Claremont Colleges

Scholarship @ Claremont

CGU Theses & Dissertations

CGU Student Scholarship

Spring 2021

Who Gets the Power, Resources, and Knowledge from California Assembly Bill 705?

Erin Christine Feld

Claremont Graduate University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgu_etd

Recommended Citation

Feld, Erin Christine. (2021). *Who Gets the Power, Resources, and Knowledge from California Assembly Bill 705?*. CGU Theses & Dissertations, 211. https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgu_etd/211. doi: 10.5642/cguetd/211

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the CGU Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in CGU Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Who Gets the Power, Resources, and Knowledge from California Assembly Bill 705?

By

Erin Christine Feld

Claremont Graduate University

2021

© Copyright Erin Christine Feld, 2021.

All rights reserved

Approval of Dissertation Committee

This dissertation has been duly read, reviewed, and critiqued by the Committee listed below, which hereby approves the manuscript of Erin Christine Feld as fulfilling the scope and quality requirements for meriting the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education.

Dina Maramba, Chair

Claremont Graduate University

Associate Professor of Education

Eligio Martinez

Claremont Graduate University

Senior Research Fellow, School of Educational Studies

Linda Perkins

Claremont Graduate University

Associate University Professor Director, Applied Gender Studies

Abstract

Who Gets the Power, Resources, and Knowledge from California Assembly Bill 705?

By

Erin Christine Feld

Claremont Graduate University: 2021

California Assembly Bill 705 (AB 705) began full implementation in fall of 2020 for California community college English departments. This Bill requires schools to reconsider developmental education saying that students can no longer be required to take classes below transfer-level in English unless the school can show a student would not be able to succeed in college-level classes without that course. Additionally, there can no longer be sequences of multiple remedial classes as there were in the past, and schools can only offer classes one level below transfer. Students must be also now be recommended into courses using multiple measures and not assessment tests. The intent of the Bill is to prevent students from getting caught in remedial course sequences that frustrate them to the point of dropping out of college altogether.

The purpose of this study is to interview English faculty from San Diego County community colleges to see what they are observing in the early implementation of AB 705. The Critical Policy Analysis framework will be used to see what teachers are noticing with their students and what is happening at their institutions in terms of distribution of power, resources, and knowledge, and if inequality and privilege exist because of this Bill.

Findings and implications demonstrate that AB 705 appears to be helping students in some ways, but there are still concerns about some aspects of it because some students might still be left behind because of the Bill.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Maramba. As my academic advisor, instructor, and dissertation chair, I have appreciated all of the knowledge you have shared and guidance you have given me as you have led me to feel like I could be successful in this program. Your compassion and passion for your students, research, and teaching has been greatly appreciated and admired. I wrote in my application letter that you were one of the faculty members I wanted to work with, and I am very thankful I was given that opportunity as I see my growth as a researcher under your direction.

I was happy when the university hired you, Dr. Martinez, because we were getting someone with community college expertise that I was eager to learn from in class. The community college class not only broadened my knowledge, but it also introduced me to the framework I used in my study when a speaker you brought to class mentioned it. Additionally, the last day of class you told me you would be happy to be on my committee, and that offer gave me confidence that someone I admire believed in my work.

My research ideas were very scattered when I started the program, but it was the History of Higher Education class with you, Dr. Perkins, where I finally started to focus on developmental education. Your advice and support through that paper led to my continued work and research on that topic which has led to this dissertation. You have been with me from the start of this project though what is here sure has grown since those original papers. Your words of encouragement and compliments have always helped when I have felt unsure of my work.

From our start in the field of higher education as tutors in the RWS MA program, I knew you were a great friend and person, Dr. Sharp-Hoskins, but I cannot thank you enough for the

enthusiasm, support, and suggestions you have so happily given me throughout my PhD journey. I sure am glad you got your PhD well before me because your advice has been invaluable.

I appreciate all of my friends who have supported and encouraged me as I commuted, worked my way through classes, and as I conducted interviews and wrote this during a pandemic.

I cannot express enough gratitude to my respondents for being willing to spend time with me in an interview during a pandemic. I know the already busy schedules college English faculty have in normal times, so your willingness to help me complete my study with the extra stressors created by COVID-19 is deeply appreciated.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their love and support. At some point in my childhood, a poster with a bird flying through a rainbow getting the rainbow on its nose was hung in my room. The poster said, “Believe in you and you’ll come through with flying colors.” That early motivation and support has continued, and I thank you for everything.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND OF AB 705.....	1
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.....	5
PURPOSE OF STUDY	6
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	7
CENTRAL QUESTION	7
SUB-QUESTIONS.....	7
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY.....	8
METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW	8
DEFINITION OF TERMS	9
<i>Remedial</i>	9
<i>Developmental</i>	10
ORGANIZATION OF STUDY	11
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
INTRODUCTION	12
HISTORY OF REMEDIATION.....	13
HARVARD	13
PREPARATORY SCHOOLS	13
HIGHER EDUCATION OPENED TO MORE PEOPLE	14
CONDITIONAL ADMISSION	15
TUTORING SCHOOLS.....	15
MORRILL ACT OF 1862	16
INCREASE IN REMEDIAL OFFERINGS.....	17
STUDENTS NOT READY FOR COLLEGE FOR VARIOUS REASONS.....	18
IVY LEAGUE SCHOOLS	19
THE START OF JUNIOR COLLEGES	19
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT	20
OPEN ACCESS TO JUNIOR COLLEGES.....	20
1970s	21
1980s	22
1990s	23
REASONS FOR ACCEPTING UNPREPARED STUDENTS.....	24
FINANCES	24
HIGH SCHOOL ISSUES.....	25
DESIRE TO REMOVE REMEDIATION FROM HIGHER EDUCATION.....	25
INTRODUCTION	25
CONTROVERSY WITH REMEDIATION.....	26
IN SUPPORT OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION	28
INTRODUCTION	28
HELPS STUDENTS.....	28
MORE LIKELY TO PERSIST	29
NOT AS EXPENSIVE AS OTHER OPTIONS	30

CRITICISM OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION.....	31
INTRODUCTION	31
STUDENTS TAKING TOO MANY COURSES	31
UNFAIR TESTING	33
DISCRIMINATION IN TESTING	35
NEED FOR OTHER SKILLS TO SUCCEED	36
MONEY/COST TO SCHOOLS	37
MONEY/COST TO STUDENTS	38
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSION	40
THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSION.....	40
COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY	41
COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS	42
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS	43
HISTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THEIR ACTS, BILLS, AND MOVEMENTS WHICH INFLUENCED REMEDIATION	44
UPWARD EXTENSION LAW (1907) ASSEMBLY BILL 528 (1907)	44
BALLARD ACT (1917)	47
JUNIOR COLLEGE ACT AND THE SMITH-HUGHES ACT (1917)	47
THE DISTRICT JUNIOR COLLEGE LAW OF 1921	48
1929	49
THE CARNEGIE REPORT (1931)	49
GEORGE-DEEN ACT (1937)	50
THE TRUMAN REPORT (1947)	50
DONAHOE ACT – 1960 (THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION)	51
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963	54
LEARNING COMMUNITIES (1960S).....	54
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM (1964)	55
TRIO (1964)	55
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT (1965 REAUTHORIZED 1968, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1986, 1992, 1998, 2008)	56
LEARNING ASSISTANCE CENTERS 1970S.....	57
SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION (1973)	57
EDUCATION CODE ARTICLE 1: STUDENT MATRICULATION (1976 AND 1993)	58
THE 1981 REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION (CPEC)	59
SEYMOUR-CAMPBELL MATRICULATION ACT OF 1986	60
ASSEMBLY BILL No. 1725 (1988)	60
PROPOSITION 98 (1988).....	61
STUDENT EQUITY PLANS (1991, 1992, 1996, 2002)	62
ACHIEVING THE DREAM: COMMUNITY COLLEGES COUNT (2004)	62
THE BASIC SKILLS INITIATIVE (2006)	63
ACCELERATED LEARNING PROJECT (2007).....	64
DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE (2009)	66
COMPLETE COLLEGE AMERICA (2009)	66
SENATE BILL No. 1143 (2010)	67
GETTING PAST GO (2010)	68
COMPLETION BY DESIGN (2011)	68
SEYMOUR-CAMPBELL STUDENT SUCCESS ACT OF 2012 (SENATE BILL 1456)	68
ASSEMBLY BILL 288 (2016).....	69
ASSEMBLY BILL 705 (2017).....	70

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	72
RESEARCH DESIGN	72
LIMITATIONS	72
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: CRITICAL POLICY ANALYSIS	73
CONTEXT OF STUDY	74
PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT.....	74
RECRUITMENT PROCESS	78
FINAL GROUP OF PARTICIPANTS	79
DATA COLLECTION	80
INTERVIEW DESCRIPTION	81
DATA ANALYSIS.....	81
TRUSTWORTHINESS	82
RESEARCHER REFLEXIVITY.....	83
PEER REVIEW	84
MEMBER CHECKING	84
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	85
INTRODUCTION	85
STEP ONE	87
WHAT IS BEING DONE	87
WHAT DEPARTMENTS ARE SAYING TO DO CONCERNING AB 705	88
PRESSURE TO PASS STUDENTS?	89
STEP TWO	93
STEP THREE.....	93
DISTRIBUTION OF POWER	94
PLACEMENT AND REGISTRATION	94
AGENCY IN CLASS	96
DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS	98
<i>Tutoring</i>	<i>99</i>
LACK OF READING SKILL SUPPORT	101
DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES FOR FACULTY	103
<i>Training</i>	<i>104</i>
<i>Help Available to Instructors</i>	<i>107</i>
DISTRIBUTION OF KNOWLEDGE	108
STEP FOUR	114
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	114
ESL STUDENTS	116
GENERATION 1.5.....	117
<i>Students who lack time</i>	<i>118</i>
THOSE WITH TIME CONSTRAINTS	120
THOSE IT WAS MEANT TO HELP	122
OTHERS	123
NO ONE	124
CONCLUSION.....	125

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE	126
INTRODUCTION	126
KEY FINDINGS	128
CRITICAL POLICY ANALYSIS	128
STEP THREE: DISTRIBUTION OF POWER	129
<i>Placement and Registration</i>	130
STEP THREE: DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES	131
<i>Tutoring</i>	131
<i>Reading</i>	132
STEP FOUR	133
<i>Students with Disabilities</i>	133
<i>ESL and Generation 1.5 Students</i>	135
<i>Time Issues</i>	135
<i>Class Sizes</i>	136
LIMITATIONS	137
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	138
CONCLUSION	140
REFERENCES	142
APPENDICES	159
APPENDIX 1: RECRUITMENT EMAIL	159
APPENDIX 2: REVISED RECRUITMENT EMAIL	160
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW CONFIRMATION EMAIL	161
APPENDIX 5: REVISED CONSENT FORM	164
APPENDIX 6: PRE-INTERVIEW SURVEY QUESTIONS	166
APPENDIX 7: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	167

List of Figures

Figure 1 Demographic Breakdown of Participants.....	80
---	----

Chapter 1: Introduction

Remedial/developmental¹ education has long been debated in higher education. Proponents and supporters have been discussing remediation's benefits and drawbacks and looking for ways to best help students since the beginning of higher education. Community colleges in California were developed in 1907, and with the Master Plan in 1960, it was highlighted that these schools should offer lower division courses for transfer, general education, remedial noncredit, and workforce training instruction (UC Institutional Research and Academic Planning, 2017). Community colleges were seen as a way to help the state's economy grow, so more bills, programs, and initiatives in the state have continued because there are still ideas of what institutions can do to assist students. One of the main focuses through all of these changes has been with remedial classes. Though there is a realization among institutions that students do not all have college-level² skills, there are also many concerns that students who are not coming to higher education with the skills needed to succeed are being left behind because of the courses they need to take before they can even begin transfer-level classes. California Assembly Bill 705 (AB 705) is the latest measure to help eliminate issues with students having to take developmental classes, and this Bill is what will be looked at in this study.

Background of AB 705

As this study will be looking specifically at California Assembly Bill 705 (AB 705), it is important to give some background on it here so future references will be clear. On February 15, 2017, Assemblymember Jacqui Irwin (D – Thousand Oaks) introduced the Community College Placement Bill also known as California AB 705 ("New Legislation Saves Students Time and

¹ The terms: remedial, developmental, pre-college, non-transferrable, basic skills, and pre-transfer will be used to describe these courses.

² The terms: college-level, transfer-level, and transferrable will be used to describe these courses.

Money toward Earning Degrees", 2017). The Bill passed on October 13, 2017 with 79 aye votes and zero no votes on record ("Bill Votes", 2017). The intent of the Bill is to help students complete their time in community college faster by making schools stop using placement tests, regulating suggestions that students take basic skills courses, and limiting how long a student is allowed to be in pre-college level courses (AB 705, 2017). Schools had to implement the Bill by fall 2019, so though some schools started enacting changes to meet the requirements earlier, others just began addressing the Bill in fall 2019.

With AB 705, schools can no longer use placement tests for suggesting levels of English, math, and reading to students. Schools will have to allow open access to either all courses or use multiple measures like high school GPA and grades in previous courses for placement or they can use guided self-placement where a student answers questions that will help suggest the appropriate class to take. In addition, AB 705 (2017) limits the number of remedial courses that can be offered in a subject to just one year's worth of work; this means two semesters or three quarters of work only. Furthermore,

The bill [AB 705] would prohibit a community college district or college from requiring students to enroll in remedial English or mathematics coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless placement research that includes consideration of high school grade point average and coursework shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics. (AB 705, 2017, n.p.) This is an attempt to restrict what schools do with course placement to help students get to and through transfer-level courses sooner and faster.

There are a few goals of the Bill: 1. To have students complete transfer-level English and math classes in one year. 2. To ensure students are correctly placed in courses so they are not

taking classes they do not need. 3. To help ESL students get through their transfer-level English classes in three years (FAQ on AB 705, 2017). The hope for AB 705 is to aid all students with placement and remediation, but it is also to help with racial issues in testing leading to lower course placement because of the high number of African American students in developmental classes (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2014). Also, 87% of students who are enrolled in developmental courses in the California community college system are Latino/a or Black (Bahr, et al., 2019). Though there is not enough data to know if these particular ethnic and racial groups are being told they have to take remedial classes or if they are choosing to take them on their own, this is an alarming piece of information. Additionally, it is noted that socioeconomic status can play a role in a student being suggested into pre-college level courses (Brathwaite & Edgecombe, 2018). All of these concerns are further reasons AB 705 could be a way to change the inequity in student enrollment in remedial versus college-level courses.

There is limited data on the effectiveness of this Bill so far since it is still early in the implementation of its requirements by all community colleges in California, and the COVID-19 pandemic has made data collection inaccurate. However, Porterville College in Porterville, CA began implementation of co-requisites in English in 2017. They eliminated developmental courses but required students who would have been in those classes to take the college-level course in addition to a co-requisite to further support their learning. The school saw their success rates “actually improved slightly. The success rate in English P101A was 66.1% in 2017-18, and 68.0% in 2018-19” (Porterville College Office of Institutional Research, 2019). They acknowledge that it is early data, so it is hard to notice trends and patterns of significance, but the school is encouraged by what they are seeing so far with the co-requisite classes and success rates (Porterville College Office of Institutional Research, 2019).

The Campaign for College Opportunity and California Acceleration Project released a report in December 2019 that looked at what was happening at schools where implementation had already started. They found students with a GPA of 1.9 to 2.59 “are three and a half times more likely to complete transfer-level English when they are placed directly into transfer-level coursework (12% vs. 43%)” (CCO & CAP, 2019, p. 5). This indicates that students who might not have been considered prepared for college level before are mostly succeeding at it when given the chance to take these classes.

Data collected by Educational Results Partnership (ERP) from 13 colleges who started early adaption of AB 705 saw that more students are placing into transfer-level classes for English and math, but it is still unclear if corequisites required with English and math are helping students (Hetts, Hayward, Newell, Willett, & Perez, 2019). They note that future research will need to be done in order to help schools share ideas for what is working and what is not in order to best help students succeed in their goals for being in college. Additionally, Black student enrollment in English classes went from 45% to 63% and in math from 20% to 30% (Smith, 2019). Latinx student enrollment in community college English went from 49% to 68% and in math from 24% to 36%, and 74% more passed English in 2018 (Smith, 2019). Also, students who passed transfer-level English with a C grade or higher increased by 18,903 in 2018 (when early adapter schools were starting AB 705 implementation) versus 2017 (Smith, 2019). Though initial data seems promising, a lot of research and data collection still needs to be done to measure the success and failures of the Bill and offer recommendations.

In November 2019, Mejia, Rodriguez, and Johnson released a report through the Public Policy Institute of California. They found students who were Latino and African American “were

more equitably represented in college composition courses across the system in fall 2019”

(Mejia, Rodriguez, & Johnson, 2019, p. 12). This same report also noted:

In fall 2019, 61 percent of first-time English takers completed college composition in one term ... This stands in stark contrast to just four years prior when 27 percent of first-time English students were able to achieve this important early milestone. In all, 57,000 additional students successfully completed college composition in one term in fall 2019 relative to fall 2015. (Mejia, Rodriguez, & Johnson, 2019, p. 20)

This early data indicates promising outcomes of AB 705.

Statement of Problem

Remediation in higher education is being changed throughout the country. Teachers need to quickly adapt to the changes in order to best help their students. Additionally, the states that enact changes need to be aware of what is happening in the classes once these policies go in affect so it can be determined what is working and what still might need to change.

Given the concern about remediation over the years, the California government has implemented a variety of actions aimed at improving higher education. Their intent with these laws and bills has been to help students achieve their college goals, but often the people at the schools who are making the changes to address the bills are left struggling with what to do to address the requirements. Most recently, California AB 705 (2017) was signed into law with the intent of helping community college students progress to and through transfer level coursework faster in an effort to help them persist until their end goal for being at the school is completed.

Given these changes, most community colleges in San Diego County have decided to eliminate all of their pre-transfer level English courses and instead will offer English 100 classes that provide some sort of additional “support” for students who previously would have been at

the developmental level. This means it would be an English 100 class with a corequisite that would further help students with their writing skills. These 100 with a corequisite classes are generally between four and six units with three to four units of the traditional English instruction and one to two additional units of support to assist students in passing the course and gaining the writing skills needed to succeed in college. The support for 100 classes ranges from required tutoring sessions to time working with an instructor and/or tutor in a writing lab to additional work on grammar and other writing mechanics that are often issues for students.

Since just a few years ago developmental classes were a major focus of importance at California community colleges because of the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), this is a drastic shift, and it is one administrators and faculty are working hard to adapt to in an effort to implement in ways that will aid students to pass classes they might not have had success with in the past. Though implementation has begun, schools and the state are still looking to see what is working and what is not working for students, and it is important to get feedback from faculty in addition to data from the schools in order to support learners.

Purpose of Study

The results of this research will be used to help colleges consider what they need to do as they continue to adjust to the transition to the elimination of developmental classes to best aid students who would have been in those courses in the past. Many schools and committees at the community colleges have been hosting workshops and meetings about AB 705, so I would like to share the information I gathered from professors to help those discussing this Bill think about what they might want to do while adjusting to the corequisite versions of English 100. This research will be able to help administrators, faculty, staff, and the government officials looking at community colleges to think about what they can do to support their teachers which will, in

turn, help students succeed. This research could also help California and other states looking to implement changes to remediation to think about key concerns that have come out of this Bill. For example, what happens to students with disabilities? If schools are not offering the for-credit developmental classes these students were able to take in the past, what happens to them now, and is this really a way to serve all people which is who these open access institutions are open to?

