Strengthening Developmental Education in Texas

January 2011

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Fred W. Heldenfels IV, CHAIR

Elaine Mendoza, VICE CHAIR

Joe B. Hinton, SECRETARY

Durga D. Agrawal

Dennis D. Golden

Wallace L. Hall, Jr.

Harold Hahn

Lyn Bracewell Phillips

A.W. "Whit" Riter III

Eric Rohne, STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Austin

San Antonio

Crawford

Houston

Carthage

Dallas

El Paso

Bastrop

Tyler

Corpus Christi

Raymund A. Paredes, COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mission of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions and other entities to help Texas meet the goals of the state's higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015, and thereby provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

Philosophy of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education. The agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Rider 50

Executive Summary.....	2
Overview of Research	4
Developmental Education Demonstration Projects	5
Organization and Administrative Practice	6
Assessment and Placement Policies	6
Appropriate and Ongoing Advising	8
Curriculum and Pedagogy	8
Faculty Preparation and Engagement.....	9
Conclusions and Recommendations	11
RIDER 50 REPORT.....	12
APPENDIX A – RIDER 50.....	12

Rider 59

Introduction	14
Background on Implementation of Non-Semester-Length Developmental Interventions	15
Defining Non-Course-Based Developmental Education	15
Research Literature on Non-Course-Based Developmental Education.....	17
Non-Course-Based Remediation and the Developmental Education Program Survey	18
Examples of Non-Course-Based Remediation in Texas	20
Open Labs.....	20
Zero Week Activities	21
Recommendations	21
RIDER 59 REPORT.....	22
APPENDIX A – RIDER 59.....	22
APPENDIX B – PROPOSED DEFINITIONS OF NON-COURSE-BASED REMEDIATION.....	23
Non-Course-Based Remediation (Proposed Definition)	23
Proposed Definition for Academic Course Guide Manual	23

List of Tables

Table A: Key Practices Noted in Research Literature

Rider 50 Report

Strengthening Developmental Education in Texas

A Review of Key Practices for Community College
Developmental Education Programs and
Recommendations for Statewide Implementation

Executive Summary

The General Appropriations Act, House Bill 1, 81st Texas Legislature, Section 50 (page III-62) – more commonly known as “Rider 50” and called that in this report – charged the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Coordinating Board) with creating pilot programs for underprepared students needing developmental education at community and technical colleges. The pilot programs:

“would use technology and diagnostic assessments to determine students’ needs and college readiness and use educational methods, including non-course based, that would improve developmental education outcomes.”

The importance of improving services to students needing developmental education cannot be overstated. Almost 42 percent of students entering community colleges in Fall 2006 were underprepared in mathematics, and only 27 percent of those met Texas Success Initiatives (TSI) obligations within two years (by Summer 2008). If Texas is to achieve the goals of *Closings the Gaps by 2015*, it is imperative that community and technical colleges establish effective, research-based developmental education programs that prepare students for success in college-credit courses. To underscore the importance of this issue and ensure that underprepared students are provided appropriate instruction and support to develop needed academic skills, the Legislature in Rider 50 further directed the Coordinating Board to:

“study the issue of developmental education focusing on researching best practices to implement statewide and submit a report to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House of Appropriations, the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, the Chair of House Appropriations, Senate Committee on Higher Education and House Committee on Higher Education before January 1, 2011.”

The Coordinating Board responded to the two parts of Rider 50 so that they complement and support each other. In particular, the Board’s staff reviewed research on developmental education since the early 1990s and analyzed the results of the 2009 Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS), which was the first in-depth study of developmental education in Texas. Data from those sources were used to create a Request for Proposals for community and technical college pilot programs in developmental education. Five colleges or districts – the Alamo Colleges, El Paso Community College, the Lone Star

College System, the San Jacinto College District, and the Tarrant County College District – were awarded two-year grants to pay for large-scale, systemic reforms of their developmental education programs to permeate all facets of the college experience, including but not limited to the:

- Role of adult education and its relationship to developmental education;
- Methods and procedures to assess and counsel students;
- Appropriateness and variety of the curriculum that will form the basis of courses that support student success;
- Preparation of faculty and staff to accommodate the needs of the students to be served; and
- Relationship of developmental education to general education that serves students who are college ready.

This report shows how the research described in the following section has been used to support the developmental education pilot projects and use their findings for recommendations to the Legislature for improving services for students needing developmental education statewide. The Coordinating Board shaped the pilot projects so that they produce sound research that can guide future practice. Most importantly, this is the first large-scale effort in Texas to implement change concurrently in all areas of developmental education programming – from assessment to services, to faculty development, and to program evaluation. Although another two years of funding is needed to determine the effectiveness and efficiencies of the modifications that are being researched and evaluated through the pilots, the results could change profoundly the futures of the 70,000 students who begin developmental education but do not persist in higher education and earn a postsecondary credential. The success of these students would take Texas much closer to achieving the state's *Closing the Gaps* goals.

Research indicates that successful programs, regardless of the type – a developmental education program, a student success program, or an honors program – have common characteristics. Although terminology may vary, five components seem vital:

- Organization and administration;
- Assessment and placement;
- Academic advising;
- Curriculum and pedagogy; and
- Faculty preparation and engagement.

Based on these five components, the Coordinating Board created the Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) in 2009 and required all Texas public two-year and four-year institutions to participate.

The DEPS report, available on the Coordinating Board’s website at this Internet address – <http://www.txhighereddata.org/interactive/DEPS.cfm> – identified patterns that offer insights into the design of the DEDP:¹

- 67 percent of Texas community and technical colleges do not have centralized developmental education services offered in one department.
- 33 percent do not have mission statements for their developmental education programs.
- 70 percent require student academic advising only once a semester; fewer than one-half have specialized developmental education advisors.
- 19 percent indicate there is no monitoring of student academic performance throughout the semester; of those that do monitor progress, almost 26 percent do so only once a semester.
- 24 percent of the community and technical colleges provide no faculty development for developmental education faculty.
- While 79 percent of colleges report having a program evaluation model, the low rate of student completion suggests that this effort is not always implemented effectively to improve programs.

Developmental Education Demonstration Projects

In 2009, the Coordinating Board developed a Request for Proposals with rigorous requirements for community and technical colleges to become DEDP sites. The requirements were based on the national research findings and results from the 2009 DEPS. Over the next

¹ Because Section 50 targeted only the community and technical colleges, data presented in this section and throughout the report are on community colleges and technical colleges only.

several years, the Coordinating Board will monitor the development and results of these projects in relation to other Texas programs that do not follow to the structured approach used at the DEDP sites. In order to support the research and evaluation of the DEDP sites, the Coordinating Board solicited proposals from universities to offer doctoral programs in developmental education. These new doctoral programs will focus on producing high-quality, rigorous research with data collected through the DEDP program and other sources. Through this research, Texas will contribute substantially to knowledge on effective developmental education and become a national leader in the field. The DEDP effort focuses on five areas, which are reviewed below to show how research was used to develop the program's design.

Organization and Administrative Practice

Organization refers to the centralized or decentralized structure under which developmental education operates within an institution. Research indicates that services for students needing developmental education are better managed and achieve greater results when they are centralized in one department under a coordinator with responsibility for program effectiveness. Responsibility for developmental math, reading, and writing should be housed in one unit rather than located in each of the respective discipline departments. Additionally, the importance of having a mission statement that clearly defines the program's purpose and structure seems to be critical. *Administrative practice* issues include mandatory orientation, student success courses, and prohibitions on late registration for developmental education students.

To ensure that organizational and administrative practices support the DEDP, all DEDP sites are required to:

- Have a specified program coordinator;
- Review and modify their mission statements when appropriate;
- Serve all developmental education students as part of the DEDP; and
- Review and modify their administrative practices to reflect current research.