Research Questions

The qualitative interview-based questions I ask will be to discover how English professors at San Diego County community colleges are understanding AB 705, what their schools are asking them to do in relation to the Bill, the support they are getting to implement AB 705, challenges they are facing because of the legislation, and their ideas on how they think the Bill might help or hinder students and who might get left behind because of these new requirements.

Central Question

This study will be guided by the question: How do policies concerning developmental education affect and influence community college English professors and students?

Sub-Questions

This study will also look to answer the questions:

1. What were the initial approaches of San Diego County community college professors when facing the elimination of remediation?
2. How have pedagogical approaches for San Diego County community college English professors changed (if at all) since remediation was eliminated?

3. What are the changes San Diego County community college professors are seeing as they adapt to the elimination of remediation?

Significance of Study

Since California has the largest community college system in the country, it is important to look at how the implementation of AB 705 goes so other states looking to eliminate placement tests and remediation can use this information to help with their own application ("Key Facts", 2019). It is also vital for faculty members to gather information as enactment of the Bill in California continues so they can keep working on helping students in the best ways possible. It is also essential to consider if the state may need to make modifications to the Bill or if schools and departments need to make modifications to their execution of the Bill to keep the intent of AB 705 a reality.

Given the very rapid and challenging nature of fulfilling the requirements of this new Bill, it is imperative to look at what instructors are seeing at colleges and what will happen now that the San Diego county community colleges have almost completely eliminating developmental English courses.

Methodological Overview

This qualitative research will entail interviews of at least 24 English faculty at all eight San Diego County community colleges. All results will be anonymous, and pseudonyms will be used for both the faculty members interviewed and the schools where they teach. In addition, course names and numbers will be changed so identifying information is not given in answers from faculty in order for them to feel safe to talk openly. The faculty selected will have previously taught the developmental education courses or they will currently be teaching one of

the English classes with a corequisite or support requirement. I will be looking at the points faculty raise about AB 705 using a constructivist paradigm.

I will also collect demographic information from the faculty before the interview to determine age, race/ethnicity, pronouns used, and what classes they have taught in that school's English department in the past and present in order to see if there are any themes in responses based on that information. All of this will be approved by the Claremont Graduate University Institutional Review Board before I proceed.

Definition of Terms

Remedial

It is important to understand the terms used the most for these types of classes – remedial and developmental. “Remedial” was used from the 1860s to the 1960s and focused on the fact students need help with specific skills they lack or need to work on in order to succeed in academics and beyond (Clowes, 1980; Hull, et al., 1991; Arendale, 2014, p. 30). Astin (1998) suggests “‘remedial student’ and ‘remedial education’ are basically social constructs that have strong negative connotations” (p. 21). Students need remedial skills to succeed in college, and they may need to overcome academic issues. However, it could also be that a student is defined as remedial based on test scores and class grades “but where we draw the line is completely arbitrary” (Astin, 1998, p. 21). This leads to concern some students may not actually have difficulties to overcome but, instead, it is the arbitrary placement that makes them remedial.

Ultimately, with the term remedial it is believed students’ academic problems can be “remedied” with further work after the student is diagnosed and the proper solution to solve their remedial issues is developed (Clowes, 1980; Astin, 1998). Hull, Rose, Fraser, & Castellano (1991) point out that terms used for students in low level classes in the past implied a lack of

intelligence but also that there was something wrong with the student's character (Hull et al., 1991). Later, though the lack of intelligence stigma was still around, character flaw labels eased up and the blame started to be placed on society producing students who were not able to do work at their grade level (Hull, et al., 1991). Additionally, race, culture, and socioeconomic status began to come into the language of talking about students not at the skill level expected for their grade level.

Developmental

Remedial was considered distinct from “developmental” because developmental courses were seen as helping students who had basic high school skills, which might not be the case with remedial students, but developmental students are viewed as needing more work to develop skills for college success. A stigma among students and faculty was attached to the word “remedial,” so when Harvard changed their Remedial Reading class's name to Reading Class, they saw an increase of 370 students taking the class (Clowes, 1980; Arendale, 2014, p. 36). This stigma has followed the term remedial throughout the history of higher education prompting a change in the use of the word.

In the 1970s, schools started using the term “developmental education” to refer to learning assistance. Developmental was considered a positive term because it described how students are always developing, and they want to move from one stage to another in their development. There was also the assumption that these students already had skills they could develop, or they simply had a weakness that could be overcome versus a deficiency (Hull, et al., 1991; Arendale, 2014, p. 45-46). Given the stigma of the term remedial, developmental became the commonly used term for pre-transfer level classes.

Organization of Study

This study will be organized into five chapters. The first chapter will include: an introduction, the statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study, the central and sub questions, the methodological overview, a brief background of AB 705, and the history of and definition of the terms remedial and developmental. The second chapter will be the literature review which will include: the history of remediation, reasons for universities accepting unprepared students, the community college mission; the California community college mission; community college faculty; community college student demographic information; California community college student data; the history of wanting to remove remediation from colleges and universities; controversy with remediation, the reasons people support remediation; reasons people are against remediation; and the history of California community colleges, acts, bills, and movements that aimed to help with remediation in higher education from 1907 to 2017. Chapter 3 contains the methodology and include the research design and research questions for the study, researcher positionality, the conceptual framework of critical policy analysis, how the data collected in the interviews will be coded, and the limitations of this study. Chapter four will discuss the key findings of the interviews, and chapter five will be a discussion and recommendations based on the results of this study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

In order to help students succeed in California higher education, the state, administrators, and schools have worked to assist learners in community colleges in a variety of ways. From laws to initiatives, there have been many attempts to guide pupils to help them accomplish their goals for attending college. However, because students come to higher education with a large variance in skill levels, it is challenging for schools to keep up with how to best help all of their students. After initially establishing junior/community colleges, other movements helped junior colleges to consider education beyond just the general requirements to also include adult education and vocational training in their missions.

This review of the literature will look at a few key things. First, the history of remediation will be discussed; then there will be an explanation of reasons universities were accepting students who were not academically prepared; next, the mission of community colleges and specifically California community colleges will be discussed followed by background on the community college faculty, their students, and California community college student demographics; the history and controversy of remediation and wanting to remove it from higher education will be explained next followed by a discussion of reasons people support this type of education. The chapter will end with the history of California community colleges and the acts, bills, and movements that have been enacted that influenced developmental instruction in these schools.

History of Remediation

Harvard

The need for remedial education started with the founding of Harvard in 1630. In the case of Harvard, the need for remediation was mainly because students did not know Latin or did not know it well enough to read their textbooks or understand the lectures which were mostly in Latin (Boylan & White, 1988; Boylan & White, 1994). Though there were admissions tests that may have kept students without the necessary skills out of the school, these students were still admitted with the requirement to meet with a Latin tutor so they could get the language skills needed to succeed at the university (White, Martirosyan, Wanjohi, 2014). Because of the admission of these students without the necessary skills in Latin, Harvard had tutors work with the students who were about to attend the school. Additionally, many students were required to continue this tutoring in their first year to improve their language skills. The tutoring mainly meant the tutor read the material to the students who recited it back. This was not especially effective, but the practice continued. The students at Harvard at this time were affluent white males, so the need for tutoring was not seen negatively, so this type of remediation did not have the negative association that developed later (Arendale, 2014).

Preparatory Schools

Over 100 years later in 1795, the University of North Carolina created a preparatory school to help students who were unprepared for college. The courses included grammar, writing, and math. Once the students passed these courses, they could then take regular college classes (Boylan & Bonham, 2014). In the early 1800s, schools did not have admission requirements like they do today, so as long as students had the money to attend schools, they generally could without any difficulty or concerns about their lack of preparation. This continued

to add to the number of students who were not ready to do college-level work though they were in higher education (Cafarella, 2014).

In 1830, New York University (NYU) began helping students with math, physical science, philosophy, and English in an “academic preparatory academy” (Arendale, 2014, p. 32). The main focus of this academy was for students to learn the content areas and there was no real work on methods for learning which could have helped these students in future classes.

In 1849, the University of Wisconsin started a preparatory department and it “provided remedial courses in reading, writing, and arithmetic to students who lacked sufficient background to succeed in more advanced college courses” and lasted for 31 years (Brier, 1984; Boylan & White, 1988, p. 4; Arendale, 2014). By 1895, 40% of students entering colleges and universities had been in these preparatory schools, and by 1900 in the United States, 80-84% of colleges and universities had these schools (Brier, 1984; Boylan & White, 1988, Boylan & White, 1994; Roueche & Roueche, 1993; Cohen & Brawer, 2014). Eventually the department closed in Wisconsin because people at the university were concerned it made the school look bad because it meant students were not as prepared as they should be for college. There was an attempt to rename the department instead of closing it, but people at the school were still upset about how the department made the school look, so it was forced to close (Arendale, 2010).

Higher Education Opened to More People

The Jacksonian Period of 1824-1848 led to higher education opening to more people in an effort to help improve lives. This meant anyone was able to attend college if they had the money. Therefore, people were attending even though they had little academic preparation because there was not a strong system of high schools in the country yet, therefore, not everyone was adequately prepared to go to school at a higher level (Boylan & White, 1994). Given this, in

1828, the *Yale Report* said students should not be admitted if they were not prepared (Brier, 1984). Concerned about the lack of preparation of students, colleges offered tutors to help, but this became an issue as more people needed the help, and there were not enough tutors to meet the demand. Additionally, schools found just working with tutors was not enough to help students, so remedial courses were seen as a better solution (Arendale, 2014).

Conditional Admission

Students in this time period also found themselves being admitted to schools conditionally. This was something commonly seen at Cornell University, and students accepted this way had to take preparatory classes or attend tutoring sessions as a condition of their acceptance (Brier, 1984). Harvard also used conditional status of admission in 1879 when 50% of the students admitted that year failed the entrance exam (Brier, 1984). The original tutoring given to students to help them pass their entrance exam changed to tutoring to help students pass their classes. Harvard was also dismayed to discover students who were in this situation were not just from low-income backgrounds but also students from the upper-class who they assumed had the high school education needed to succeed at their school (Brier, 1984). At the University of Buffalo, if students were not at college-level, they had to take a three-week class before the semester started, and if students did not succeed in the class, their admission was either rescinded, or the classes they could take were limited (Casazza & Silverman, 1996).

Tutoring schools

Another method of preparing students was seen in Cascadilla School in Ithaca, New York which was a “tutoring school” to prepare students for college entrance exams by helping them with subjects they would need to know for the exam but were not prepared to be tested on (Brier, 1984, p. 15). Additionally, wealthy families were able to send their children to “dame schools” in

England to prepare them for their college admissions tests. These boarding schools were “run by educated women of high social standing and education” (Arendale, 2014, p. 29). In addition to helping students prepare for the exam, they also gave students the developmental education skills they needed to succeed in college.

Morrill Act of 1862

The Morrill Act of 1862 established land grant colleges which encouraged more people to pursue an education no matter what their background; therefore, this act also necessitated the need for remedial work and college preparatory departments as many of these new students had not attended high school or had attended a school that did not prepare students for college. More students were now interested in higher education because the Act was partly to expand access to people in races and ethnicities who were not able to attend college before, but they were not necessarily prepared because the limits on their previous education (Witt, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 2014; Baber, et al. 2019). For example, Iowa State College only required students be 14 years old and able to read, write, and do math (Roueche & Roueche, 1993; Boylan & White, 1994). Consequently, it was easy to have students who had no other college skills or knowledge to enroll, but it did not mean they knew enough to do well with academic material. At the same time, there was an increase in desire for higher education because “...the agricultural and mechanical industrialization of American society became prominent. As a result, the industrial market required an influx of workers with advanced education beyond that provided in secondary schools” (Nevarez & Wood, 2010, p. 27). This meant education beyond high school was becoming necessary for more people than in the past.

Though the Morrill Act did not address community colleges directly, an increased interest in attending college came from this Act because people began to realize higher education

could be to learn a trade and for the “common people” and not just for the privileged classes and races to learn about the classics (Nevarez & Wood, 2010, p. 28).

Increase in Remedial Offerings

In 1889, it was reported that there were almost 400 institutes of higher education in the United States, but only 65 did not have a preparatory department – the rest offered these departments for students (Boylan & White, 1994, p. 5). Around the same time, “...enrollment in American colleges increased by 31% while preparatory enrollment increased 51%. In 1890, preparatory enrollment was only 5,000 less than the 39,000 regular collegiate students” (White, et al., 2014, p. 20). Besides the large number of college preparatory departments, “Eighty-four percent of land-grant institutions offered remedial courses by the late 1880s” (Arendale, 2014, p. 35). In addition to the need for academic preparation, schools also found the need to educate students in social skills and study skills which was done in the preparatory departments of these institutions (Brier, 1984).

Besides offering help in college preparatory departments, in 1874 Harvard had a remedial English class for first-year students (Arendale, 2014). Harvard also began offering “remedial reading” in the early 1900s (Casazza & Silverman, 1996, p. 22). Besides remedial academic courses and preparatory departments, schools also began to offer study skills courses (Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Arendale, 2014). The U.S. Commissioner for Education reported in 1913 that “approximately 80 percent of postsecondary institutions offered college preparatory programs with a wide variety of services, including tutoring and remedial courses” (Arendale, 2014, p. 36). There was now a realization in higher education that students needed a variety of support to help them do college-level work.

Students Not Ready for College for Various Reasons

Colleges that focused on a particular population like women and Black students also meant an increase in students who needed developmental education to succeed in college in the 19th century. Women and Black students were often unprepared for college because of their limited opportunities to attend high school (Boylan & White, 1994; Casazza & Silverman, 1996).

Many of the initial women's colleges found themselves offering courses and programs of study that were more like that of high school because of the lack of preparation females had for college, so degrees from women's institutions were not as highly valued as those from other institutions at this time. Also, administrators in higher education did not want women in this level of education in general for fear "admitting them would lower the standards of universities in general" (Casazza & Silverman, 1996, p. 18). This shows the initial reluctance to educate women and continued the need for remedial work in order to help them succeed when they were able to attend college.

Black students had been denied a formal education due to slavery, so after the Civil War, developmental education was needed at the newly formed Black colleges to help students with the skills they should have gotten leading up to college (Boylan & White, 1994). Colleges and universities were denied funding if discrimination was found in their admission processes, so the Black colleges that formed allowed students to get an education above high school though the reason these schools were formed was because of racism. The Black colleges "were more successful in their funding efforts when they held to a trade school curriculum rather than attempting to offer traditional liberal arts," showing the limitations being placed on Black students who wanted to get a degree which continues to be reflected in students of color placing into developmental classes into the 2000s (Casazza & Silverman, 1996, p. 17).

Additionally, students who were not ready for college were recruited, but many of them were unprepared because of their socioeconomic situation which prevented them from going to adequate high schools if they attended secondary school at all. Also, they may have been serving in the military during the Civil War instead of going to high school, so there were also gaps in education because of this. Schools at this time also started to offer college preparatory work specifically for students who were not old enough to serve in the war (Arendale, 2014; Casazza & Silverman, 1996). The schools wanted to admit younger students to help make up for money lost because students left to join the service, but the schools realized they needed to get these students academically prepared, so remediation work continued (Arendale, 2010).

Ivy League Schools

In 1907, remedial education was still a necessity even at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Princeton where “more than half the students entering...were reported as not meeting the formal entrance requirements” (Wright & Cahalan, 1985, p. 5; Casazza & Silverman, 1996). Additionally, “More than half of the students enrolled at Ivy League universities in 1913 had failed the college entrance examination and were placed in preparatory courses” (Boylan & Bonham, 2014, p. 5). Schools were increasing entrance requirements, but that did not mean students could meet those requirements, so remediation continued to be necessary.

The Start of Junior Colleges

In the early 1900s, junior colleges operated with the mission to help students with academic preparation, so four-year institutions began housing their remedial courses in local junior colleges in an effort for students to get that assistance there instead of at four-year schools. Furthermore, state and federal money began helping universities more, so this meant schools did not have to admit unprepared students to help with their income. Students now had somewhere to

go for a remedial education, so universities did not feel as much pressure to admit students who were not at college-level (Grubb, 1999; Arendale, 2014). More on junior/community colleges will be discussed later in this chapter.

Higher Education Act and Civil Rights Movement

The 1960s saw an increased need for remediation as students of color were beginning to be accepted into more colleges because of the civil rights movement and the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Arendale, 2002; Cafarella, 2014). The government saw this type of educational assistance as a way to make up for the fact many of these students attended high schools that did not prepare them, and they called this “compensatory education” (Roueche & Roueche, 1993; Arendale, 2014, p. 39). The government felt these courses were a responsibility to make up for discrimination and the poverty people faced because of racism. In addition to tutoring, counseling, and remedial classes, these programs also included activities for the students that would help to enrich them culturally and educationally (Cohen & Brawer, 2014; Arendale, 2014).

Open Access to Junior Colleges

In the 1960s, junior colleges began to admit everyone to fulfill the idea of opportunity and access for all, and “the vision of expanding postsecondary education has remained a core principle of these institutions throughout its tenure” (Nevarez & Wood, 2010, p. 4). This meant people who might have gone straight into the workforce before were now going to school, but that did not mean they were ready academically; therefore, the two-year schools now needed to work on helping students transfer to four-year institutions (Roueche & Baker, 1987; Boylan & White, 1988; Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Cohen & Brawer, 2014; Arendale, 2014).

At this time as well, four-year schools wanted to get GI Bill money which meant students who were not ready for four-year universities were no longer being accepted at them, so they were going to two-year schools more, and this changed the way these schools operated and gave them a focus on remediation (Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Grubb, 1999; Brothen & Wambach, 2004; Arendale, 2014).

Students going into the community colleges at this time were often placed into remedial classes and did not have a choice of the classes they wanted to take; therefore:

The open-door philosophy of the community college implies that these students should not be denied...if that access is limited to a developmental program that offers primarily the same type of basic education that failed the students in the lower schools, then students have been cruelly denied access to higher learning. (Cohen & Brawer, 2014, p. 270-271)

There was the concern that though these schools were supposed to be open access, many limitations were placed on students who attend them including placement tests and pre-transfer classes they had to take (Grubb, 1999). These issues highlight early concerns that students at schools open to all were still facing barriers to continuing their education in the form of class restrictions and requirements because of developmental course placements. The idea of schools being open access means everyone is welcome, but these limits pose challenges for the schools because not everyone was prepared for higher education.

1970s

Remedial education was also a reflection of social class and race because those from the upper class were more likely to get better academic preparation than those from lower economic classes or students of color (Roueche & Wheeler, 1973; Cross, 1976; Arendale, 2014). There was

an increase in college enrollment by as much as 45% in the 1970s, and “nearly 80% of all postsecondary institutions provided academic enrichment and support programs” (Arendale, 2010, p. 41). This showed students were still not coming to school prepared though high schools and colleges had been working together more than in the past.

A lot of this increase in enrollment had to do with adults entering the schools because of assistance like the GI Bill or students who had families before starting college, but these adults needed support that was different than the support their younger classmates required. Because of this need for distinct types of support besides just with academics, remedial programs also started to add tutoring, having students take fewer classes, and counseling services as far back as the 1950s (McGrath, 1965; Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Arendale, 2014). However, the 1970s were also a time period when schools realized how they were treating remedial courses mattered. For example, Harvard had a class called Remedial Reading, and then they changed the name to The Reading Class, “enrollment increased dramatically. From thirty reluctant freshmen per year, the classes began to attract hundreds of freshmen, upperclassmen, graduate students, and even professors from the law school” (Wyatt, 1992; Casazza & Silverman, 1996, p. 22). This highlights the continued stigma of remedial education in universities and colleges.

1980s

The 1980s saw an increase in hiring instructors specifically qualified to teach developmental and remedial courses though schools offered little training to help these faculty members (Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Maxwell, 1997; Arendale, 2014; Levine-Brown, Anthony, & Boylan, 2017). At the same time, professional organizations to support these teachers also began to increase because of the need to help these faculty members given the challenge of teaching courses at this level. Instructors were teaching developmental classes

without really knowing much about the classes or the students in them, so it was important for schools to look at qualifications for these teachers closer to make sure the students got the best help possible. Also, many times the classes were given to adjuncts who usually do not get as much time to prepare for classes and to attend training as full-time faculty. Additionally, the schools needed to be sure to offer professional development and training to the faculty teaching these classes (Casazza & Silverman, 1996; Maxwell, 1997; Arendale, 2014; Levine-Brown, Anthony, & Boylan, 2017).

1990s

In the 1990s, schools saw an upturn in enrollment while they also began to look for ways to save money and to meet the needs of so many students. Therefore, colleges began to contract with companies outside of the school to help with various campus resources (The Institute for Higher Education, 1998; Saxon & Boylan, 2001; Arendale, 2010). Something schools started to outsource was developmental education. They began to contract with Kaplan, Inc. and Sylvan Learning Systems to offer remedial instruction for college students through these companies instead of through the schools. One issue, however, was that students had to pay a fee in addition to their tuition since the companies running the programs were for-profit. This caused concern for the schools, so that was one reason the experiment ended quickly. Another reason this attempt with outside vendors providing remedial education ended was because schools began to use online tutoring for students in developmental courses. As funding and resources for remedial and learning assistance programs became harder for schools to get, programs were reduced (The Institute for Higher Education, 1998; Saxon & Boylan, 2001; Arendale, 2014).

Another system of getting students out of pre-college-level courses sooner that was looked at in the 1990s was modularization where students have to complete and show their

mastery of material in a particular module before they move to the next. This allows them to work at their own pace on the material which enables students to work as fast or as slow as they need while getting help to achieve mastery of the concepts (Ariovich, L., & Walker, 2014).

Reasons for Accepting Unprepared Students

Finances

Next, it is important to understand why schools accepted students who were not ready for college leading to the need for remedial work at universities. One reason we saw before is finances. Schools need students in order to make money (Arendale, 2010). This means in the early days of higher education, schools could not just rely on wealthy families to send their sons (as it was just males going to college originally) to school; therefore, universities needed to expand their student body. Consequently, colleges began to let people know they accepted students other schools would not in order to increase their enrollment. Students knew to apply to schools that were not as rigid if they could not pass admissions tests at other schools. The more difficult schools used their high standards for acceptance as a way to brag about the academic preparedness of their students (Arendale, 2014). Other schools looked to make a profit on students who could not get into every school.

During the Civil War, schools saw a loss in their finances because students were leaving to join the fighting, so colleges began allowing students younger than 14 and students who had previously been denied admission. However, because these were not students they would normally admit to their school, the students needed additional academic work to help them succeed in college (Arendale, 2014).

High School Issues

Additionally, high schools in the early years of the country had problems in general. Some students did not go to high school at all, and there were no set requirements for what high schools should be teaching, so there was inequity in education because each school was picking what to teach on its own. Furthermore, many high schools did not have college preparation programs, so students in many cases had no option to take the courses they needed before college (Brier, 1984).

Children in the Midwest were one group who struggled in higher education because there were not a lot public high schools, so many would-be-students were not able to attend high school. At the same time in the Midwest, there were more colleges than students with high school diplomas to use these schools, so that lead to schools having challenges with finding students (White, et al., 2014).

Colleges also did not have transparent standards for admission, so it was hard for high school students to get the academic preparation they needed if they did not know what the colleges wanted (Brier, 1984). The issues with high schools and lack of clear expectations from colleges meant schools were forced to admit students with minimal secondary education even if they would have preferred not to admit them. These were all challenges the country faced as they worked on their systems of education.

Desire to Remove Remediation from Higher Education

Introduction

This study will be looking at the latest bill in the state of California to help students who are in classes below transfer-level. In order to understand how the current measure has come about, it was important to start with the background of why there is remediation in colleges. This

section will now look at the controversy of there being remediation in colleges and universities to establish that context.

Controversy with Remediation

Like with all parts of education, there has been controversy concerning remedial education for a long time. Educators, administration, the government, and the public wonder things like: should students be accepted into a university if they are not prepared? If accepted, should courses be written to work with students at the level they came in at and not the level where the school wanted the students to be? If a student is taking a preparatory class that is not at college-level, should that course count for college credit? (Brier, 1984). Are schools lowering their standards if they admit students who need remedial work? (Attewell, 2014). From a taxpayer perspective, it is also argued people are paying for students to learn material twice if they graduated from high school without the skills they need for college and then the student needs to take developmental courses in a community college or state school (Arendale, 2010; Levine-Brown, Anthony, & Boylan, 2017).

The discussion of removing remedial courses from higher education began in 1977 when Illinois began calling for remedial coursework to be moved out of universities and into colleges by 1983. The state also felt no remedial courses should result in units towards a degree because the state believed preparatory work being offered at the university meant colleges were acting as high schools and not institutes of higher education (Wright & Cahalan, 1985). The Board of Education in Illinois wanted to make sure the high schools and not universities were doing preparatory work with students (White, et al., 2014).

Virginia and Maryland also started talking about remedial education around the same time. Those two states decided to increase admissions standards at universities as a way to

eliminate the need for remedial courses in four-year schools. During this same period, New Jersey began working with high schools to focus on basic skills with their students to help eliminate the need for these courses when the students entered higher education (White, et al., 2014). States like Tennessee started offering “transition” courses to high school seniors to help them learn the math skills they need in college so they can go straight into classes worth credits when they go on to post-secondary work (Sawchuk, 2018, p. 7).

Furthermore, in the 1990s, schools and educators began to question remedial education, and the public policies surrounding it also began to change (Atwell, et al., 2014). At this time, teachers began to realize there continued to be a stigma concerning remedial education, but that stigma had also spread to developmental education and learning assistance programs. Professors felt the other terms were just different ways of saying remedial, and they continued to see this type education in colleges and universities as negative.

Additionally, as when education was developing in the United States, high schools were often taking the blame for students not being ready for college. But many times, students not being prepared has to do with the socioeconomic status of the high schools’ communities which usually affects students of color the most (Roueche & Wheeler, 1973; Arendale, 2010; Levine-Brown, Anthony, & Boylan, 2017). However, in 1994 it was found that 29% of students in developmental courses at two-year institutions and 37% at four-year institutions were Black or Hispanic (Arendale, 2010). This meant there were concerns of racism and the need to eliminate discrimination in the placement of students in developmental classes. But, in an interview with Boylan in 2017, he pointed out the larger percentage of students in these classes are white, so “latent racism contributed to some of the negative attitudes about developmental education” (Levine-Brown, Anthony, & Boylan, 2017, p. 19). This means that although racism in placement

needs to be considered, the reputation of the classes was more of the issue that needed to be addressed.

At the same time, people questioned if it was fair that remedial programs originally created to help upper class, white, male college students are being discontinued when these same programs are needed to help students who do not fall into these demographic categories (Arendale, 2010).

These are just some of the current movements to change remedial work in higher education. There are other movements, and there will no doubt be even more as remedial education in colleges is reconsidered.

In Support of Remedial Education

Introduction

Although many people oppose remedial work in higher education, there are some people who still support this work happening after high school. This section will elaborate on the arguments being made in support of remediation in colleges and universities.

Helps Students

One of the main reasons supporters of remedial education cite in favor of these classes is they help students of color, those from lower incomes, and those whose first language is not English. These researchers argue that students from these backgrounds would not be able to transfer to or initially attend a four-year college without remediation work at the community college level (Attewell, et al., 2014). Also, proponents feel these classes are necessary for students to succeed in college courses and life in general, so they believe remediation in reading, writing, and math is necessary for learners who still need improvement in these areas (Bahr, 2010). It was also noted as early as 1998 that the workforce is rapidly changing in terms of the

skills employees need, and given the complaint there are many unskilled workers in a time where there are many high skill jobs to be filled, basic skills classes are necessary to help the workforce to grow and succeed (Kozieracki, 2002).

Two researchers cautioned early on in the movement to stop offering remedial work in higher education that the implementation is concerning. While in the past students would have had required developmental classes to get to college-level classes if the students did not come in at that level, schools started to offer corequisite classes which combined transfer-level classes with developmental classes allowing students to get college credit right away. Goudas & Boylan, (2012) commented, "...the suggestion to completely replace prerequisites with corequisites is a radical shift in the history of developmental courses in higher education and all educators should be extremely concerned about the potentially harmful changes" (p. 12). Just because something has traditionally been done does not mean it is the best course of action, but the suggested change may also not be better, so this is a point to consider as schools move to eliminate remedial work and start requiring corequisites instead.

More Likely to Persist

A study by Bahr (2010) found there can be success for students who start in developmental classes:

...those who do remediate successfully go on to acquire two-year credentials and to transfer to four-year institutions at rates that are comparable to those of college-prepared students who attain similar math and English competency... students who are sorely underprepared for college coursework, even in multiple skills areas, may succeed and achieve well beyond what one would predict based on their initial course placements. (Bahr, 2010, p. 200)

This is important to note because it shows basic skills courses are believed to be beneficial, and it may be necessary to help unprepared students to get to the levels of their classmates who came in not needing remediation. These classes helped students to succeed in their academic tracks when they might not have without the extra coursework. Moreover, Bettinger and Long (2005) found students who went through remedial courses had higher persistence and graduation rates, and this was especially noticeable with minority students. Therefore, they “suggest that outright remediation would be dangerous and counterproductive” (Braxton, et al., 2013, p. 27). This needs to be considered as schools think about helping their students persist.

Not as Expensive as Other Options

In 1998, The Institute for Higher Education Policy stated, “Developmental education is less costly than the alternatives, which can include unemployment, low-wage jobs, welfare participation, and incarceration” (Kozeracki, 2002, n.p.). Since one of the arguments against remediation has to do with the cost to fund these classes and that the state is paying twice for students to learn subjects, this point becomes one to consider – is it worth spending the money for developmental education in order to cut the costs of other social programs and issues? The idea is developmental education will empower students and prevent them from worse fates in the future because they will be educated.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said between 1994 and 2005 there would be the greatest increase in jobs that required people to have an associate degree, and the need for more advanced degrees would also increase, so remedial courses would help some students achieve their goals for a degree (Adelman 1998; Merisotis & Phipps, 2000). This stresses the economic impact of higher education and reiterates the need to get people to complete community college. One way of helping students pass could be by offering basic skills

coursework to get them to college-level and prepare them for success in all of their classes with these skills.

Criticism of Developmental Education

Introduction

The controversy over remediation in higher education also exists because many people are opposed to these classes at this level. This section will explain the main arguments opponents of higher education make.

Students Taking too Many Courses

One challenge with developmental classes is because the students in them are discouraged, and the students “without the necessary academic skills are more likely to fail their courses and have lower graduation rates” (Xu, Hartman, Uribe, & Mencke, 2001, p. 22) The students are confused as to why they have to take a class they feel they took in high school since they completed it there already, and this can make the student frustrated and less academically motivated (Hodara & Smith Jaggars, 2014). It has been found that the fewer classes below-transfer a student has to take, the more likely they are to complete a degree (Boylan & Saxon, 1999; Brothen & Wambach, 2004).

There was concern students were not getting out of the remedial classes and into transfer-level courses, so states wanted to work to fix this problem. In a study looking at 57 community colleges in seven states, it was discovered that only 17% of students who placed three levels below transfer in math completed the developmental courses they needed in three years (Adelman, 1999; Adelman, 2006; Arendale, 2010; Braxton, et al., 2013). After complaints that too many students get bogged down trying to complete those pre-transfer level requirements and then do not graduate because of the additional units of remedial courses they have to take before

even getting to required units, schools wanted to make sure students were able to reach their educational goals (Attewell, et al., 2014).

Likewise, Bahr (2012) found students “who began the writing sequence at lower points of entry were more likely to delay their first writing course than students who began at higher points” which can also lead to delays in finishing school if students finish at all (p. 685).

Additionally, Bahr (2012) said students who delayed taking these courses were also more likely to: fail them when they did take them; not continue in the remedial sequence at the school; and if they did try the next step in the remedial sequence, they were more likely to delay taking the next class instead of taking it the semester or quarter directly after the first class. An additional challenge was found by Bahr (2007) who discovered the need for remedial English makes it harder for students to do well in remedial math classes. He revealed students in the lowest levels of remedial math were not very likely to get through remedial math sequences successfully even if they were not students in the lowest level of English remediation. Students in very low levels English courses who are in the lowest level math classes are very unlikely to get through remedial math sequences successfully (Bahr, 2007).

Students getting trapped in remedial sequences of courses in any subject for too long is seen as an issue because:

The traditional system of developmental education has negative side effects (at the very least, developmental coursework takes time and resources and may discourage students) which, when considering the developmental population as a whole, tend to balance out its positive effects. (Bailey, Jaggars, & Scott-Clayton, 2013, p. 2)

Given this, Bailey et al. (2013) highlight that they do not think developmental education should be eliminated, but they think it should be revised so students can get the support they need more

efficiently and in a way that is not as likely to keep them in an endless cycle of classes that do not count towards graduation.

Another concern about the remedial sequences is the amount of time students spend in these classes leads to students not completing their coursework. “Fewer than half of community college developmental education students complete their assigned remedial sequences—and many fewer do so among those students assigned to multiple levels” (Bailey, et al., 2013, p. 7). This becomes an issue for a variety of reasons. One reason is then the students do not complete what they came to the college to do, and the schools do not know where the students end up or what they do with their lives. This is concerning for a system of education whose mission includes the idea of wanting to make the future better for its students. Will their futures be better without the education they originally desired?

Unfair Testing

Researchers believe many students could possibly do fine in a college-level courses, but they are not as good at testing as others, get very stressed for tests, could be sick on the test day, or have other issues that cause them to not do well on placement tests, so they end up in remedial courses (Jaggars & Bickerstaff, 2018). To help with this issue, in the 2000s, many schools began to look at other ways to determine the classes students would have to take. One method schools developed is offering students review courses before they take the placement exam(s) or after they have taken and failed the test(s). This way students can review the material before they test or before they retest (Bailey, et al., 2013; Jaggars & Bickerstaff, 2018). Though schools have never been able to require students to take remedial courses in California, many students did not know that when they got their course recommendations after placement testing, and many students did not know schools generally had a process for appeals concerning their placement in

developmental courses. Also, many schools do not adequately explain the purpose or ramifications of the tests, so students do not realize how seriously they have to take them (Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015). If students knew they could be in three semesters of coursework before they get to transfer-level, it is possible they would approach the tests differently. That does not mean they would necessarily do better on them, but they would at least realize the high stakes of the tests going into them.

Bailey et al. (2015) also noted that because students are placed in these courses by test scores, comparing students who scored higher versus those who score below college-level to start with is not fair or accurate when looking at data. The authors continue to criticize the fact that cut-off scores used in tests mean students could be very close or very far from the cut-off, but they would place in the same classes though their skillsets could be different. Bailey (2008) also suggests that students who have cutoff scores just below the requirements would be fine in college-level classes and would be more likely to succeed if they took the higher-level class. Bailey et al. (2015) argue that when data is used to compare students who were college-ready or close to being ready with students who were further from transfer-level work, the comparison is not equivalent, so conclusions drawn from that data is not valid (Bailey et al., 2015). This means schools could be looking at the scores in ways that do not accurately measure students' skillsets.

In his research, Bailey (2008) also talks about the variety of placement tests schools give to students and how what they measure of students' abilities can vary. Surprisingly, he also explains schools can pick the cutoff scores for placement themselves, so this means a student may place in a lower or higher-level class depending on the school where they test (Bailey, 2008; Saxon & Boylan, 2001). Though some states have mandated scores for consistency, not all have, and the attempt to do this has been fought by faculty because they do not think all schools align

in terms of student standards (Bailey et al., 2015). These issues leave students at a loss for what they need to do and why they were told they do not have the skills required by colleges despite graduating from high school.

There is also frustration with placement tests because they are only looking for specific skills and not all the skills a student needs to do well in college. Without gauging college skills on the tests, students may do well on placement tests but still may not have basic knowledge and skills to navigate college (Bailey, et al., 2015). Another concern about placement tests is that they do not provide information to instructors about what a student's weaknesses are and what type of developmental work might be best for them, so taking the tests does not provide professors any feedback that would be useful for working to help students in their classes.

Discrimination in Testing

Besides having issues with testing in general, there are racial issues with testing leading to placement because "... African American students are significantly more likely to enroll in college remedial courses than are white students with the same academic skills and preparation and social background" (Attewell, et al., 2014). Though there is not enough data to know if Black students are being told they have to take these classes or if they are choosing to take them on their own, the fact remains this is an alarming piece of information.

This concern about inequity in placement among ethnicities and races is further elaborated on by Brathwaite and Edgecombe (2018) who note the "completion gap...between white students and black and Latino students in a California community college district is explained by differences in level of placement" (p. 22). Furthermore, socioeconomic status and gender can also lead to unequal placement in developmental courses. In Brathwaite and Edgecombe's (2018) study, they found that with multiple measures being used for placement,

Pell Grant recipients were placed into transfer-level English at a rate of 15% and women are more likely to place into college-level English by 5% (p. 23). Other researchers argue, “Despite their open-access mission, then, community colleges may inadvertently reinforce the stratification of educational opportunities by diverting low-income students from bachelor’s degrees” (Hodara & Jaggars, 2014, p. 246).

These are race and income concerns about the democracy of community colleges and if these schools are still working the way they were intended as open access institutions. The placement tests can discriminate based on race, income, and gender, so they limit the access to certain classes for students who need remediation work.

Need for Other Skills to Succeed

Students may also place into college-level work due to these tests, but then those students might find themselves struggling in the classes because they lack other proficiencies like time management and study skills that are needed to be good students. For example, skills like “metacognitive skills, critical-thinking skills, and levels of academic motivation” are not measured, and they can be even bigger predictors of success than academic skills (Bailey, et al., 2015, p. 127). Therefore, the students might be in a transfer-level course, but they still might not pass because of other proficiencies they lack beyond academic talent (Bailey, et al., 2013). Moreover, Bailey, et al. (2015) explain that students who placed at the developmental level did not do worse than other students when attempting higher level courses, so it may not be skills in subjects but other college skills that matter more for student success.

One problem for students coming from high schools is, “Because colleges have not clearly articulated the skills that students must possess to be college-ready, students are blindsided when they are placed into remedial courses, and high schools don’t have a clear

benchmark for preparing students for success” (Vandal & Wellman, 2011, n.p.). Besides issues for students coming from high school, often students come to community colleges years after they have had any formal schooling. This means the math and English skills they are tested on may not be something they have retained since they first learned the material, and this can cause them to be placed in remedial courses when a quick refresher of some sort (review sessions, an intensive course over a few weeks before the semester, etc.) might help them remember the information to successfully pass the test and place into college-level classes (Vandal & Wellman, 2011).