Assessment and Placement Policies

Assessment and placement policies refer to the way college readiness is determined for each student and the need for differentiated placement based upon those results. To determine college readiness, defined as being academically prepared for credit-bearing college

courses, a first-time college student in Texas must take one of several assessment instruments approved under the Texas Success Initiative (TSI), Texas Education Code Section 51.3062. High school students take the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), but students also may take Accuplacer, Compass, SAT, ACT, or the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA). While the state sets minimum placement scores for these instruments, individual campuses may set higher scores.

The multiple scores and assessments make research and definitive statements about developmental education students difficult. They also confuse many first-time students about college-ready requirements. For example, one institution may determine that a student is ready for credit-bearing courses while another institution, using a different instrument and setting higher scores, does not. In addition, according to a recent study commissioned by the Coordinating Board to determine how well the assessment instruments match the Texas College and Career Readiness Standards adopted in 2008, only one – the THEA – approached the complexity and challenge of the standards.

Students' need for services is determined often on the same day they take one of the assessments, often with little counseling or discussion with the student. Students who might need three weeks of accelerated instruction could be placed in a 16-week semester long course. Of more concern, students who need far more than two years to become college ready might be placed inappropriately in a course with more advanced students. This pattern often repeats the negative experiences that students had in public schools and reinforces the impression that "college is not for me." Many of the students in developmental education would be more appropriately served in adult basic education career pathways, where basic skills and job training could be incorporated.

To ensure that students receive a more holistic and thoughtful assessment and appropriate placements, all DEDP sites are required to:

- Use the THEA as their assessment instrument;
- Limit services in developmental education to students who are within two years of college readiness; and

- Provide information on adult basic education services in the community college region they serve and explain the options to students.

Appropriate and Ongoing Advising

Appropriate and ongoing advising refers to implementing cost-effective student support services that provide students with the opportunity to build relationships with faculty, staff, and peers while obtaining important information to help them persist through college and earn a degree.

Students who are not college ready often have other needs beyond those related to academic shortcomings. As noted in much of the research, social and cultural background drives many students, particularly first-generation students, to drop out of college. Also, older students may have work and family commitments that interfere with college success. Some institutions address these issues. For example, many institutions have "early warning" systems allowing appropriate intervention if students are not coming to class regularly, and some offer childcare services for their students who attend evening classes.

A strong advising and counseling program that involves faculty and staff and offers an array of assistance is a promising strategy noted in the literature and incorporated into the DEDP. Students must be advised of their current academic abilities and given options for steady improvement. Diagnostic assessments that suggest certain career paths should be provided and discussed with students to create individual plans. Ongoing counseling can build the type of relationships that encourage students to discuss problems before they become barriers.

To ensure appropriate advising is taking place, all DEDP sites are required to:

- Establish comprehensive advising and counseling centers that share appropriate developmental and adult basic education options with the student; and
- Provide each student an individualized plan that is monitored regularly to ensure ongoing support for student completion and success.

Curriculum and Pedagogy

Research indicates that students in developmental education need differentiated instruction that targets specific skills to accelerate students through the remediation process, incorporating academic advising into the curriculum whenever possible.

Pedagogy focuses on expanding the use of collaborative and active learning strategies such as small group activities that provide opportunities for students to learn and apply academic content (Meyers & Jones, 1993). Because many students who have not achieved college and career readiness have negative feelings about school, successful developmental education efforts must re-engage students in academics. The DEDP provides the opportunity for institutions to create innovative services that either accelerate student learning and/or improve previously offered courses that have not been as successful as hoped. In this way, students will be acquiring skills that will help them across the curriculum when they pursue their academic and career choices.

To ensure the curriculum and instruction is appropriate for students in developmental education, all DEDP sites are required to:

- Combine reading and writing courses to determine if this is a better way of improving student skills in both areas;
- Integrate online services to better meet the needs of students whose time and finances are limited;
- Initiate or expand the use of accelerated, non-course-based² options;
- Create linked or paired courses that provide extra assistance and support in mathematics and reading; and
- Incorporate strategies such as learning communities, paired courses, and organized tutorials into developmental education options.