Money/Cost to Schools

The early 2000s saw public universities eliminating remedial courses and having students that needed those courses take them at community colleges, and 100% of community colleges offer developmental classes (Brothen & Wambach, 2004; Attewell, et al., 2014). State governments began expressing concern about the number of students in remedial courses in community colleges especially, and they also were concerned many of these students did not pass the classes and ended up having to repeat them. Upset at the amount of money being spent on remedial education, state governments began tying funding for schools to student success and retention rates. Various organizations have given schools grants to help students in remedial classes succeed, and schools began trying programs like acceleration to move students through remedial sequences faster in an effort to retain those students. Furthermore, paying for basic skills coursework at the college level is seen by the public and some in the government as having to “pay a second time for students to learn what they should have learned in K-12” (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011, p. 167). This frustrates them and makes them wonder why colleges are getting money to teach these courses when these are skills that should have already been learned. It also

makes people wonder why high schools are passing students who do not have basic skills in English, reading, and math.

Other researchers argue it costs too much money to offer developmental courses with very little student success which means the classes are not worth it, but Goudas & Boylan (2012) argue developmental classes are only 2% of the budget, so that is not substantial enough to cause concern about having a financial impact in schools. Instead of 2%, others say schools generally only spend 1% of their budget on remediation for both freshmen and “returning adult students” (Breneman & Haarlow, 1998, p. 8; Institute for Higher Education, 1998; Brothen & Wombach, 2004; Bailey, 2009). However, more recently The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation estimated the cost of remedial education to be \$2.3 billion a year, and the Institute of Higher Education concedes that their original estimates may be off, and it may be closer to 2% of schools’ budgets spent on remediation (Institute for Higher Education, 1998; “Getting Past Go”, 2010). Saxon and Boylan (2001) found remedial costs are the same as or less than the revenue the schools bring in from these classes, so the schools do not have to spend extra money for the classes and they “pay for themselves” (Saxon & Boylan, 2001; Brothen & Wambach, 2004, p. 17). Saxon and Boylan (2001) also highlight that community college remedial classes generally get revenue instead of lose revenue from these classes and given this information and that there are so few studies on the costs, they suggest large-scale changes to remedial education should not be based on finances alone.

Money/Cost to Students

Another concern is that though remedial courses do not count towards units needed for graduation, they do count towards financial aid limits, so a student might reach their maximum amount of aid before they have even gotten to transfer-level work. This will also cause students

not to complete their coursework because they have run out of funds (Bailey, 2008; Bailey, et al., 2013). Or, if a student is not on financial aid, they may not take all the classes they planned because they paid for developmental classes first.

For low-income students, those who have work or family responsibilities, or students who may be on time-limited financial aid, the requirement to take extra courses is especially perilous. These students are caught in a dilemma:

They may need remediation and may not be able to finish their college programs without such classes; but the extra time required, the drudgery of many courses...and the lack of any connection to their academic or vocational ambitions may knock them out of college altogether. (Grubb, 1999, p. 175)

This means students may have only mastered “basic skills” which will benefit them, but if they leave college at that point, those skills will probably not be enough to get a job that will enable them to flourish in the career they hoped for when they started college. This also means many students may have too many other responsibilities to have time for remedial courses; they need to get their certificate or degree and start working as soon as possible, so the students may leave school without the qualifications they went in for and without the skills to get the job they hoped for because of their need to earn money sooner.

It is estimated “that each developmental course costs students \$3,000 and adds \$1,000 in student loan debt” (Valentine, Konstantopoulos, & Goldrick-Rab, 2017). This is money students do not always have, so they often will choose not to incur the cost or debt and will instead leave school. Additionally, Breneman and Haarlow (1998) say students in remedial classes have economic costs because of their inability to get higher paying jobs because of their need for remediation. Bailey (2008) reiterates that these classes mean students are not getting into higher

paying jobs as quickly as students who do not need pre-transfer level classes, so it is a financial cost to students because they are not yet earning the money they could after they get a degree.

The Community College Mission

Given the emergence of the need for community colleges, it is significant to look at their missions in relation to remedial courses. No matter what the state or individual college's mission is, "Community colleges have an implied social contract with the public to act as 'the people's college,' serving whatever are the local and perhaps regional needs, and fulfilling this contract requires deeply understanding each individual college's mission(s) and enacting it strategically" (Amey, 2017, p. 95). This is noted to highlight that no matter what changes are occurring in schools and the way these schools help students, the fact remains they are open-access institutions that need to serve the community where they are located. Ayers (2017) highlights that mission statements for community colleges serve a few purposes: to act as advertising and outreach for the school, to make people in the community and local government aware of what is done at the school, and to help dictate the plans and budget in order to achieve the school's goals.

The California Community College Mission

Though community colleges were established in California in 1907, it wasn't until 1973 when they began creating mission statements using Peter Drucker's idea for management and translating his idea into higher education in order for schools to distinguish themselves from each other (Beach, 2010; Ayers, 2017). According to the California Community College Chancellor's Office, "The mission of the California Community College Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office is to empower the community colleges through leadership, advocacy and support" (California Community College Mission, 2019). They continue on to state that their vision is: "...of a better future for Californians by exemplifying exceptional leadership, advocacy

and support on behalf of the community colleges. Their guidance provides access to lifelong learning for all citizens and creates a skilled, progressive workforce to advance the state's interests" (California Community College Vision, 2019, n.p.). There is an emphasis on the schools being for everyone and includes lifelong learning for everyone in the state.

Community College Faculty

Faculty are at the heart of the community college mission as they are the ones responsible for helping their students learn and advance. Additionally, they are the people who need to enact policies their administration gives them based on what the state is telling them to do. Since this research will look specifically at faculty and AB 705, it is also essential to consider information about the faculty at community colleges.

With community colleges originally starting as part of high schools, the requirements of full-time faculty come from state educational codes. These contractual requirements might include preparing the classes and continuing professional development (Aguilar-Smith & Gonzales, 2021). Additionally, faculty might be responsible for, "Mandated on-campus hours for faculty members, assigned teaching schedules, textbook selected by committees, and obligatory attendance at college events" (Cohen & Brawer, 2014, p. 80). Today, there are about 350,000 faculty members at community colleges in the United States, and of those faculty, about 58% are part-time (Aguilar-Smith & Gonzales, 2021; Finley & Kinslow, 2016). Part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty because they cost less, but schools with more full-time faculty have higher rates of retention of students (Smith, 2010; Cohen & Brawer, 2014). However, since adjuncts are cheaper to schools, they hire more of them than full-time faculty.

Generally speaking, in the United States the community colleges have more female than male teachers, those instructors have at least a master's degree in the subject they are teaching or

else they have “equivalent experience in the occupations they teach,” they do not do as much scholarly research and writing, and they usually teach between four and five classes a semester if they are full-time (Cohen & Brawer, 2014, p. 81; Finley & Kinslow, 2016). Though originally a master’s degree was preferred because schools felt a doctorate only prepared faculty to research and not teach, the percentage of community college faculty with doctorates went from less than 4% in the 1920s to “19 percent of full-time and 14 percent of part-time instructors” by 2003 showing that doctoral schooling can help with teaching (Cohen & Brawer, 2014, p. 84).

As with every job, there are benefits and complaints. For community colleges, some of the generalized benefits and disadvantages are explained here:

Compared with university faculty, community college instructors are more satisfied with their salaries, the reputation of their departments and their institutions, the time they can spend with their family, and their social relations with other faculty. They are less satisfied with the quality of their students, teaching load, rigidity of their work schedule, and opportunities for scholarly pursuits and professional recognition. (Cohen & Brawer, 2014, p. 100)

This means the faculty who choose to teach at the community college enjoy many benefits, but they are also striving to deal with challenges that come with their jobs.

Community College Students

Due to the open access for all people responsibility, community colleges tend to have more diverse students than universities and private colleges. The diversity seen is in ethnicity, race, and socioeconomic status among other demographic characteristics. There are many different goals for attending these schools with some students taking classes to transfer to a university while others are taking classes for a certificate, an AA degree, or for personal

enrichment. In fall of 2017, 49.6% of the higher education institutions in the United States were public two-year colleges, and 43% of them were Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) (“Hispanic-Serving Institutions: 2018-19,” 2018; Baber, 2019). Being an HSI means the school has at least 25% of their enrollment consisting of Hispanic students who are full-time undergraduates (“Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program - Definition of an HIS, 2016). In 2017, associate degrees were awarded to 57.3% women, and 55.1% “were awarded to Whites, followed by 19.5% to Hispanic or Latino students, 12.3% to Black or African American students, 5.0% to Asian students, 0.9% to American Indian/Alaskan Native students, and 0.2% to Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students” (Ginder, et al., 2018; Baber, 2019, p. 209). This information gives an overview of community college students in general.

California Community College Students

As this study takes place in California, it is also important to consider the student demographics at students in community colleges in this state. The California Community College system has over 2.1 million students in their 116 colleges, and of the 116 community colleges in California, 104 of them were Hispanic Serving Institutions as of fall 2018, and the eight community colleges in San Diego County are HSIs (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, 2019; “Hispanic-Serving Institutions: 2018-19,” 2018). Of the over two million students in California community colleges, 44.54% are Hispanic, 25.88% are white, 11.56% are Asian, 5.9% are African-American, 4.77% are unknown, 3.82% are multi-ethnicity, 0.43% are Native American, and 0.41% are Pacific Islander (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, 2019). Almost half of the students in California community colleges are over age 25 with 53.6% of them being female (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, 2019).

Looking at the overall ethnicity/race data for California community college students in comparison to the eight colleges in San Diego County, the numbers are similar to the state average. Additionally, the state of California and the San Diego County 2019 demographic information shows that white and Hispanic or Latino are the highest racial group percentages of the population in the state which is also reflected in the community college enrollment (“QuickFacts: San Diego County, California; California; United States,” 2019).

History of the California Community Colleges and their Acts, Bills, and Movements Which Influenced Remediation

Given the history of and the many sides of the issue of remediation work in higher education, I will now outline the laws and initiatives that have been implemented over the years which have led to AB 705. This is done to consider how community colleges in the state of California started and what revisions have been made to them in an effort to encourage open access schools while promoting student equity and success.

Upward Extension Law (1907) Assembly Bill 528 (1907)

Though there is some debate as to the origin of California community colleges, they were originally seen as a continuation of high school, and in 1907, “California was the first state to develop and fund a network of public junior colleges” (Brubacher & Rudy, 2007; Douglass, 2007, p. 11). William Rainey Harper created the first junior college in Illinois, and upon talking to people at Stanford College and University of California Berkeley, they took the junior college information Harper gave them to form their own junior college system in California. At this time, high schools were covering college preparatory education, but Alexis Lange, a professor and Dean of the School of Education at Berkeley who is called “the father of the California junior college movement,” took the idea of junior colleges to the state Senate where State

Senator Anthony Caminetti authored the Upward Extension Law (Butts & Cremin, 1953; Witt, 1994; Beach, 2010, p. 71).

Though many high schools were offering college classes already, the state passed the Upward Extension Law to formalize what was happening and added more oversight (Witt, 1994). Furthermore, the Law helped make the school system “more unified, more consistent with the needs of the people who make them possible. Equal educational opportunity for all must not be a mere theory, as in the past, but a fact. Ours must be a system functioning for the greatest social efficiency for all the citizens of the state, and not for just a few” (Gray, 1915, p. 468). The Law also said high schools “may prescribe postgraduate courses of study for the graduates of such high schools...which course of study shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses” (McLane, 1913, p. 162; Eells, 1931; Butts, 1953; Witt 1994). This Law “formally allowed California high schools not just to prepare students for college but also to offer a junior college curriculum that was the equivalent of first- and second-year undergraduate courses at the University of California” (Beach, 2010, p. 71). In passing the Law, California became the first state to begin to figure out how junior colleges would work in their higher education system as a means for helping to prepare students before they continued on to a university, and it laid the groundwork for what was to be developed for the community college system in the state. However, this initial law did not help with funding the junior colleges.

For the next 14 years, California formed 18 junior colleges mostly housed on high school campuses that worked with the state’s universities to accept junior college students upon completion of their education at those schools (Beach, 2010). It was in 1910 when the Associate of Art (AA) degree (known as the “junior college certificate”) began, and it meant a student would be able to transfer to Berkeley and other UC schools automatically as a junior (Douglass,

2007, p. 36; Beach, 2010). Given the agreement to accept students with an AA at the University of California (UC) schools and to ensure the quality of the junior colleges, the junior colleges had to be accredited by faculty from the University of California.

In 1910, Fresno began the first junior college in California, and it focused on vocational education and courses for transfer to the university. By 1912, there were four more junior colleges in the state (Eells, 1931; Douglass, 2007; Beach 2010). The junior colleges were seen as a way to reach students who did not live near the universities which were only in Palo Alto, Berkeley, and Los Angeles originally, and this also offered opportunities for schooling to students whose parents might not want their child to go to school far from home to live at these universities. Additionally, students who might not have had the money to travel from home and live away from home were able to access community colleges which opened up higher education to more people (McLane, 1913; Gray, 1915; Eells, 1931; Witt, 1994; Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Beach, 2010).

Furthermore, the junior colleges were seen as a way to provide vocational training to students and have professional training occur at universities. Alexis Lange also saw junior colleges as a way to keep universities as places “only for those students who were ‘capable of carrying on university work’ and that the remainder of the aspiring, yet ‘incapable’ California population would be ‘den[ied] admission’” and could attend junior colleges instead (Beach, 2010, p. 74). However, others saw junior colleges as having two purposes – preparation for the university and as a terminal education leading to a specific career (Witt, 1994).

A report in 1937 indicated that 80% of junior college students did not continue to universities, so this justified the need for junior colleges to be separate from universities and for the schools to have different roles (Beach, 2010). Though it would not be until 1960 that

California formally adopted the structure of three different roles of state schools of higher education, in the 1930s community colleges “seemed to offer democratic equality and meritocratic opportunity to new generations of high school graduates, it also structured a socially efficient and hierarchically tiered system of higher education that would constrain social mobility of lower-class, non-white, and immigrant students” (Beach, 2010, p. 74). This highlights the early inequities seen in how students were treated in higher education that have led to many of the policies that will further be discussed in this chapter.

Ballard Act (1917)

Though a previous attempt to fund junior colleges was made by the state of California in 1909, it wasn't until the Ballard Act in 1917 that money was allocated from the state and counties for junior colleges. This act also “introduced the use of the words ‘junior college courses’ for the previously stated ‘post-high school or postgraduate courses’” (Winter, 1964, p. 5; Witt, 1994; Beach, 2010). The Act set up a yearly amount that would go to each school and then distributed money based on student attendance on a daily basis. The schools also received funding from taxes and the fees that were placed on nonresident students (Beach, 2010).

The Ballard Act also dictated the amount of money schools would get, what was required for schools to establish junior colleges, defined what was required in terms of units for students to graduate, and it outlined the types of classes the junior colleges could offer (Winter, 1964; Witt, 1994). Additionally, the act required that classes “had to be approved by the State Department of Education before any state funds could be given the school” (Winter, 1964, p. 5). This Act's granting of funding to community colleges resulted in five more such schools to form.

Junior College Act and the Smith-Hughes Act (1917)

The Junior College Act of 1917 deemed junior colleges to be part of the secondary school system in the state of California (1917 amendment to the California State Political Code: Chapter 304). This Act set the requirement of 60 credit hours to graduate, and the courses could be offered at high schools or at local junior colleges (“1917 Amendment to the California State Political Code: Chapter 304,” 2019). The attendance of students in classes at a college was counted towards attendance figures for the high school district where the junior college was located. To figure out funding, the district superintendent needed to include the junior college(s) located in the district as well as the high school(s) (“1917 Amendment to the California State Political Code: Chapter 304,” 2019).

The same year, the Smith-Hughes Act was passed and gave vocational education programs federal money to ensure schools participated in vocational programs which also meant junior colleges were actively involved in helping to educate students for careers that required vocational degrees (CA Dept of Ed, 2007; Baber, 2019). This movement helped the existing junior colleges to expand and further develop their role with specific goals and purposes in the California higher education system.

The District Junior College Law of 1921

This was passed to amend the Ballard Act and had the community colleges form “districts to fund and administer junior colleges” (Eells, 1931; Witt, 1994, p. 52). These districts were formed by high school districts or, if there was not a high school district in the county, they could form a junior college district. This new Law also required a certain value of real estate, a certain population, and specific “average daily high school attendance” for a junior college district to be formed (Eells, 1931; Witt, 1994, p. 52). The law dictated the amount of money the state would provide the district, and it also led to the districts creating their own boards of

education. It was responsible for seven junior college districts forming within two years. With this new funding, the Law led to high schools moving away from housing the junior colleges and instead the junior college districts started their own campuses (Witt, 1994). Additionally, the law allowed the UC schools “to inspect affiliated junior colleges and dictate their teacher qualifications” (Eells, 1931; Witt, 1994, p. 53). This was done to make sure qualified teachers were helping students who would be transferring to universities.

1929

An unnamed law was passed in California in 1929 which required districts to have more money than in the 1921 Act in order to start a junior college. The 1929 law also set average daily attendance of students for the first two years of a new junior college district (Eells, 1931).

The Carnegie Report (1931)

The governor and state legislature of California wanted a study done on the state’s system of higher education, so the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was hired. The final Carnegie Report specifically talked about junior colleges saying they:

...gave a wholly admirable description of the work being done by the junior colleges at that time; it characterized fairly some questionable practices in higher education; and it presented a constructive theory and plans for the future development of a junior college program. (Seashore, 1940, p. 21)

This was the start of the state really looking into the junior colleges and deciding the path the schools should take in the state’s higher education system. The Report stressed the fact that junior colleges were a higher and final stage of high school with “the dominate purpose...is general to all purposes of civilized life insofar as different students wish to or can achieve them” (Seashore, 1940, p. 21). They saw the curriculum at junior colleges as being for: social

intelligence; core curriculum such as literature, languages, music, and visual arts; university requirements; vocational courses; pre-professional study; pre-academic study; and adult education. The Report also noted that the time for experimenting with the junior college needed to end and the policies for the schools and their organization needed to be formalized. It was suggested that the state should form a new Board of Education for the junior colleges to work with the University of California to make sure these schools were helping their students as effectively as possible (Seashore, 1940).

George-Deen Act (1937)

“Community colleges have long functioned as the most responsive academic entities to local economic development needs” (Yarnall, 2014, p. 250). Part of the need of local communities is skilled workers, so the George-Deen Act continued reiterating the importance of vocational education in community colleges. It gave federal money “to institutions that offered preparatory courses for employment in industry versus regular liberal arts college courses” (Witt, 1994; Cohen, 2001; Cohen & Brawer, 2014; Baber, 2019, p. 207). By giving community colleges this funding, the idea of higher education open to all people was also reiterated as something the government saw as an important role of these schools in order to help local economies.

The Truman Report (1947)

In 1947, there were 600 junior colleges in the country that were “confused in mission and faced an uncertain future” (Quigley & Bailey, 2003, p. xii). The Truman Report was released that year and encouraged the idea that more students should be able to receive a higher education, and in addition to creating more community colleges, these schools also needed take on more functions and would be considered attending school through the 14th grade-level. This

also meant these schools should be free like high schools, and the authors of the Report realized the financial help should not just be for tuition but also for necessities students required for classes and living in general so they would not have to drop out for financial reasons (Thelin, 2014).

The Report specifically notes, “Whatever form the community college takes, its purpose is educational service to the entire community” (Zook, 1947, p. 67). The hope of the authors was that these schools would help people who might have had limitations on higher education due to “geographic and economic barriers” to now have a chance at some form of education after high school (Zook, 1947, p. 67). In addition, the Report “called for the full availability of educational opportunity to Americans regardless of race, gender, religion, or economic status...to be fulfilled by the junior college/community college” (Baber, 2019, p. 207). This continued the idea that community colleges should be open to anyone who wants to attend them and barriers to access needed to be removed.