Faculty Preparation and Engagement

The final component of strong developmental education programs is a faculty with the latest knowledge and understanding of developmental education. The majority of developmental education classes are taught by part-time faculty who often lack the time to be fully engaged in teaching the most at-risk students on campus. Also, part-time faculty often have lower-level credentials and less exposure to professional development opportunities when compared to full-time faculty. Best practice recommendations encourage institutions to keep the percentage of developmental education courses taught by part-time faculty as low as possible. Nationally, over 65 percent of instructors teaching developmental education classes are employed part-time. Other best practice recommendations include providing stipends and

² Non-course-based developmental education targets students in need of short-term remediation with flexible entry and exit options (i.e., math refresher workshop or modular curricular programs such as an emporium-style learning center). See page 23 for a more detailed discussion of non-course-based developmental education.

supplemental pay to encourage the most qualified faculty to teach developmental education classes.

Because developmental education involves so many at-risk students, it is one of the most critical pathways for student success at any institution. It requires faculty who are committed to student achievement and knowledgeable about accelerating student learning and supporting high-level student performance. While many of the faculty who engage in teaching developmental education also teach in other areas, such as in the mathematics or English department, participation in the developmental education efforts must not be viewed as "second best" or less meaningful. Faculty from other departments, from high schools, or from the community at large must be focused on the mission of preparing students for success in college and for career readiness.

The depth of teaching and learning required in DEDP requires a targeted faculty and staff development program. The program must support faculty and staff efforts in providing appropriate instruction, materials, and services to ensure academic success for developmental education students.

To address the needs of faculty, the Coordinating Board created the Success Initiative in Developmental Education—Mathematics (SIDE-M) at Texas State University-San Marcos to assist and support the DEDPs in creating innovative and successful mathematics courses and modules. Faculty from Texas State model instructional strategies and review curriculum developed by DEDP sites to build strong research-based levels of service. In reading/writing, the Coordinating Board has contracted with the U.S. Department of Education's *Student Achievement in Reading* (STAR) program to provide faculty development services to a cadre of instructors at each of the DEDP sites. This group will support STAR trainers working with faculty at their own campuses. This model, through training the trainers and providing ongoing, high-quality professional development, is most effective in improving the ability and performance of faculty who had not been appropriately prepared to teach developmental education courses.

To ensure that faculty are appropriately prepared to deliver developmental education instruction, all DEPD sites are required to:

- Participate in the Success Initiative in Developmental Education—Mathematics project (SIDE-M) and the Student Achievement in Reading (STAR) training program;

- Ensure that the most qualified and committed faculty are assigned to teach developmental education courses;
- Develop a long-range plan for faculty and staff development focused on improving teaching, learning, advising, and counseling; and
- Review and revise as necessary requirements for teaching developmental education courses.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Institutional change does not happen quickly. The developmental education transformation that the Texas Legislature and the Coordinating Board anticipate requires a minimum of four years. As a result, the Coordinating Board recommends maintaining current levels of funding for the DEDP through the 2012-2013 biennium. That continued support will provide Texas with the model for instruction and student support it needs to improve developmental education and thereby boost student performance and learning at all institutions in the state.

RIDER 50 REPORT**APPENDIX A – RIDER 50****General Appropriations Act, House Bill 1, 81st Texas Legislature, Section 50 (page III-62)**

Developmental Education. Out of funds appropriated above in Strategy E.1.1, Developmental Education Program, \$2,500,000 in general revenue for fiscal year 2010 and \$2,500,000 in general revenue for fiscal year 2011 shall be used for the purpose establishing a pilot program for developmental education. The Higher Education Coordinating Board is required to use the funds for pilot programs at community colleges and public technical institutions. The pilot programs would use technology and diagnostic assessments to determine student's needs and college readiness and use educational methods, including non-course based, that would improve developmental education outcomes. Out of funds appropriated to this strategy, the Higher Education Coordinating Board will study the issue of developmental education focusing on researching best practices to implement statewide and submit a report to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House of Appropriations, the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, the Chair of House Appropriations, Senate Committee on Higher Education and House Committee on Higher Education before January 1, 2011. Any balances remaining as of August 31, 2010 are hereby appropriated for the same purpose for the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2010.

Rider 59 Report

Non-Course-Based Developmental Education

Challenges, Interventions, and Preliminary Recommendation

Introduction

Texas higher education institutions deliver developmental education primarily through a traditional course-based model. Most students enroll in a 16-week full semester course regardless of the amount of remediation required. As a result, a student who is close to the meeting the state's minimum standards for college readiness as outlined in Coordinating Board rules for the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) must study material already mastered. This redundancy needlessly increases tuition costs for the student and possibly instructional costs for the institution. Also, students enrolled in courses that require them to review previously mastered material are likely to become bored and lose motivation to persist and complete remediation, much less the work needed for an academic credential.

Institutions that recognize students' varied needs provide them with alternate pathways, such as non-course-based interventions for students close to meeting TSI minimum passing standards, to complete remediation. Non-course-based interventions increase the likelihood that students will move on to credit-bearing courses quickly, with the added benefit of eliminating unnecessary tuition costs for them. A recent study on the progression of developmental education students through remediation shows that alternate pathways for students are critical (Bailey, 2010; Zachry, 2010). Bailey (2009) followed more than 96,000 developmental education students, finding that only 10 percent of the total cohort completed the three-course remediation sequence after three years of follow-up (Bailey, 2009).

Prior to actions of the 81st Texas Legislature, institutions that diversified their remediation options beyond traditional coursework funded those innovations through locally generated resources or external funding provided by philanthropic organizations. Rider 59 now allows institutions to support non-coursed-based remediation efforts with state formula funding.

In August 2009, the Coordinating Board approved courses eligible for non-course-based remediation activities eligible for formula funding in the Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM). Effective August 2010, institutions may submit the number of non-course-based remediation contact hours or the credit-hour equivalent to the Coordinating Board for reimbursement.

The next section of this document discusses the challenges faced by the Coordinating Board as it implements Rider 59 in a way that gives institutions some necessary flexibility while providing the Coordinating Board with parameters to measure the effectiveness of non-course-based interventions. The lack of a clear, measurable definition of non-course-based developmental education is the most difficult implementation challenge.

This document concludes with the most common types of non-course-based remediation opportunities offered at community colleges and recommendations for a proposed revision to the definition of non-course-based remediation for the ACGM.

Background on Implementation of Non-Semester-Length Developmental Interventions

In July 2009, Coordinating Board Academic Affairs and Research (AAR) staff members began their review of Rider 59 and established an implementation plan. They met with other Coordinating Board staff from the agency's Planning & Accountability and P-16 Initiatives Divisions and developed policies and procedures to allow institutions to report developmental education interventions of less than a semester in length. The AAR Division placed the issue on the agenda for the Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM) Advisory Committee, which is comprised of faculty from 2-year and 4-year institutions, and developed suggested non-course-based interventions for the advisory committee to consider.

In early August 2009, the ACGM Advisory Committee approved the proposed interventions. By the end of August, AAR staff incorporated those proposed interventions into the Fall 2009 ACGM, allowing institutions to report their efforts in this area.

In August of 2010, AAR staff developed the course titles and numbers necessary to allow institutions to claim contact hour formula funding for the interventions and incorporated those numbers into the ACGM. The Fall 2010 ACGM was published with that information, and notice of this change was given to higher education institutions and their representatives.

Defining Non-Course-Based Developmental Education

Rider 59 specifically refers to "non-semester-length" developmental education. However, most of the activities it describes were eligible for funding prior to its passage. Non-

course-based remediation is the only new activity eligible for funding under Rider 59, but a clear and measurable definition with examples is not put forth in the rider.

The absence of a clear and measurable definition for Rider 59 efforts makes it difficult for the Coordinating Board to evaluate non-course-based developmental education activities reported by institutions under this rider. Rider 59 does not provide the Coordinating Board with authority to establish rules to guide institutions with implementation or a basis for compliance monitoring, especially for reporting contact hours. As a result, the key recommendation from the Coordinating Board related to Rider 59 involves moving authority for non-course-based remediation into the Texas Success Initiative statute (Education Code 51.3062).