The Report also envisioned that these schools would help with adult education, general education, and vocational training in their respective communities. The authors felt community colleges should offer education in ways other institutions did not so classes could be accessible to more people; for example, offering night classes for people who work during the day was recommended (Zook, 1947). The authors believed opening more community colleges would allow a larger number of people who may not have considered higher education before to consider it now because now classes would be cheaper, more geographically accessible, and available to people in their community.

Donahoe Act – 1960 (The California Master Plan for Higher Education)

Switching from the name junior colleges to community colleges by the 1960s, California began working on their community college system more when the Donahoe Act (also known as the California Master Plan for Higher Education) became a law on April 26, 1960 (Donahoe Report, 1960; Douglass, 2007; UC Institutional Research and Academic Planning, 2017). This Act was in response to the large number of people moving to the state and the desire of the government to make sure there was some order to the new schools opening in response to the population boom (Grenier, 1990).

Mainly, this Act helped distinguish the public systems of higher education in California from each other by naming three sections of the system. One of the distinctions of higher education in the state was the naming of the University of California system as the “primary academic research institution” from undergraduate through all levels of graduate studies which would accept the top students in their high school classes. A second distinction in the higher education system in the state was the California State University (CSU) system focusing on graduate and undergraduate education with only the ability to award four specific doctoral degrees. The CSU system would accept a larger percentage of graduating high school students than the UC system. The final distinction in California’s system of higher education is the community colleges which were not to go past the 14th grade of education. Their intent, according to the California Master Plan for Higher Education, was to provide lower division courses for transfer, general education, remedial noncredit, and workforce training instruction. The desired effect was the community colleges would help California to grow economically and to be a competitor in the global market (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, 2019).

The Act allowed for state money to build community colleges instead of funding just coming from the district where schools were located. The state also limited the percentage of students who could “be admitted by exception at the freshman level” at the universities in order to get more students to attend a community college before heading to the university (Douglass, 2007, p. 81).

Additionally, it was also dictated that residents of California would be able to go to a UC or CSU if they fulfilled specific requirements, and students transferring into one of those systems from a community college would “be given priority over freshmen in the admissions process system” (UC Institutional Research and Academic Planning, 2017).

The Act also stressed the extreme importance of affordability of the schools for students. With the Act, the state hoped to etch out goals and missions for each system as distinct from the others to show the importance of each system. Additionally, the Master Plan helped with community college growth because, since 1960, there have been 50 more schools added to the California Community College system (UC Institutional Research and Academic Planning, 2017).

Given the Master Plan has been around for over 50 years, there is criticism that it does not address the educational needs of the 21st century and really only looks at the division between schools and not the actual needs of the state in terms of education (Burdman, 2009). Given this concern, there have been many other laws and initiatives enacted since the plan first came out in an effort to continue helping students as times change. The following initiatives and acts are ways that people and the government have tried to help students who are not yet ready for college-level work.

Vocational Education Act of 1963

The Vocational Act of 1963 was of importance to community colleges because it gave more money to them to help with vocational programs. There was money for “equipment grants, curriculum development, and programs for economically disadvantaged and physically challenged students” (Witt, 1994; Cohen, 2001; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Baber, et al., 2019, p. 207). This furthered the idea in the country that community colleges should be open for anyone who wanted an education beyond high school, and this also meant there could be more students coming to the schools needing remedial work.

Learning Communities (1960s)

A way schools began helping students succeed was with Learning Communities which began in the 1960s and picked up momentum in the 1990s as a system where students take multiple classes together. The instructors of the classes work jointly to create “curricular coherence; integrative, high-quality learning; collaborative knowledge-construction; and skills and knowledge relevant to living in a complex, messy, diverse world” to further help students succeed (Lardner & Malnarich, 2008, p. 32).

As Learning Communities have continued, “Researchers have been particularly enthusiastic about learning community formats for remediation” (Bailey, 2009). Given the nature of students having multiple classes together in this matter they “...persist in their studies if the learning they experience is meaningful, deeply engaging, and relevant to their lives...” (Lardner & Malnarich, 2008, p. 32). Therefore, students in learning communities are shown to continue throughout academic course sequences because, as a study by Parsley, Tino, Goodsell-Love, & Russo (1999) found, students felt like they found friends and support which is often hard to do

the first year, and they also got help with navigating academics and the social structure of college.

Learning Communities were thought to be helpful with remedial students in the community college especially because they help students build support systems and get resources to help navigate their way through the college system. These are skills many students lack, and having this type of support can help developmental students persist from semester to semester when they might not otherwise because of a lack of support.

Educational Opportunity Program (1964)

The first Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) began in 1964 at Berkeley in an effort to help low-income students. These students would go to campus in the summer starting in at least eighth grade (if not earlier) and engage in programs that would help them understand college in general, the school itself, counseling, and they would work on some courses that would prepare them for higher education (Douglass, 2007). Other UCs also began running EOP programs with the hope they would help students who might not have a chance to go to Berkeley otherwise, and by doing so, the school would interest the students enough that they would want to go there when the time came for them to attend college (Douglass, 2007). This program “specified that students selected should have substandard academic performance as well as lower socioeconomic status” (Maxwell, 1997).

Though EOP expanded beyond Berkeley and is for students at both the college and university levels, since remedial classes are often disproportionately made up of low-income students who are not always college-ready, this program has been seen as a way to help students succeed in that level of coursework enabling them to continue in college.

TRIO (1964)

As part of the funding from Lyndon Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act, the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds was created, and it was referred to as TRIO. This Act gave money and created programs for disadvantaged students to attend and succeed in college (McElroy & Armesto, 1998). In order to participate in TRIO programs, students must be first-generation and how they did in school in the past is considered. There was continued focus on students who would be most at risk for dropping out because they are from low-income families, they are recent immigrants, they lack the ability to speak English, and they come from racial or ethnic minorities (McElroy & Armesto, 1998). The TRIO program has supported a variety of different programs over the years including: Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Support Centers, and Staff and Leadership Training Authority (McElroy & Armesto, 1998).

Though TRIO is not just for community college students, these programs were integrated into these schools in an effort to help students with money and support making them more likely to graduate having achieved their goals. TRIO can also be seen as a way to help remedial students because students who qualify for the program are often the students who end up in developmental courses because of the issues with placement tests.

Higher Education Act (1965 reauthorized 1968, 1972, 1976, 1980, 1986, 1992, 1998, 2008)

The Higher Education Act of 1965 increased funding for higher education in an attempt to help expand resources for student success ("Do you know TRIO?", 2003). It aimed to give all students a chance to seek higher education if they wanted to, and it oversees: "Student-aid programs, federal aid to colleges, and oversight of teacher preparation programs" ("Higher Education Act," 2019). The 1965 Act sought to focus on continuing education programs, college libraries, helping schools develop, and student financial assistance (Keppel, 1987). This helped

community colleges with the ability to give their students financial aid and more support during their time in college. These things all benefited students in pre-college level classes at the community college.

Learning Assistance Centers 1970s

During the early 1970s, Learning Assistance Centers (LACs) were developed by Frank Christ of California State University – Long Beach. LACs worked with students at various academic levels, and they used a combination of tutoring and counseling (Ellison, 1973; Christ, 1984; Arendale, 2014). Some students who took advantage of this learning were students who needed traditional remedial education. Others who went to the LACs were students who had failed a class in college and wanted help because they were retaking the class. The LACs did not have the stigma of remedial courses or tutoring because they were new, and students could also use these centers to increase skills they had, so they were not seen as negatively since students with a high degree of competency in a subject could also use them. LACs also helped faculty members with training to work with students who were not at college level academically, and they helped centralize resources for students to make it easier for them to access tutoring, mentoring, and study skill guidance (Arendale, 2002). This was a system used at some community colleges that helped not just their developmental students but others as well.

Supplemental Instruction (1973)

Supplemental instruction (SI) started in 1973 at University of Missouri–Kansas City and also became a way to support remedial students (Arendale, 2002). Led by a tutor, a former student in the class, or the instructor, the goal of these sessions is to give very explicit help for a course to students instead of one-on-one help with just an individual issue (Blanc, DeBuhr, & Martin, 1983; Maxwell, 1997; Rutschow & Schneider, 2011; Bers, 2018). The goal of SI is to

help students to pass their developmental courses, so they are more likely to continue their education at the community college or university. “The data shows that students who participate in SI are less likely to drop the targeted course and therefore more likely to persist” (Stone & Jacobs, 2006, p. 23). There is not really any research to show if SI is an effective intervention because it is usually a struggle to get schools to offer it due to the challenge of finding people to run the sessions and the resistance students have in taking any extra classes (Bers, 2018). However, these sessions when used are seen as a way to help students at all levels and especially the students taking pre-college level classes at the community college because they are given extra course-specific assistance.

Education Code Article 1: Student Matriculation (1976 and 1993)

In 1976, the state of California addressed student assessments tests in the Education Code (EDC) Title 3: Postsecondary Education, Division 7: Community Colleges, Part 48: Community Colleges, Education Programs, Chapter 2: Courses of Study, Article 1: Student Matriculation (enacted in 1993). The Code declared that community colleges could only use assessment tests as recommendations for students concerning the courses they are suggested to take. It was noted that it needed to be just recommendations of courses, and students could take whatever courses they wanted despite the recommendations. Also, no student could be denied admission to the community college based on these assessment exams.

Moreover, the 1993 version of the EDC said it was important that community colleges work to help students get to transfer-level courses within their first year at the school, and measures like high school grades and grade point average (GPA) should be used to place students in courses instead of assessment tests. If a student’s transcript information was not easy for students or the school to access, then the school could allow the student to report this

information on their own. Article 1 stresses that schools cannot require a student to take remedial courses unless they can prove through GPA and high school grades that the student would not be able to pass transfer-level work without remediation first (EDC, 1976 and 1993). This was an initial attempt to help prevent students from having to stay in remedial classes for so long they ended up dropping out of school, and these requirements are reinforced in the passage of AB 705 in 2017.

The 1981 Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)

In this Report, there was discussion on the “directions and priorities” of the community colleges as they now had “more than one-third of all college students” in the state (Thelin, 2014, p. 98). The Report questioned if the original mission of California community colleges, to provide general education and vocational training for adult students, was what was still needed at the schools. There were concerns because fewer students were transferring to CSU schools, and for those who did transfer, only 34% graduated from any school in the system while fewer than one in three graduated within three years from the school they originally transferred to (Thelin, 2014).

The Report called for the general education courses at community colleges to be reexamined in light of the fact the CSU system had changed their graduation requirements (Thelin, 2014). There was concern from CPEC that colleges were making changes without talking to the CSUs to see what changes, if any, were actually needed in general education programs at the community college (Thelin, 2014).

Additionally, the Report expressed six major ideas the community colleges needed to consider regarding their mission: “... (1) overcoming the myth of the ‘two-year college,’ (2) rethinking open enrollment within open admission, (3) improving articulation with the secondary

schools, (4) reconsidering student affirmative action, (5) providing remediation, and (6) assuring transfer” (Thelin, 2014, p. 283). It is important to note that providing remedial support was considered important at the community colleges at this time, and these goals were all an attempt to help students to get through college as easily and efficiently as possible.

Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act of 1986

The Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act of 1986 gave the Board of Governors power to oversee “the matriculation services that the community colleges should provide” (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011, p. 164). It addressed the need for all students in California to have an opportunity for an equitable education and to give them access to support to help with their success for their goals (Berger, 1997; California Community Colleges, 2016). This act also reiterates that students can only be advised into courses based on their assessment results; they cannot be required to take basic skills classes despite their placement results unless they have “statistical evidence that prerequisite or corequisite courses are strongly related to success in subsequent college-level courses” (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011, p. 164). The Act also called for “improved counseling services and the use of multiple measures in student placement” in an effort to eliminate inequity in students’ course placement (Hughes & Scott-Clayton, 2011, n.p.). There was a realization that students needed help navigating their way through the many obstacles they faced in college not just on the academic side but with counseling and course placement as well which greatly affected students in developmental course sequences.

Assembly Bill No. 1725 (1988)

Assembly Bill No. 1725 (1988) changed the way the Board of Governors worked and “... would expressly designate the system as the California Community Colleges.” AB 1725 also

changed the structure of the Board of Governors and their responsibilities (Assembly Bill No. 1725, 1988). Most notably, AB 1725 stated:

The community colleges - once envisaged as “junior colleges” devoted primarily to providing middle-class youth with a local option to the lower-division years of college - will be called upon for the tasks of retraining workers, teaching English to those recently among us, providing skills and opportunities for the elderly, providing a second chance to those who were failed by our secondary schools, and still providing lower division transfer education of quality and integrity for all who want it. (Assembly Bill 1725, 1988, p. 8)

This Bill stresses a few key missions of community colleges: for students to get units to transfer, to teach vocational and technical skills, to teach remedial courses, to teach ESL courses, and to provide degree and certificate programs that consist of lower division courses (Assembly Bill 1725, 1988).

AB 1725 also said that the three systems of schooling in the state (UC, CSU, and community colleges) needed to come up with a “common core curriculum in general education courses and lower division major preparation curricula for purposes of transfer” (Assembly Bill 1725, 1988, p. 2). The Bill continues to stress the importance of remedial courses to the community college mission in an effort to help students who are not adequately prepared for college because this schooling is open to all Californians.

Proposition 98 (1988)

Proposition 98 (1988) gave California schools through the community college level minimum funding. The funds were mostly determined by the growth in enrollment in the K-12 level, and then it was divided among those schools and the community colleges. This means the

schools are competing for money at all levels, so though the colleges could help the K-12 system prepare their students better, the colleges saw no incentive to do this because that would require more money go to lower grade levels meaning there would be less funding for the colleges (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011). This put schools directly in competition with each other over funding, so it lessened the desire for them to help each other leading to more issues for students because the schools were competing for money and not looking out for how to help students. Instead of finding ways to jointly help students and potentially eliminating the need for remedial classes in college, the schools stayed singular in their missions instead of combining their missions to help with student success (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011).

Student Equity Plans (1991, 1992, 1996, 2002)

In 1991, the state of California declared they wanted schools at all levels to work on equity so “each person...has a reasonable chance to fully develop his or her potential” (California Code, 2019, n.p.). By 1992, the state required schools to have equity policies to get their state funding (California Community Colleges Fact Sheet, 2017). In 2005, 109 California Community Colleges gave Student Equity Plans to the Chancellor’s Office with the idea that equity in education is related to the completion rates of students in basic skills courses (Illowsky, 2008). Money has remained available to schools though the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) as long as they keep a student equity plan (CA Community Colleges Fact Sheet, 2017). This in another way it was reiterated that developmental coursework is important in the mission of community colleges.

Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count (2004)

Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count was an initiative started in 2004 by the Lumina Foundation for Education to help student success and outcomes around the country.

Their goal is: “To lead and support a national network of community colleges to achieve sustainable institutional transformation through sharing knowledge, innovative solutions and effective practices and policies leading to improved outcomes for all students” (Achieving the Dream, Inc., 2019, n.p.). The schools participating go over transcripts to look into the groups of students they need to work with the most in order to help with improving their chances of success in college by working to fix problems and come up with institution-wide reform.

The initial schools that participated mainly worked on revising their developmental education approach and many worked to accelerate the developmental courses they offered (Zachry, 2008). The developmental courses were seen as one of the main issues that needed institutional change, and another initiative was created out of this a few years later because of the need for remedial work.

The Basic Skills Initiative (2006)

The Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) began in 2006 and was funded by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office as a faculty-driven initiative. “The goal of the BSI was to improving [sic] student access and success” (Basic Skills Initiative, 2009, n.p.). Schools were awarded money to help their students improve their basic skills in areas like English, English as a second language (ESL), math, and reading. In addition, schools received money to train faculty and staff to help basic skills students (Basic Skills Initiative, 2009). With a \$30 million yearly budget, it worked to suggest best practices, assess what was and wasn’t working in the schools and the way institutions were addressing basic skills, and professional development to help instructors with teaching these courses (Offenstein & Shulock, 2011).

In 2006, the Board of Governors also changed the minimum English and math requirements for an associate degree, so the requirements necessitated more from students than

in the past. This increased the need for BSI work in schools so students could achieve these new requirements (Illowsky, 2008). BSI was another attempt by the state to help students who were getting bogged down in developmental sequences while realizing students still needed this help.

Accelerated Learning Project (2007)

A speech by the chair of the Conference on Basic Writing, Peter Adams, in 1992 suggested that students who tested into basic writing classes should be “mainstreamed” into first year composition courses (Adams, Gearhart, Miller, & Roberts, 2009). This means students would enroll in their basic skills courses and college-level courses at the same time. Over the next few years, schools started variations of this type of mainstreaming. One version was the stretch model where students completed the first-year composition class over two semesters. The intensive model had the students meet for five hours a week of instruction instead of the usual three hours. Finally, the studio model had students attend their regular class in addition to a one hour a week studio where they talked to other students about their writing (Adams, et al., 2009, p. 59).

These models were the start of an idea that led to the Accelerated Learning Project (ALP) which began in Baltimore in 2007 to help students who need remedial writing to get through the classes while also getting college credit for their required composition sequence. “Proponents of acceleration believe that it can mitigate two problems that plague students’ progress in developmental education: too many opportunities to quit in the developmental course sequence, and poor alignment with college-level curricula” (Bailey, et al., 2015). Therefore, this is a model many institutions in California began to implement in a number of ways like: “paired courses, compressed courses/sequences, or mainstreaming students in college-level courses with added academic support” (Bailey et al., 2015, p. 133). The last type of ALP is also called the

corequisite model and is being featured in many community college English course reforms in response to AB 705.

With ALP, a few classes in a pre-100 level sequence are put together in a one-semester course in order to help students get through the remedial education they need faster with the hope these students will persist in their higher education (Jaggars, Smith, & Bickerstaff, 2018). This helps keep students from having to take multiple pre-college level courses that do not get them any college credit which often leads to the students not continuing in school because "...the longer the course sequence, the more opportunities there are for such 'giving up'" (Adams et al., 2009, p. 54-55) Schools want to be sure they do not lose students due to the long sequences of pre-transfer level courses, but despite the hopes for this type of student support, "Thus far, however, there has been limited empirical research on the effects of accelerating students' progression through their developmental requirements" (Hodara & Jaggars, 2014, p. 248). Additionally, there are a few main concerns about acceleration: 1. It requires money schools may not have or may not continue to have to fund these programs. 2. It is unclear if this type of support actually helps students who place the lowest on assessment tests. 3. Faculty are worried if students don't pass ALP classes it will "dampen long-term student success" (Hodara & Jaggars, 2014, p. 251). Therefore, although this type of remedial help is still being strongly suggested as part of the California Acceleration Project (CAP), it is still unclear what the success of this program is until more students have gone through it; however, Cho, Kopko, Jenkins, and Jaggars (2012) suggest the "success rate is substantially higher for ALP students than for students first enrolled in traditional, stand-alone developmental courses" (Bers, 2018). Therefore, schools feel it is worthwhile to continue working with acceleration as a way to help developmental students succeed.

Developmental Education Initiative (2009)

An offspring of the Achieving the Dream initiative of 2004, the Developmental Education Initiative was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Lumina Foundation in 2009. With this initiative:

Fifteen highly diverse community colleges that had been early participants in Achieving the Dream, a national community college reform network, each received a three-year grant of \$743,000 to scale up existing interventions or establish new ones that would help students progress through developmental courses more quickly and successfully. (Quint, Jaggars, Byndloss, & Magazinnik, 2013, p. iii).

The schools looked at ways to change instruction and student support in an effort to help reform the schools' approaches to developmental education based on information they had learned while looking at their school with Achieving the Dream (Quint et al., 2013).