Another difficulty with implementing Rider 59 is the lack of research literature that provides guidance on a clear definition of non-course-based remediation. When introduced in the literature, the identifiers provided for non-course-based developmental education refer to short-term, subject-focused refresher workshops; college prep programs; tutoring; or online learning modules. These are examples of alternatives to a traditional semester-length, 16-week developmental education course. Without a clear operational definition of non-course-based developmental education in the literature, the Coordinating Board developed a working definition:

Non-course-based developmental education includes developmental education interventions that use innovative learning approaches that, compared to traditional lecture-only classes, more effectively and efficiently prepare students for college-level work. These interventions must be overseen by an instructor of record; must not fit traditional course frameworks for contact hours; and cannot include advising or learning support activities such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, or labs connected to traditional courses where a student incurs tuition costs. Students may not be charged tuition for these interventions.³

Students enrolled in interventions under Rider 59 have been assessed and deemed in need of minor remediation in one or more areas (e.g., reading, writing, or mathematics). Without clear mastery objectives and competencies to be learned by students as a result of

³ Proposed 9.30.2010 – See Appendix B for the proposed definition as printed in the Academic Course Guide Manual (October 2010) and program requirements for credit hour reimbursement (i.e., teacher of record must be present during intervention activities).

these interventions, the Coordinating Board recommends that students completing these programs take a Coordinating Board-approved TSI assessment to determine the success of the intervention and the students' readiness for academic coursework.

Research Literature on Non-Course-Based Developmental Education

Because the Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) indicated that non-course-based remediation activities might be implemented in different ways on campuses, institutions need guidance on what is considered to be non-course-based developmental education for funding purposes. The literature references described below were used by the Coordinating Board to help define the concept and guide institutions on implementation.

In a report from the Higher Education Policy Institute of the Coordinating Board, Holcombe and Alexander described course-based remediation as a course taken in a 16-week semester, while non-course-based developmental education includes an array of innovative interventions centered on the needs of the individual students. Although this offers a good start for understanding the two types of developmental education delivery systems, a concrete definition of non-course-based developmental education isn't offered. But using Holcombe and Alexander's descriptors, the characteristics of those programs are clear. They are innovative, learner-centered, and not tied to a 16-week semester.

After a review of additional literature, the term's definition remains unclear, but in practice, it generally falls into two categories. The most common types mentioned in the research are academic advising (individual or cohort), in-class and out-of-class tutoring, peer tutoring or mentoring, supplemental instructions, and writing/math labs. Coordinating Board rules do not allow institutions to report direct academic advising activities for contact hour reimbursement under the formula, so these activities were not included in the Coordinating Board's working definition. Another example of non-course-based intervention might include tutoring targeted to a student or small cohort of students needing a refresher on a particular mathematical concept (e.g., multiplying fractions).

In the non-course-based models described in this report, pre- and post-assessment, student interviews, and advising are vital elements. Student assessments, interviews, and other college admissions requirements provide the faculty advisor or academic advisor with the tools

necessary to better inform students on the most appropriate path through developmental education: course-based or non-course-based options, or accelerated or full semester-length courses. Using Rider 59 as a way to experiment with what might improve developmental education in Texas, researchers, administrators, and faculty of developmental education are beginning to create programs that address what many have known for a long time: Students might be better served in a two-week workshop designed to teach to students' needs rather than enrolled in a 16-week developmental education course.

In conclusion, the types of interventions considered as “non-course-based” are likely to be innovative and various. They are not tied to a course, and they will not require students to pay a tuition fee for access to them. They will be uniquely geared toward students who have been assessed and identified as in need of developmental education. Innovations will provide an alternative pathway through the traditional developmental education sequence via targeted acceleration, intensive short-term instruction, or cohort/small group tutoring by a faculty member.

Non-Course-Based Remediation and the Developmental Education Program Survey

The Developmental Education Program Survey (DEPS) described in the Rider 50 report asked institutions to report on the use and types of non-course-based remediation activities provided to students. Initially, the Coordinating Board did not adequately define those types of interventions. But a second survey, to be administered in Spring 2011, will include the operational definition presented in this document (see page 23). Despite the limitations with the definition in the first survey, the findings provide insight into what institutions consider to be non-course-based remediation. Each institution listed up to five non-course-based remediation programs that they offer to students. Two-thirds of the institutions indicated that they did not provide any type of non-course-based remediation to developmental education students. The remaining indicated that they provided opportunities for remediation, but their interpretations of “non-course-based remediation” tended to vary despite the definition

provided by the Coordinating Board in the DEPS glossary⁴ and through several training webinars with the institutions to clarify the meaning. In the survey responses, examples of non-course-based remediation were primarily summer bridge programs and academic support/learning assistance outreach programs. Thirty institutions considered non-course-based programs to be Summer Bridge or summer intensive programs aimed for students who wish to complete requirements or retest out of developmental courses. Thirty institutions considered non-course-based programs to include tutoring, seminars, learning labs, or workshops provided by an academic support unit such as a learning center. But these services are offered to the general student population and are not necessarily focused on serving developmental education students who may or may not be enrolled in the courses at the college. Therefore, they would not be included in the current Coordinating Board definition of non-course-based remediation.

Sixteen institutions considered non-course-based programs to be those that focus on preparation for TSI-approved assessments such as the Accuplacer or Compass. These are generally test preparation courses targeting students who scored just below the minimum cut-scores for college readiness. Because these interventions target students at the developmental education level, this type of remediation could be considered non-course based. Institutions pay staff and/or instructors to teach these short refresher courses.

Three institutions considered non-course-based programs to be tutoring or advising opportunities offered under the federal TRIO program (e.g., Student Support Services, Upward Bound). Whether these tutoring opportunities targeted students prior to enrollment is unknown, but they were likely open to the general student population that was eligible for their services.

⁴ DEPS I (2009) definition ***Non-Course-Based Developmental Education Program/Service***: A service or program providing developmental education students with an opportunity to supplement subject knowledge they may be lacking, while not affecting their enrollment status. It might include, but is not limited to, tutoring, supervised self study, and participation in learning assistance centers. Non-course-based developmental education is not eligible for state formula funding (Univ, HRI, CTC CBM002).

Examples of Non-Course-Based Remediation in Texas

Several community colleges and universities in the state offer non-course-based interventions to developmental education students. The most common intervention is the open lab model. Other interventions include short-term, targeted tutoring and labs with non-student access to online support. These interventions are described on the following pages.

Open Labs

The open math lab or Math Emporium is another example of a successful non-course-based developmental education model. After a student's academic skills are assessed, a dedicated case manager talks at length with the student about his or her academic and career goals. A student might be advised to participate in (1) a preparation program to improve test-taking strategies and better understand the design of the assessment, or (2) an open math, reading, or writing lab program allowing self-paced lessons. The software used in these non-course-based interventions allows students to build on prior knowledge, increase their understanding of core concepts, and monitor their own learning. In the labs, faculty are on hand to answer questions, provide just-in-time instruction to small cohorts of students having similar problems, and to advise and mentor students.

The Access Learning Center at Amarillo College is one example of an open-entry/open-exit lab where students can take pre-assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics; target their weaknesses in certain concepts through a combination of self-study and faculty instruction (in the lab); and post-test to determine their readiness to move to a higher level. After revising the developmental education mathematics curriculum in 2007 to accelerate the pace of student progress through it and produce better results than in semester-length coursework, Amarillo College piloted the accelerated, online approach with instructors in the lab with students. Of the 24 students who began in the pilot, 83 percent improved their understanding of math concepts and placed higher in mathematics (including seven who placed into College Algebra). Students who had intermediate or more advanced levels of math skills recorded the largest increase on the Accuplacer assessment. This group required fewer hours of review study and completed several levels of developmental education in a fewer number of weeks.