Overall, the schools that participated were able to increase the ways they were working to fix developmental education, but it was up to the schools to determine the goals of students, so it was hard to gauge how many students were directly impacted. Additionally, there was a limitation because the research was based on best practices instead of research showing what would work best to fix the issues with basic skills work (Quint et al., 2013). So though this was an attempt to help developmental students at the community college, its impact is not known.

Complete College America (2009)

Beginning in 2009, Complete College America's (CCA) mission aspired to work at, "Leveraging our Alliance to eliminate achievement gaps by providing equity of opportunity for all students to complete college degree and credentials of purpose and value" (Complete College America, 2009, n.p.). One of their goals to help with achievement gaps is to have students enroll

in college-level math and English classes in their first year and include additional support if needed to help the students in these classes to pass them. CCA specifically highlights that remedial work is often not well-structured and can keep students from completing college. This continued to highlight concerns about students who need to take developmental classes for their academic success.

Senate Bill No. 1143 (2010)

California Senate Bill No. 1143 (2010) “require[d] the board to adopt a plan for promoting and improving student success within the California Community Colleges and to establish a taskforce to examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success” (Senate Bill No. 1143, 2010, n.p.). The Bill expressed concern that not enough community college students were completing their degrees which was a threat to the state’s economy because at that time, “Over 70 percent of public undergraduate enrollment in California is in the community colleges,” but despite that large number, only 24% get a degree or certificate in six years (Senate Bill No, 1143, 2010, n.p.). Additionally, the Bill called out how schools get their money based on the enrollment in the third week of the semester, so though schools are motivated to enroll students, there is no motivation to help those students complete their classes, certificate, or degree.

With this Act, it was decided the schools must develop a taskforce to look at what is working in institutions around the country to present as models. The Act also wanted schools to use multiple measures for student placement in courses repeating an equity theme first heard in the 1970s and reiterated many other times including in AB 705.

Getting Past Go (2010)

In 2010 the Lumina Foundation funded a grant for Getting Past Go (GPG) to “study how policy has either facilitated or impeded innovation in the delivery of remedial education” (“Getting Past Go”, 2010, n.p.). Their findings illustrated that policymakers see the need for students to take “at least one remedial education course in reading, writing or mathematics is a symptom of the educational system’s failure to adequately prepare students for postsecondary education” (“Getting Past Go”, 2010, n.p.). The report further stated that in 2010, 43% of students in the community college “required some remedial education” (“Getting Past Go”, 2010, n.p.). The research of GPG suggested schools look into how they are using data for their policies to look for ways they might change the courses to give students in developmental education a program that works best for them.

Completion by Design (2011)

Funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation, nine colleges in North Carolina, Florida, and Ohio embarked on the beginning of Completion by Design (CBD) in 2011. The goal was for community college professionals to work with students to help with “policies, practices, processes, and culture that together improve student performance and completion outcomes” (“Completion by Design”, 2017, n.p.). Students are given specific pathways to help complete their goals for being in school with the aim of helping with completion rates and costs. These are all challenges of developmental education, so this program is also used to help remedial students, and the hope was the ideas from the colleges who worked on CBD could share ideas and expand the ideas that worked to other schools and states.

Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012 (Senate Bill 1456)

The Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act was signed into law in California in 2012 and became known as the Student Success Initiative (SSI) (Student Success Initiative Timeline, 2019). The goal of this Act was to help students in California Community Colleges to succeed by aiding them with orientations, counseling, and other academic planning and intervention services (Senate Bill 1456, 2012). The intent was to make sure students were given information on all the possible resources the school has to help them persist and graduate with a degree or certificate. The state required that a taskforce be formed to work on success initiatives and that a formula be developed for giving schools money to achieve these goals. The Act stressed helping students to establish their career goals and then to outline a program of study for the students to follow to achieve those goals (Senate Bill 1456, 2012). It makes schools aware that it is a joint effort between the college and the students to help with success – all the expectations cannot be placed solely on students; the schools need to provide resources to help them. It is noted in the Act that the transition into community college is not easy, so schools need to guide students to have more of a chance for achieving their academic goals (Senate Bill 1456, 2012).

The state sees SSSP, SSI, and BSI also integrating together “because all three have the same ultimate goal of increasing student success while closing achievement gaps” (California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, 2017). This continues to reiterate how important California sees the need for change to help students develop their skills and not struggle with academic and administrative barriers like developmental courses.

Assembly Bill 288 (2016)

Assembly Bill 288 allowed for students to dually enroll in high school and college courses permitting them to receive college credit while still a high school student. The courses students take could be basic skills or more advanced classes. Ultimately, “The purpose behind

dual enrollments programs is to give students knowledge and skills – a pathway – that encourages them to continue on a post-secondary journey” (California Community Colleges, 2015).

This is a method that has been used for remediation – let high school students get to college-level in subjects like English, ESL, math, and reading while they are still in high school while also receiving college credit. Generally, these classes are taught at the high school by instructors from the local community college which also allows the students to see what college classes are like (California Community Colleges, 2015). By allowing this, schools can eliminate the time students might need in remedial work once they reach college in an effort to help retain the students instead of losing them because of the long sequence of basic skills class they might otherwise have to take when they start college.

Assembly Bill 705 (2017)

As mentioned earlier, this Bill notes that 75% of California community college students are “underprepared.” Therefore, students are getting stuck in remedial courses for too long and are not persisting past these courses (AB 705, 2017). Sounding a lot like the Education Code Article 1 of 1993, the Bill aims to help get students out of remedial courses by only allowing students to be placed in these courses if the school can demonstrate from high school grades or GPA that the student would not be likely to pass transfer-level courses without the help of additional classes. There are a few goals of the Bill: 1. To have students complete transfer-level English and math classes in one year. 2. To ensure students are correctly placed in courses so they are not taking classes they do not need. 3. To help ESL students get through their transfer-level English classes in three years (FAQ on AB 705, 2017).

Additionally, assessment tests will no longer be allowed to place students in courses if a school is still using that type of assessment. This has been something that has been discussed for years because, “If institutions allocate opportunity based on test scores that do not adequately reflect the skills needed for course success, the mission of the community college to provide access to college-level courses for all is threatened” (Marwick, 2014, p. 265). Instead, multiple measures must be used which means high school grades or GPA will help determine the best English, ESL, math, and reading courses for students instead of placement tests (AB 705, 2017). To help make sure students who still might need support to pass, “Assessments using multiple measures, combined with in-person advising, should help determine which low-scoring students need a more sustained and intensive developmental education program” (Bailey, et al., 2015, p. 135). This means students could be suggested to take a developmental class if the school still has them, or the school may recommend students need to take a corequisite class that adds additional units to the English 100 class which is meant to give students the instruction they may have gotten in developmental classes. Repeating these ideas from past government bills, AB 705 is finally enforcing a timeline of fall 2019 for these requirements to be enacted by community colleges.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

This chapter will present an overview of the methodology used for this study. The research design will be explained, the researcher's positionality will be discussed, the framework used to form the research and interview questions will be outlined, how the interview analysis occurred will be developed, and limitations will also be discussed.

Limitations

The world faced a major crisis during this study, so I need to address the limitations first in order for the other parts of this section to be understood with the proper lens of what was happening at this time. The biggest obstacle for this study was finding people who qualified and who were willing to participate mainly because of a worldwide pandemic. In early 2020, the COVID-19 disease reached the United States, and people were hearing about it and were being warned about how contagious and dangerous it was though the number of cases in the United States were initially low. However, by March of that year, more people were getting sick from the disease, and cities and states began shutting down businesses and issuing "stay at home" orders. Schools were included in the shutdown of businesses with colleges telling faculty they would need to start teaching their students remotely using a variety of methods like the school learning management system, Zoom, emailing work between students and teachers, etc. Since not all students have internet and computer access at home, the colleges in San Diego County began helping students to get these resources so they could continue their educations from home. Schools also began offering lenient drop policies for students who could not continue the semester in this mode for a variety of reasons.

This abrupt and massive transition to remote education left faculty having to recreate the way they were teaching, and it produced a great amount of work and stress for teachers. Many had

not even used the course management systems before, not all had used Zoom before, and there was suddenly emergency teaching online training being offered by the schools. Teachers who already have a difficult job now had to do things they had never done before with little to no time to prepare. This was a factor in my ability to get interview participants.

Conceptual Framework: Critical Policy Analysis

In this study I will look at the Critical Policy Analysis (CPA) framework (Taylor, 1997; Diem, Young, Welton, Mansfield, and Lee, 2014). This framework was chosen because AB 705 is a new policy that colleges are being required to use, so it is critical to see what is happening with the steps outlined in the framework in the policy's early days. For this study, CPA helped frame the interview questions and the analysis of the questions to scrutinize AB 705 in terms of its intent, implementation, roots, the benefits of the Bill and who gets those benefits, who might still face inequity because of the policy, and how instructors are adapting to the policy.

The five steps of this framework according to Diem, et al. (2014) are: 1. Looking at what is said in the policy versus what is being done with the policy. 2. Studying at the roots and developments of the policy. 3. Seeing who gets what with the policy and the "distribution of power, resources, and knowledge" that comes from the policy (Diem, et al., 2014, p. 1072). 4. Considering how the policy could affect "inequality and privilege" (Diem, et al., 2014, p. 1072). 5. Assessing how "non-dominant groups" "resist process of domination and oppression" (Diem, et al., 2014, p. 1072).

My interviews with faculty will shed light on what is being done in schools and classes and how schools have implemented AB 705 in relation to its text. I will then be able to compare that to the ideas behind the Bill. The literature review in this research has looked at the roots of this new remediation and testing policy in California. While new data emerges from studies in

the initial years of AB 705 implementation and from my interviews, I will be able to see who is getting power from AB 705, the resources, and the knowledge from this Bill. Given one of the reasons the policy was implemented was because of inequity with placement tests and general placement into remedial classes, I will be able to see if faculty think there are negative or positive effects for students who the Bill was intended to help through early data from the state and interview data. Finally, I will see if there is any resistance to this new Bill as full implementation continues.

Context of Study

Participant Recruitment

Recruitment was conducted via email starting in June 2020, and due to the COVID-19 pandemic, interviews were conducted over Zoom from June 2020 – January 2021. In order to get participants, a few different methods were used depending on the college. In order to get a variety of viewpoints, the original goal of this study was to get 24 participants – three from each of the eight community colleges in San Diego County, and of those I would interview a tenured, a tenure-track, and a part-time English faculty member from each school.

However, all of the community colleges in San Diego County were teaching remotely in summer and fall of 2020, so all faculty were either teaching through Zoom and a learning management system, or they were teaching their classes solely online. For many of these professors, this was their first time teaching online in any capacity. Teaching through Zoom added a new challenge for instructors as well. After the intensity of moving to remote education in the middle of the spring 2020 semester, many of the faculty I know said they were using summer to work on their online methods for teaching, and to catch up on things the spring triage

of moving online prevented them from doing in their own lives. I believe this was why I did not get replies to many of the emails I sent as will be outlined further on in this section.

Snowball sampling is when researchers ask “well-situated people” who might be good to talk to or who might know a lot about a particular subject (Patton, 2002). This method of getting interviewees worked in some cases where people I knew or interviewed were able to help connect me with other participants from their school or another institution, but because I could not go to the schools in person to meet people as originally planned, connecting in person as I originally hoped did not work, and I believe this also was a factor in the limited replies I got to my requests to participate in an interview.

At Clemens College, I first contacted Carol by email because I knew she had been working with AB 705 at the school. When we spoke on the day of the interview, she suggested some faculty who would be good for me to interview, so I emailed them, and they all replied by email agreeing to participate. There was one person she suggested that did not reply to my email, so I moved to the second person she recommended in that teaching position. I had also reached out to one part-time faculty member I had taught with at another school, but he replied he was unable to participate.

At Alga College, I reached out during a Zoom conversation to the person I knew best in the English department for suggestions of who might be willing to be participate given the criteria I was looking at for arranging interviews. She suggested multiple people, so I emailed them, but I only heard back from one of those people who I did interview. When the recommended people did not reply to my email inquiries, I then emailed anyone who taught the English 100 with support class at that school who was an adjunct or tenure-track, but I received no other replies. I then reached out to another tenured faculty member I knew, and she agreed to be interviewed.

Though I had already interviewed a tenured instructor at Alga, in order to get more data, this seemed the best solution.

With Cuvier College, I started with looking at their schedule to see if I knew anyone teaching the English 100 and its corequisite class, and I found one person I know from teaching at the same school over ten years ago. She agreed to be interviewed, and when we talked, I asked if she knew any tenure-track faculty who taught the support class who might be willing to be interviewed. Unfortunately, the person she reached out to on my behalf could not participate at that time, and I was not successful in getting anyone who fit this category to participate. The adjunct I interviewed from Cuvier was recommended to me by someone I knew from another school. The person I knew reached out to the part-timer to see if she would be willing to participate, and she agreed, so her email was passed on to me so we could coordinate the interview.

For Nichols College, I looked at the list of people who taught the English 100 with support class and found someone I knew from when I taught there, so I emailed her first, and she and I coordinated an interview. At the end of our interview, I inquired if she knew any adjuncts or tenure-track faculty who might be willing to participate, and she reached out to two instructors for me. They both told her they would be willing to contribute, so I then reached out to them with the recruitment email (see Appendix 1). One never replied, and the other replied and suggested a day of the week that worked, but then he did not respond when we got to scheduling the exact day and time of the interview. I then emailed everyone else in the tenure-track and part-time categories at the school teaching the corequisite, but I did not hear back from anyone else. Therefore, to increase data, I reached out to a second tenured faculty member at the school who I know, and she was willing to be interviewed.

When looking at the schedule for Patton College, I saw someone I knew who is tenured and teaches the 100 with support class, so I reached out to him. He agreed to be interviewed, and at the end of the interview, I asked if he had any tenure-track or adjunct recommendations. He contacted a tenure-track faculty member who said she would be willing to be interviewed, so he provided me with her email address, and I sent her the recruitment email. At the end of her interview, I asked if she could think of any adjuncts who fit the criteria and might agree to be questioned. She emailed two part-time faculty members and copied me on the email so they could let me know if they were interested. One replied, and we coordinated her official recruitment and interview.

The Anderson College schedule showed me I knew a tenured instructor teaching the support class, so I reached out to her first, and we coordinated an interview. I asked if she could think of people in the other two categories, and she reached out to a tenure-track faculty member she thought would be good to interview. He told her he would do it, and she provided me with his email address so I could reach out to him. However, my emails to those who are adjuncts teaching the support version of English 100 at the school received no replies.

At Birmingham College I first tried reaching out to a full-time faculty member I know who was not teaching the support class, but to see if he had any suggestions of who might be willing to participate in my study. I did not hear back from him, so a week later I reached out to another tenured faculty member I knew who was teaching the support class to see if she would be willing to be interviewed. She said yes, but then I did not hear back from her when we got to scheduling. I then moved on to email an adjunct I knew from when I taught at the school, and she agreed to participate in the study, and we arranged those plans while I also tried emailing another full-time faculty member I knew. When I did not hear back from the other full-timer, I then emailed

everyone listed as teaching the 100 with support class who I could identify as tenured or tenure-track. Those emails received no reply.

I knew no one at the college where I only got one reply to my recruitment email. I looked at the schedule and emailed all those who were listed as teaching the 100 with support class. When the only reply I got was to say he could not participate, I reached out to friends I knew at other schools to see if they knew anyone to connect me with at this school. Unfortunately, that did not lead to finding any connections, and a month after the initial email was sent, I still had no one to interview at the school. I then submitted a revised consent form to the Institutional Review Board to include offering the incentive of being entered into a raffle for an Amazon gift card for their participation. I then sent the recruitment email to the same people (except for the one who declined to be interviewed before) and added this sentence at the top: “An update from my previous inquiry, I can now offer to put your name into a raffle for your participation, see the third paragraph of this email.” The third paragraph then explained the compensation I was now offering (Appendix 2). Still, I received no replies.

Recruitment Process

All participants were sent the recruitment email in Appendix 1 even if I had first informally contacted them or if someone else had reached out to them for me. They replied to the recruitment email with suggestions for days and times that worked for them to be interviewed. I then sent the confirmation email (Appendix 2) with the Zoom link for our meeting. A separate email through Adobe Sign was sent with the consent form (Appendix 3). The signatures on the consent forms were collected using Adobe Sign because I did not know if everyone would have access to a scanner and because this way would be easier and less time consuming for the participants since we would not be meeting in person. The interview confirmation email

contained a link to the demographic survey I created and administered through SurveyMonkey (Appendix 5) and requested they complete the survey.

Final Group of Participants

To maintain confidentiality so participants would feel comfortable being interviewed, all participant names are anonymous, and pseudonyms were used for faculty members and their schools. In addition, for this study, all of the classes will be referred to as English 100 with support or with a corequisite no matter what the name or course number is at each school.

Sixteen faculty participated in structured interviews for this study representing seven of the eight community colleges in San Diego County, and all of the schools in this study are Hispanic Serving Institutions. Of the 16 people interviewed, 13 identified themselves with female pronouns and three identified themselves with male pronouns. There were nine tenured faculty interviewed, and seven of the nine were white women, one was one Hispanic woman, one did not give an ethnicity, and one was a white man. Of the three tenure-track faculty who were interviewed, this group included one Latina woman, one white man, and one white woman. Additionally, four part-time faculty were interviewed which consisted of one white man, one white woman, one Latina, and one Mexican American woman.

The educational background of the participants included three with PhDs, and seven stated they went to community college. All faculty who teach English in the California community colleges are required to have master's degrees, and all of the respondents said they have one ranging in things from comparative literature to American literature to British literature, and English in general.

Figure 1 below shows a breakdown of the interview participants from information collected in a pre-interview online survey which is included in appendix 5. The race/ethnicity section uses

the respondents' words to describe themselves in this category as they were not given any options to choose from (Appendix 6). Furthermore, the pronouns were also identified by the interviewees without any words to choose from. Information asked in the survey was gathered in case there were any themes that emerged based on participant responses and this demographic information.

Figure 1 Demographic Breakdown of Participants

Name	School	Position	Pronouns	Age	Years of Experience	Race/ethnicity
Lydia	Clemens College	Tenure track	She/hers	41-45	11 years	Latina
Jesse	Clemens College	Adjunct	He/him	31-35	5 years	White
Carol	Clemens College	Tenured	She/her/hers	61-65	37 years	White
Adele	Clemens College	Tenured	She/her/hers	46-50	26 years	Caucasian
Jaqueline	Alga College	Tenured	She/her	46-50	26 years	White
Kellie	Alga College	Tenured	She/her	41-45	13 years	White
Charlotte	Cuvier College	Tenured	She/her	Not given	31 years	Not given
Lucy	Cuvier College	Adjunct	She/her	31-35	5 years	Latina
Joan	Nichols College	Tenured	She/her/hers	46-50	27 years	White
Christina	Nichols College	Tenured	She/her	41-45	16 years	Hispanic
Corey	Patton College	Tenured	He/him	46-50	20 years	White
Cecilia	Patton College	Adjunct	She/her	31-35	2 years	Mexican American
Aurora	Patton College	Tenure track	She/her	41-45	6 years	White
Ava	Anderson College	Tenured	She/her/hers	36-40	10 years	White
Joe	Anderson College	Tenure track	He/him	41-45	7 years	White
Veronica	Birmingham College (not HSI)	Adjunct	She/her/hers	36-40	13 years	Caucasian

Data Collection

Data were collected during structured interviews that lasted about one hour with the 16 respondents over Zoom. They were recorded using Zoom and the Zoom software Otter.ai produced transcripts. The transcripts were reviewed and edited by the interviewer. Additionally, a consent form was sent to and returned by interviewees and demographic data was collected from a pre-interview survey. The data from the survey is shown in Figure 1.