Zero Week Activities

Another example of non-course-based remediation are the math tutoring and retesting opportunities available to students during Zero Week at Temple College. After students register for classes but prior to the first class day, the college sets one week for students to become better acquainted with the college, participate in orientation to e-learning opportunities on campus, and receive tutoring from math faculty in the college Math Lab. The tutoring, designed specifically for students whose college entrance assessment scores place them in developmental math, offers online math remediation with faculty support. Retesting opportunities are provided for students after tutoring, and student schedules are changed during the week if they place out of developmental math.

Recommendations

Recommendations are aimed at implementing and continuing to promote and support the establishment of more non-course-based developmental education alternatives for students on university and community college campuses:

- Revise Rider 59 in the General Appropriations Act for the 2012-2013 biennium to focus solely on non-course-based remediation and add it as a chapter in the TSI statute. This change would provide the Coordinating Board with rulemaking authority and an opportunity to remove redundant activities that are already covered through course-based developmental education. (See Appendix B)
- Require institutions that offer non-course-based remediation to use pre- and post-assessments to better gauge the success of the intervention.
- Require the Coordinating Board to identify the most effective and efficient combination of non-course-based developmental education interventions from the DEDPs and consider them for statewide implementation in 2013.
- Require the Coordinating Board to study the types of non-course-based developmental education activities reported by institutions and report the results to the Legislature no later than January 1, 2013.

RIDER 59 REPORT**APPENDIX A – RIDER 59****General Appropriations Act, House Bill 1, 81st Texas Legislature,
Section 59 (page III-63)**

Funding for Non-Semester-Length Developmental Education. Out of funds appropriated above, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall approve non-semester-length developmental education interventions (including course-based, non-course-based, alternative entry/exit, and other intensive developmental education activities) in the Lower Division Academic Course Guide Manual before August 31, 2009. Approved non-semester-length developmental education interventions shall be eligible for formula funding beginning in fall 2010 and subject to limitations prescribed by law.

Institutions shall analyze the fiscal and instructional impacts on student outcomes for both semester-length and non-semester-length developmental education interventions. The institutions shall prepare a report to the Board no later than June 1, 2010. The Board, in conjunction with the Legislative Budget Board and institutions of higher education, shall use existing performance measures and data to assist in the evaluation of student outcomes for these interventions, including but not limited to, student success in first-college-level-course by subject, persistence, transfer, and degree or certificate completion.

The Board shall analyze and compare all institution reports to determine the most effective and efficient combination of developmental education interventions and make recommendations to the Legislative Budget Board and the Governor before January 1, 2011.

RIDER 59 REPORT

APPENDIX B – PROPOSED DEFINITIONS OF NON-COURSE-BASED REMEDIATION

Non-Course-Based Remediation (Proposed Definition)

Non-course-based developmental education: Developmental interventions that use innovative approaches to more effectively and efficiently prepare students for college-level work. These interventions must be overseen by an instructor of record; do not fit traditional course frameworks for contact hours; cannot include advising; and can not include learning support activities such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, or labs connected to traditional courses where a student incurs tuition costs. Students may not be charged tuition for these interventions.

Proposed Definition for Academic Course Guide Manual

Non-course-based developmental education interventions target students in need of short-term remediation with flexible entry and exit options (i.e., math refresher workshop or modular curricular programs such as an emporium-style learning center). An instructor of record must be available to assist students.

Non-course-based interventions eligible for formula funding reimbursement:

- Do not include learning support activities such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, and labs generally connected to traditional courses where a student incurs a tuition cost and may receive financial aid.
- Do not include academic advising activities in any form (faculty, group, cohort-based, or case management).
- Must be offered to students at no additional cost (no tuition payment).
- Must be reported to the Coordinating Board using contact hour equivalents.

It is recommended that students who complete non-course-based developmental education programs demonstrate readiness for college-level work by meeting the TSI standard for college readiness on one of the state-approved college readiness assessment tests in the applicable subject area.