Interview Description

The interviews started with introductions if I did not know the person or a reintroduction if it had been a while since we had seen each other. The qualitative interview-based questions I asked were to ascertain how English professors at San Diego County community colleges are understanding AB 705, what their schools are asking them to do in relation to the Bill, the support they are getting to implement AB 705, challenges they are facing because of the Bill, and their predictions on how they think the Bill might help or hinder student success and who might get left behind because of it.

Data Analysis

To look at the data for this study, I first started by reviewing the interviews while reading the transcripts and making any corrections to the transcripts that were needed. Then, the first level coding included attribute coding to explain the demographic information about the instructors interviewed, structural coding to label key themes, and initial coding where I looked at interview responses line by line to see main concepts and categories the responses fit into (Saldaña, 2009).

During the first level coding, causation coding was used during the first review of data. This coding helps in “searches for causes, conditions, contexts, and consequences. Also appropriate to evaluate the efficacy of a particular program” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 291). In this case,

the “cause” is AB 705, and I coded looking for the conditions (how the Bill is being applied in schools), contexts (what faculty are doing in their classes and seeing in their students), and consequences (if they think this Bill will help students, and if they think any students might not benefit from it). Descriptive coding was then used to summarize topics found in the interviews. For this coding, I used the main words from the steps given in the Critical Policy Analysis to identify times these topics were addressed: power, resources, knowledge, inequity, privilege, domination, and oppression.

I used second cycle coding starting with pattern coding to find major themes from the initial coding. From this step, the main subtopics found were: concerning, helping, leaving behind, implementing, training, tutoring, reading, and writing.

Then I used focused coding to look for categories in the themes. In this case, I continued to use the CPA framework, and I used the words: empowering, accessing resources, knowing, discriminating, and privileging to label the main categories. From these categories, I decided which ideas fit into each of the five steps of CPA to decide how they would be integrated into discussions about the ideas from respondents.

Trustworthiness

Creswell (2013) suggests, “How we write is a reflection of our own interpretation based on the cultural, social, gender, class, and personal politics that we bring to research” (p. 179). Therefore, it is important for me to explain my background and reasons for conducting research on this topic. Additionally, this section will explain the peer review and the member checking I undertook after data were interpreted.

Researcher Reflexivity

Creswell (2016) says, “In a good qualitative study, you should write about the biases, values, and experiences you bring to the study...” (p. 223). Therefore, this section will give you more of my background to understand the context I brought to this study. My interest in looking at AB 705 comes from my background as a tenured community college professor of reading in San Diego County. This Bill has been the focus of many discussions, workshops, and reorganization of class offerings, so I wanted to learn more about what faculty are seeing and doing as it is being implemented. I began my teaching career as a teaching associate of writing classes and then a lecturer at a university. I taught English and critical thinking courses, and then, after more coursework, I also started teaching reading classes. When I started teaching, the basic skills were a major focus at schools, so I was heavily involved in discussions and work involving developmental classes.

I taught for six of the eight community colleges in San Diego County including all but one of the schools in this study. In addition, I was also an adjunct at two trade colleges and one university in the county. The courses I taught ranged from three levels below transfer in reading and writing to being the last class students had to take in writing at the university. I also continue to work grading the writing assessment test a local university gives students who have reached the semester of their 60th unit or who are transferring into the school.

As I am currently working with students affected by AB 705 and I wonder if it is here to stay or will be modified or will be gone in ten years, I wanted to hear from fellow community college teachers. Faculty are the ones who can make government requirements successes or failures, so I was curious to see what is being observed at the start of this Bill’s implementation.

Peer Review

Morse (2015) recommends peer review “to prevent bias and aid conceptual development of the study” (p. 1215). In order to confirm the data collected accurately reflects conversations about AB 705 that are happening in English Departments in San Diego County, I discussed the findings with a male and a female English instructor from two different community colleges in San Diego. The male has over 20 years of community college teaching experience, and the female has over ten years of teaching experience. Both have taught developmental English classes in addition to English 100 with and without support. They felt the findings accurately reflected the discussions they have been part of at their schools and that they have heard at other conferences and with talking to people at other schools.

Member Checking

Additionally, Cho & Trent (2006) suggest member checking is needed for “the informant to check for perceived accuracy and reactions” and they say it is vital for credibility (p. 322). This method of checking interview data works in “reassuring the credibility of construction of the participants” (Cho & Trent, 2006, p. 323). Morse (2015) disagrees with allowing participants “with such an opportunity to change his or her mind; it is not required in other types of research” (p. 1216). Morse (2015) continues on to say member checking poses many possible problems, so, “The researcher’s background in theory and research methods must outrank the participant as judge of the analysis” (p. 1216).

In order to add trustworthiness to this study by doing a form of member checking, interview participants were emailed the main findings of the study, and I informed them of where I was using information they provided in their interview in my study. This allowed anyone who wanted to reply or to verify how I was using their information to comment or offer feedback.

Chapter Four: Findings

Introduction

This was a qualitative study consisting of 16 interviews of English faculty at seven San Diego County community colleges. The participants discussed their perspectives on their students and what the participants are doing in their schools and classrooms with AB 705 in place.

This chapter will discuss the findings of these interviews using the Critical Policy Analysis framework. CPA was used to analyze the interviews because of its focus on policies and how the intent of the policy may not be what is happening in the implementation, and inequities may still exist despite a policy's attempt to eliminate them. This applies to AB 705 and its attempt to eliminate the bias and discrimination that developmental classes have created.

The first step of the framework asks people to look at the words of a policy to compare them to what is actually being done with the policy as it is being employed. The ideas behind doing this exploration occurred in the collection of data from the interviews in this study where respondents answered questions about what their understanding of AB 705 is, and what their department is telling them to do concerning this policy (see appendix 7 for all of the interview questions).

The second step of CPA suggests looking at the roots and development of the policy. Remediation began with the founding of Harvard in 1630 to help students with Latin (Boylan & White, 1988; Boylan & White, 1994). The need to help students with basic skills continued as education developed because students were still not always coming to college ready to do work at the college-level. Various laws, bills, and other attempts to help students in need of remediation were enacted from 1907 up until the passage of AB 705 in 2017. People ultimately

knew students were staying in pre-transfer level course sequences for a long time and possibly not getting past those courses, and they complained students were often in these sequences because of unfair testing and racism in testing. Additionally, there were concerns about the cost of offering developmental classes to schools and the cost of these classes to students. The California community college system has been actively looking at ways to help students who are not prepared for college-level English, and many attempts have been made, but AB 705 is an attempt to finally solve this problem in community colleges in the state.

CPA framework says in step three there should be analysis about who is getting what with the policy and specifically looking at power, resources, and knowledge that is gained or lost due to this policy. This will be reviewed by looking at the responses to the interview questions that reflect these ideas.

Step four of CPA wants analysis of ways of inequality and privilege could occur due to the policy. The interview questions were used to consider who might still be privileged over others despite the intent of the policy to make college English education options more uniform for everyone.

Similarly, step five, is to look into how non-dominate groups resist domination and oppression. This idea is at the root of the creation and understanding of AB 705. Professors see the Bill as breaking down the domination schools had over students and oppressing them into taking multiple classes that did not count towards their transfer which often led to students not completing college. When asked about their understanding of AB 705, instructors stated it helping disadvantaged students, underrepresented students, and students of color. Additionally, being a social justice and equity issue was highlighted by respondents, so it appears the Bill is already helping to break the oppression of students forced to take developmental classes in the

past. However, until AB 705 is in practice longer, it is unclear if there will be further concerns about oppressing students related to the Bill, or if it has solved the concerns about this domination of students in terms of developmental English. Therefore, the chapter will look at themes that emerged from the interviews for steps one, three, and four.

Step One

The first step in CPA is to look at what is said in the policy versus what is being done with the policy. AB 705 requires schools to stop using placement tests and to no longer require developmental classes. This section will look at what the interviews found concerning this and what can be found by looking at the schools' web sites.

What is Being Done

Schools are following these requirements by using multiple measures to suggest classes to their students instead of placement tests. This means there are no longer placement tests that have caused so much concern in the past. Of the schools in this study, three of seven no longer offer any developmental classes in English, and four of seven schools have one developmental class with minimal offerings.

All seven schools in the study are offering English 100 "with support" as a way to allow students who would have been in developmental classes in the past to take English 100. The students attend up to two additional hours of class in this version of 100 to add further time with the instructor.

The participants in the study discussed a variety of ways they used the support classes when answering various questions. Some said they use the time allowed by the corequisite to have students do their writing while the instructor is there to help them and using the time as optional help sessions on specific topics students are struggling with. Joan from Nichols College

described her optional sessions by saying she will say to students, “Today we're going to work on rhetorical strategies more... if you don't understand them... sign on and we'll go over those.” Jesse at Clemens College said he is using the time to “support the students” and “not adding more material.” Also at Clemens, Adele said the department thought about the extra time when developing the corequisite and, “we purposely set out in our department that the extra two units is like... do with it what you will.” This leaves the additional time up to the instructors to determine what is best for helping their students.

Charlotte of Cuvier explained she uses the time “to let the students read, like literally to read in the classroom and have me be able to come around and help them answer questions and those kinds of things.” These examples show how instructors are implementing the policy. They are still helping students who want developmental English support, but they are able to do this in the English 100 classroom where students will get units to transfer instead of having them stuck in a cycle of pre-100 level classes.

What Departments are Saying to do Concerning AB 705

When asked what their department was asking them to do concerning AB 705, most of the faculty responded about the new format with the corequisite class and their department talking to them about what that format is at their school. Charlotte said Cuvier College is, “...trying to be really conscious of the curriculum that we have in place and how it is meeting students’ needs.” Lucy who teaches at the same college as Charlotte said the department is focusing on “promoting student confidence and belonging” in the corequisite 100 classes, and that is an important factor in helping students who have not always been encouraged to peruse higher education to feel motivated and inspired to learn.

Veronica from Birmingham College who is a part-time instructor was the only one who mentioned her department has “told me nothing” about AB 705. No one else was interviewed from the school, so it is unclear if this is because of the school or if it is because she is an adjunct or both or neither of these reasons.

Pressure to Pass Students?

Respondents were asked if they are feeling pressure to pass students because of the requirements of AB 705. This is important to the implementation of the policy to see if this is still a rigorous class that will adequately prepare students for future writing. Of those interviewed, 11 firmly responded they did not feel this pressure. Ava said:

I do not feel that pressure at all. In fact, I think, if anything, I felt... like there's been this overwhelming move to support faculty to help our students, but not to push them through if they're not ready... We've had lots of conversations about... the changes we can make in our classroom to make more students successful, and... it is right where we're giving them the opportunity to do that. And we're keeping the rigor of the material and the coursework, and so that's really hard to do. Right? It's really hard to maintain that rigor even when you are seeing students struggle, and it takes quite a bit of effort on the part of the faculty to continue to give that support to our students, but it's something that is necessary. But when they don't meet those requirements and they can't do the work; they can't do the work. So, I don't... I really don't feel that pressure. I think we know that there's inevitably going to be some students who can't, and it is what it is.

Ava expressed more than any other interviewee why she does not feel pressure to pass students because of the structure of AB 705, and her ideas showed the school values the rigor of the course and that students may fail, but they have made changes to help avoid that.

Some respondents remarked they don't feel pressure to pass students, but they feel pressure in other ways. At Cuvier College, part-timer Lucy said she feels pressure to make sure she is "connecting with students so they will stay enrolled." Charlotte from the same school said, "I feel pressure to make sure my students are learning something." This illustrated another type of pressure faculty face.

Kellie at Alga and both Adele and Carol at Clemens College declared there is not currently pressure to pass students, but there is concern about that in the future because of the funding formula that California community colleges will soon have. This funding will be based on enrollment, the number of students receiving specific grants, and:

Outcomes that include the number of students earning associate degrees and credit certificates, the number of students transferring to four-year colleges and universities, the number of students who complete transfer-level math and English within their first year, the number of students who complete nine or more career education units and the number of student [sic] who have attained the regional living wage. ("Student Centered Funding Formula," 2019, n.p.)

Kellie commented she could see in the future there might be pressure to pass students because "the student-centered funding formula becoming like, yeah, we have to pass the students...we have to get them through. We have to show success." Carol explained:

I just take it as a very serious challenge to us to really think about how we're delivering instruction and...refine this while we can to make it right so that it's not driven by funding in the...student centered funding formula.

Adele said she doesn't feel pressure to pass students now, but the "performance-based funding model" California community colleges will be transitioning into using is could cause pressure to pass students.

Given this upcoming way the California community colleges will get their funding, Carol is concerned for adjuncts. She stated:

Just the air of AB 705 and the fact that people know it's going to be tied to funding, there's pressure, and especially for adjuncts. I kind of see them as distinct because they don't have the job stability, the job security. Where I can say, "Hey, if they didn't pass, they didn't pass." Whereas I know that adjuncts struggle with that and on a whole different level.

Carol realized the fragility of an adjunct's status at a college could affect grading once this new funding is enacted. This is a concern in relation to AB 705 because of the need to keep the rigor of the course because of the skills it teaches and because it is transferrable to the California State University system. However, if someone is fearful for their job because their institution's funding depends on students passing classes, faculty could start passing students who did not show mastery of the writing skills taught in the class.

Veronica who is part-time at Birmingham said she doesn't feel pressure to pass students now, but in the past, she felt anxiety for not failing people and was worried she wasn't grading hard enough. She related:

I used to feel pressure. And I don't know if I just made this up, but I used to build pressure for not failing people... This was years ago where I was like, oh man, maybe I'm not grading hard enough. And now, because there's always people failing... any pressure about failing people I think I've put on myself because I feel... every semester I would try

to redo my points to make it work. So, like if you if you've gotten below Cs on all the papers, you should not pass the class. And I would worry about these people who... somehow got all these other points and... not offer extra credit... because I thought that they should take the class over.

Veronica said now she figures, “I can’t worry about it.” Aurora shared that as a tenure-track professor she does not feel pressure to pass students, but she did feel that anxiety when she was an adjunct because, “As an adjunct I felt like I needed to have those pass rates up.” This reflects the concern Carol talked about concerning adjuncts not having job security and how that could influence their grading.

Joan at Nichols expressed, “I think I feel pressure, just in general...I don't know if it's necessarily just because of AB 705,” and a lot of the time pressure about grades comes from students: “I get a lot of emails like, I need a B in this class and you gave me a C, and what can I do about it?” Joan said since AB 705 is about student equity, she wonders if she grades harshly will she be seen as racist because “the standards are...in a way like they're... kind of embedded in racist ideology.” Though she doesn’t feel anxiety to pass students specifically, Joan does still feel pressure surrounding grades.

The one instructor who said the stress to pass students was AB 705 related was Christina, a tenured instructor at Nichols. She felt that with the concern of equity embedded in the Bill, it is a reflection on the teacher and not the student if a student doesn’t pass the class. She rationalized:

I mean, all the good things that are coming with AB 705 with this focus on equity is also putting more pressure on teachers to make sure ... [we] do whatever we can to help our students get through. And if our students aren't passing, it's more a reflection on us... it's more of a reflection of us than our students and the effort that they put in or what they're

capable of. So that concerns me... I don't feel my job is at risk thus far because of it, but just personally, yeah, I think that puts a lot more pressure on faculty

The fact there was only one firm response saying yes to this question shows schools have enacted the policy, but they are not forcing instructors to pass students just because there is this new Bill looking to help students complete their college work sooner than in the past. However, with the mention of the student-based funding formula by a few respondents, the answers to this question could change when that policy is put into place, and schools need to be careful with how they look at data for pass rates of classes.

Step Two

This step suggests looking at the roots and development of the policy being analyzed. This information was discussed in chapter two where the history of developmental education was outlined. Chapter Two also explicated the main attempts community colleges have been making for years to help students whose skills are not at transfer level. Additionally, that chapter highlighted the concerns people have with developmental classes at the college level like: students have to take too many classes at the pre-transfer level and do not finish college, the testing for placement is unfair, the placement tests are discriminatory, students need many skills to succeed in college and not all students have those skills, and the cost of these classes to schools and students.

Step Three

For step three, Diem, et al. suggest looking at who gets what with the policy and the “distribution of power, resources, and knowledge” (Diem, et al., 2014, p. 1072). To think about this more, it is important to break down these three ideas: distribution of power, resources, and knowledge” to see how these ideas are reflected in the interview responses.

Distribution of Power

CPA asks people to consider who gets power from policies. With AB 705, the goal is to give students power over their education by not requiring them to take developmental classes that could affect things like their financial aid, units towards transfer, and motivation. The following sections will explain ways students gain or lose power with AB 705.

Placement and Registration

One of the ways students gain power with AB 705 is that they are no longer required to take developmental classes. This means they are not as likely to get stuck in a series of pre-transfer classes that they may drop out of school because they are frustrated. It also means their financial aid is not affected because of all the units they had to take that did not count towards transfer. This also means students gain power because they are less likely to lose their motivation. When placed in developmental classes, they may see themselves as not as capable as other students, but with AB 705 they are taking transfer-level classes from the start. Additionally, though the English100 with support classes are suggested to students, they do not have to take that version of the class, and they could take a 100 class that does not have support units attached to it.

However, there has been discussion at schools about students being confused as to what 100 with and without support means and how students register for those classes – the 100 class is separate from the support class, but students have to enroll in the support class that matches with the 100 class they enroll in. Adele from Clemens described how students get a placement suggestion based on the multiple measures factors, but then many students are not clear what the placement they get means, and then the students also get confused when it comes to enrolling. She said, “There is a class linkage issue. They don’t know they need to enroll in both the 100 and support class. Students are confused about which class is linked.” This means instructors are left

having to explain that to students to be sure they are all registered appropriately and that they understand how the corequisite works.

Continuing with this idea, when he was asked about challenges he faces implementing AB 705, Corey from Patton commented:

Them [students] just not understanding what the difference is. Why am I here? Because, you hear this too, “Well my counselor told me I needed it. That's why I'm here.” So I have to reiterate, like for example...the last face to face class I had way back in the spring. It was [time of class given here] in the afternoon... Monday and Wednesday. And the way they broke it up, this is an admissions thing, it said [the two hours the class met given here] And then [50 minutes the corequisite met given here]. They didn't understand the breakup...

Corey then shared his screen to show what the schedule looks like to students:

So this is my online writing class. And this is how they do the coreq. It's [gave course number], and officially it's from 9:30 – 11:30 in the morning. But the [gave the number for the corequisite class] is the hour before, so they don't understand that. So, when I was teaching it face-to-face, two thirds of the students would come in at [the start time of the 100 class was given here]. And then they'd want to leave at 9:05, and I'm like, no, we're just getting started...But what I tried to tell them is just looking at it as one chunk of time. You're with me 8:15 – 11:35.

In showing and explaining this, Corey highlighted that what students are seeing is not easy for them to understand, so this does not help with students who are already confused about the English 100 and corequisite combination.

Additionally, students all have different goals. Joan from Nichols suggested the ideas of AB 705 may not be needed for every student since not every student in community college will

transfer to a four-year school. The power goes to schools who are telling students to take these classes, but Joan questioned, “What happened to the idea of just taking classes for personal enrichment? I had so many students in a reading class...they just wanted to improve like everyone, not to get a degree or anything like that.” Reflecting back on the original intent of community colleges to be for all people, this shows how they have the power to shape who in a community gets an education and what that education is allowed or not allowed to entail.

Agency in Class

Also concerning power, the teachers showed they are giving students agency in classes, which gives the students power though the question remains if all teachers give their students agency and power. One way four interviewees give students power is by using contract grading. Aurora at Patton College said she moved to contract grading, and “as a class, we come up with it. I have a set contract to start off with, but we also make adjustments, and each class has to make adjustments based on how the class is progressing and then individually.”

Also mentioning contract grading was Jesse at Clemens College who said the contract for his class is based on time, effort, and completion of assignments. He described it saying:

I have a grading contract... I do labor-based grading. So, it's based off of...putting in the time and putting in the effort and completing the assignments. So, I do labor, so we negotiate that. I really just come up with numbers at the beginning of the semester. I'm like, let's just try this, and then in.... the midpoint in the semester we make sure that it's still fair for everyone.

Jesse said traditional grading “limits voices and identities...it basically promotes white language supremacy.” This idea of contract grading is one way to allow students to feel as if they have power over their grades and learning though not all instructors use it.

Another way students are given power in the classes of those interviewed is through allowing students to have choices with their assignments. For example, Jesse mentioned “allowing students...they don't have to just write a research paper, so they could also do a podcast with a written component. Or a video with a written component because we do live in the 21st century.” Corey from Patton College said “they're analyzing the arguments in a TED Talk of their choice” for their argument analysis paper. A personal narrative assignment is part of Ava from Anderson College's classes, and said:

I have had times when students will actually... choose a text for the whole class where they get to choose their own topic. So, there's quite a bit of choice for them to find... topics to write about that they care about, that they are passionate about, that represent who they are.

Charlotte at Cuvier said, “I like to give them choice always so even if a traditional paper is the...outcome of an assignment, I would always give them choices in terms of their prompts.” These are examples of some ways faculty allow students to feel as if they have some control over their assignments to give them some power.

Though instructors expressed concerns about the students being at so many different levels in the 100 with support classes, the teachers interviewed are doing things like having students write in class so they can help all students as they work, they are using more scaffolding where they break assignments down to help students work on them slowly and with guidance along the way so their end results are successful, having collaborative work sessions with small groups of students, and they are doing more conferences with students to work with them individually on their assignments. Though versions of these things may have been done in their classes before, the need for these sorts of steps is even more necessary for students in these support classes

because there are not multiple courses below transfer for them to fall back on like before AB 705.

Two instructors who specifically commented on power concerning students are Cecilia from Patton and Jesse from Clemens College. Cecilia said, “The system was designed for the success of a very particular demographic... and AB 705 is maybe some step in the direction of making education empowering for everybody. But there's still a lot of work to do.” Cecilia was reflecting on this action to remedy problems in the California community colleges, but she still knows the implementation of AB 705 will not solve all the issues students face in school. Jesse said:

I tried to change the power dynamics of the classroom with a lot more discussions between themselves and group work, but also the labor-based grading contract does that for me...

they have a say and agency in the classroom, and then students are like more apt to...actually participate and be engaged that way. Or I hope so.

Jesse was noting the need for himself, and thus, the idea that other instructors may also need to consider changing things in their classes and the way they teach to allow students to feel as if they have power and with that power, the hope is an enhancement in their learning will also happen.

Distribution of Resources for Students

Step three of CPA also wants people to investigate what resources are given to those affected by the policy. In the case of AB 705, some of the themes that emerged during this study concerning resources were the ideas of tutoring and reading support (or a lack of these things) for students and for faculty the ideas of training and other help to guide them with AB 705 implementation were revealed and will be discussed in the next section.

Tutoring

Of vital importance to student success is their access to resources. Several of the resources some instructors interviewed mentioned they need is more tutoring including embedded tutoring. Kellie from Alga College reflected that not having embedded tutors has been a challenge, and though some instructors with the support classes get them, not all instructors do. “When I have had embedded tutors, they have really helped the students,” she shared. Because Alga does not have embedded tutors in all of the corequisite classes, Jaqueline who also teaches there said, “I personally require students to go see the tutor in the tutoring center at least three times during the semester.” This was a way to make sure students got help with their work even if there is not an embedded tutor in the class.

Joan from Nichols College said “tutoring is in jeopardy...because of the budget” at her school, and this is a concern because she wondered if students will continue to get the support they may need for being successful in classes like the English 100 with a corequisite. Joan felt lucky to have an embedded tutor in her support class which she knows helps students because when the class is face to face, they meet in a computer lab, and:

So, I was able to really use that lab. I would have them...do a lot of their drafting during the extra class time...and then...between me and the tutor, we would go around and be able to work with... each student individually...even for five minutes...just to kind of see, okay, what have you written so far, and give them guidance.

Joan also said she is concerned there is not school-wide tutoring to help students with reading. “And the tutoring is in jeopardy... because of the budget, and there's not reading tutoring... there's writing centers, but they don't have reading tutoring centers.” This highlights the concern the school is not funding tutoring the way they should be.

Christina, at the same school as Joan, also noted the funding cut to tutoring “was a response to COVID” and not having embedded tutoring in all the corequisite classes as an obstacle to supporting students with the additional help they may need in these classes.

Corey from Patton said his school has embedded tutors who “sit in [class] half the time and half the time they do out of class tutoring sessions.” At the same school as Corey, Aurora also stated, “We have our embedded tutor, and it's part of their contract that they do meet with her during the semester.” Lydia from Clemens commented she thought “having an embedded tutor would be very helpful,” and she felt the school should be increasing and not decreasing funding for tutoring and suggested the school, “Should be increasing our...tutoring. And with professional tutoring instead of decreasing it given what we're being asked to do with AB 705.”

Carol, at the same school as Lydia, also expressed the need for tutoring and that funding for tutoring, including embedded tutoring, “should be at the center of this.” Carol also stated she believes schools should use money they are getting for equity resources to help support AB 705 since there is a connection with the Bill and equity. Carol explained that Clemens College received equity money:

...and [it] was immediately spent without a foregrounding of ... this very clear equity connection with AB 705. That if we wanted to really do something with equity funds and put it in a place where it could really, really have consequences, then AB 705 would have been a perfect place because everybody working on it understood the equity issue...

To further illustrate this idea of the need for money to help students with resources to satisfy the requirements of AB 705, both Carol and Lydia believe schools should be increasing and not decreasing student support services. Lydia said, “Sometimes some decisions being made about student services seem to be completely disconnected from AB 705 and that's been difficult to

see...” This highlights the concerns some faculty have that better decisions need to be made by the schools to help students impacted by AB 705 succeed.

Lack of Reading Skill Support

A theme that emerged when talking about challenges students face that connects with resources is students not having reading skills needed to succeed in academics. Kellie from Alga expressed her concern about students’ reading skills by saying, “...they have difficulties reading challenging texts, and they haven't been taught a lot of different strategies in order to break those texts down.” Jaqueline at the same school as Kellie also mentioned students are not coming to college with academic reading skills. “I have students who have kind of a lack of preparation where their schools didn’t teach them academic reading and writing prior to coming college.” Jaqueline then said, “I do a lot of modeling and sequencing and kind of taking them through the assignment because I know it's new for many of them.” This work helps students with those skills so they can succeed with the writing components of the class. Jaqueline disclosed that her school gets a lot of first-generation students, so the reading and writing skills they come to college with are usually different than the skills of students who have parents who went to college. She said:

...we have a lot of native speakers too who tend to be first generation college students.

So maybe their academic background and reading and writing isn't as strong as someone whose parents got to go to community college or got a four-year degree. So, we definitely consider that when we're preparing our lessons and make sure we break it down and do a lot of modeling so that everyone can be successful in the class.

This demonstrates the need to consider all students are not coming to college with the skills they need to succeed, and instructors need to work on ways to help with student success in their classes. Schools also need to consider how they can help students be successful.

At Nichols College, Joan and Christina also both stated students struggle with reading comprehension. Joan feels reading and vocabulary are challenging for students: “One of the biggest struggles is with the reading. They don't understand the vocabulary level, so they don't understand... a number of words... in the reading... some of them say ...the reading level is too hard for them.” Christina said, “Focusing on a text is difficult, and pulling out the main idea for reading comprehension” makes assignments difficult for learners. As discussed before, Joan also revealed the school does not have reading-specific tutoring to help students, so it is a challenge at her school for students to get the extra support they might need with that specific skill.

Veronica at Birmingham said, “I like to say that they're engaged with the readings, but some of them are more challenging. And so even getting...the main point out of that might be difficult.” Adele from Clemens College also said getting the main point and general reading comprehension skills are hard for some students. She commented:

...I'm still just concerned about students getting that core content because I think writing...it's a foundational skill, and... part of it, too, is... now we're also expected to be teaching reading strategies and... so we're trying to do everything in grammar, reading, writing in one semester...

Continuing with those ideas, Lydia from the same school as Adele said, “But then there's also a subset that I've seen more and more of... since the implementation of AB 705 of just sentence level... issues with grammar and mechanics and just comprehension and reading

comprehension.” These quotes show the concern faculty have about their students’ reading skills and how they don’t get the support needed to read successfully in academics.

Jesse at Clemens talked about doing his own studying to help students with reading academic and scholarly articles and other reading literacies like social media. He observed, “We spent so much time with... have you read this... rather than focusing on - how did you read it.” Carol at the same school as Jesse, Adele, and Lydia stated something similar saying teachers cannot “...assume that they're [students] going to be able to go and successfully engage with the reading on their own.” Therefore, faculty teaching writing classes still need to help their students with reading skills, but that does not mean the faculty have been trained to teach writing skills.

From Cuvier College, Charlotte believes “a student who's reading with more depth and understanding... is going to produce more interesting reactions in their writing for sure,” so the skill of reading is directly linked to the ability for students to succeed in writing. Corey at Patton remarked, “We still have a reading requirement on the books, you have to be proficient in reading” even with the changes brought about by AB 705. English instructors are realizing the need for students to have these skills, but they might not be clear how to teach them, so they rely on the reading faculty to help their students become proficient readers. Academic reading skills are a necessary resource for students to have success in all of their classes – especially those that require writing.

Distribution of Resources for Faculty

When asked about resources students have access to, 11 of the 16 interviewees mentioned the Writing Center with a few mentioning students being required to go there as part of the class. Veronica from Birmingham said:

The resource that I really push is the Writing Center. Especially right now. This last semester was the first time I started offering extra credit for going there because I just... it's such a world of difference. And once they go there once, so useful.

The other resources noted by multiple instructors were the library with some having librarians come to and work with their classes, disability resource centers, and mental health counseling. This shows a few ways schools are helping students in all classes but specifically ways instructors see schools as helping students in their corequisite classes.

Training

Another way which resources are reflected was when interviewees were asked if they have received training about barriers to access students face and if they have received training about AB 705. Six instructors from four schools, Clemens, Cuvier, Nichols, and Patton, explained their departments have communities of practice where they meet with department members to discuss issues, ideas, resources, and other ways they can support students and each other as a way they have received training about barriers students face and AB 705.

Aurora from Patton said, "As far as I know, it's required to teach our support class." Christina at Nichols said instructors who taught their previous accelerated class, "Had to take the course with CAP [California Acceleration Project]." She said that because those who taught their accelerated course before the corequisite model began had required training, with the new corequisite class, "It was already...kind of assumed that you knew you knew how to teach this." This meant new training was not required at Nichols College for those teaching the English 100 with a corequisite.

No one else interviewed mentioned their school having required training though they all said training was offered except for Veronica at Birmingham College. She stated things are

discussed in department meetings, but “I can’t say we’ve really done it...as professional development.” Veronica went on further to say that if there is training on AB 705 but it is not offered the week before the semester when intense professional development is presented over the course of a week, “I just don’t have a free second to do that kind of stuff...” This means if the school is offering extensive AB 705 training, it has not been made clear to all the English instructors at Birmingham College.

Other respondents talked about training on equity with things like book clubs and speakers being part of this training. Six of those interviewed also talked about getting training for AB 705 and equity through the California Acceleration Project (CAP). This group started in 2010 as a way to help students who were in developmental classes and promoted, even before AB 705, things like corequisite classes and not using placement tests but multiple measures instead (CAP, 2021). Aurora from Patton said, “We used to attend off site for CAP training, and then we started offering it in house...and I went to the off campus one two years ago.” Adele addressed how she attended CAP training, and then in the department, “We really...did a lot of work last year in the community of practice about teaching...the affective domain and sharing...those CAP resources.” This training has been a major part of helping community college instructors in the state with implementing AB 705.

The answers about training offered showed schools were seeing both full-time and part-time attendees, and in two cases, Anderson and Alga Colleges, the schools were even able to pay adjuncts to attend at least in the past even if they cannot currently pay them. When asked about training, Ava from Anderson replied:

Nothing has been required, but there have been some, actually some paid opportunities in addition to just professional development... I've noticed it's been a mix of full time and part time since our part time teach the majority of our classes...

At Alga, Kellie noted, "...they weren't required, but we did have money at the time, and so actually, adjuncts and full timers were paid a stipend to attend." Jesse at Clemens said, "I feel like it's mostly part time. To be honest, I think there's a few full timers who come in here and there... they leave like in the middle or like 20 minutes in." Schools showed they got a mix of attendees and did have funding at least at some point to pay people to train in relation to AB 705.

In addition to AB 705-specific training, instructors were also asked about training they have gotten on the barriers to access students face, and all of the instructors were able to name instruction they have gotten from their school, department, or both. Generally, the training was in the form of workshops though some book clubs were also cited. Adele mentioned getting this type of training in the CAP workshops. Aurora who is tenure-track said that at Patton, "It's kind of an ongoing conversation in our meetings, but not so much, you know, formalized training." Cecilia who is an adjunct at Patton talked about her fortune in getting training about barriers to access. She said:

I would say, I've had a lot of training. I'm really grateful, and there have been so many opportunities for training, and...I don't know if other adjuncts have the same experiences I do. But I feel like a lot of support from the community of faculty where I am, both from fellow adjuncts and from a full-time faculty, and it's like, "Hey, this is coming up. You should join this." Or "Hey, we're going to do this. Come, come to this training with us it's paid." Or, "We're going to go out for lunch afterwards," or something. And so, the very first one I ever had was because the person who is now the department chair saw that I

was just finishing my Master's and was like, "Okay, like she really wants training, so come to this three-day event. Unfortunately, we can't pay you ..." but, I mean, the training is there. I'm thrilled because I'm so desperate for training right now.

This experience Cecilia has had with training showed her enthusiasm for it, but it also shows a school that is supportive of helping their part-time faculty to get training.

The main theme brought up when talking about the trainings they have attended was the idea that the purpose was to work on equity in their schools. These examples illustrate how schools are attempting to give power to instructors to learn about students and how to help them. This power is then transferred to students in their classes. Adele talked about her department at Clemens and said this when talking about training and equity:

Our faculty, I think, are really committed to equity. Committed to really... working with our students in a way that helps the students, and so I think the faculty who have been assigned to those classes [the corequisite classes] are really committed to equity issues, and that's the message I think that's been reinforced by the department, and it's been sent out...work with your students and do what you can to really support them and get them through this class... without lowering standards but providing that support to bring those students up.

This highlights the message schools see embedded in AB 705 – it is about equity and helping students who might not have gotten that support before.

Help Available to Instructors

When the interviewees were asked who they go to with questions about AB 705, 13 of the 16 people said their chair was a resource. Ava explained:

Our department chair right now is really knowledgeable about the curriculum and about the law and about AB 705... So, I go to him for a lot of the questions that we think are really specific about the implementation of AB 705 where I don't feel confident.

Those who did not mention their chair were still able to identify people on their campus they could get information and support from. This shows that the institutions are at least getting information to some members of the department so they can support their colleagues with the implementation of AB 705 allowing faculty to have power of agency.

Though faculty could name people they could go to for help and institutional training they have received, Joan mentioned there is not enough support for faculty in terms of class size. She said there are 35 students in each class, and they want to get students through the writing sequence faster, and the schools “want us to perform miracles,” but because of funding, faculty are expected to do this without support like tutoring “...you got rid of all these classes...then... what are we going to do to supplement that?” This concern reflects a lack of resources for students which would help faculty with teaching the classes now that developmental classes are limited or eliminated completely, and this threatens some power that could go to the students who are willing to seek help to be successful in their classes.

Distribution of Knowledge

This is a harder step to measure in the use of CPA as a framework. In education, information is being shared with students by instructors and classmates, and students are then sharing their knowledge back with their instructors and peers. When asked how she shows students she values their experiences, Cecilia stated in her assignments, “They have to rely on their own knowledge or on their own experience or on their own interests in in order to be able to do the assignment.” Lydia addressed this question in a similar way by saying her “students are

asked to draw upon their own knowledge or their own interests” in the assignments for her classes. Lucy also used the word knowledge when talking about the way students respond to the assignments. She expressed, “I tried to make it so that they have to rely on their own knowledge or on their own experience or on their own interests in in order to be able to do the assignment.” Christina described how she asks students to use their knowledge and experiences in their writing to connect what they know with what they are reading and watching in class and “supporting it [their ideas] with our course text and also their own experiences.” These responses show a distribution of knowledge because these instructors are encouraging the use of students’ experiences in their writing, so students feel as if they have something to say about the assignments that is valued, and that they are able to use that information in their work.

At the same time, there are gaps in knowledge in students taking these classes that were highlighted by various instructors interviewed. In addition to the struggles students face in school because of the other aspects of their lives, instructors also said they have students in their corequisite classes who come in not writing at a college level. Three of the interviewees said that coming up with what level their corequisite students come to school with is a tough question to answer because they do not think of levels, or, and Jesse said, “they have different literacy skills,” so leveling was challenging. Joan noted she knows she has students from universities taking her writing classes right now because of COVID-19 and the fact students can currently take the majority of their classes online. Joan clarified:

Well, I'd say...this semester, the 100-level class...their writing skills are pretty strong. I don't know if that has something to do with... the online... We're getting kind of different groups of students, and I also noticed that I have a lot of students that are usually

attending universities... like University of Arizona or Berkeley, but I guess because to save money... so I don't know if this semester's quite the accurate picture.

The other teachers said that though some of their class was right at transfer-level writing, there are students who have never written essays or were at a developmental versus transfer level of writing. Some of the writing skills teachers feel their students do not come to the 100 with support classes with are things like: organization, writing a thesis, reading skills, formatting, quoting, and the inability to answer a writing prompt. This shows there is still a gap in knowledge with the goal being for students to learn these skills in the corequisite classes.

Another way to consider the distribution of knowledge was answered when instructors were asked if they think AB 705 will hurt or improve student success. There were 11 interviewees who said it will improve success which indicates a distribution of knowledge, and the other five responses varied.

Jaqueline responded it will be important to look at data to see if AB 705 hurts or improves student success. She suggested:

We'll have to study the data to see, and... trends in education tend to be cyclical, so it is possible that in 10 years they will look at all this and say to themselves, "Wow, these students can't read or write very well. Maybe we need to bring back other kinds of instruction." And it may be that they will come up with one level below transfer that has reading, writing, but I hope they don't come up with the model of... six classes below the level where you're writing a sentence and a paragraph because I don't think that really serves our students. Our students are very capable of the work if we break it down and model it and make it accessible.

This shows that though she is confident the corequisite model is good, schools will need to look to confirm that it is truly working for students and adjust if it is not working for students.

Joan at Nichols said that her school has kept a developmental reading and a developmental writing class “on the books” so they could possibly be brought back again if there is a need.

Cecilia, Aurora, and Corey all talked about how in their department at Patton College, some people still want the developmental classes they had before. Corey said, “There was definitely resistance [to AB 705] through people in the old guard, many people who have been there 20, 30 years...” Cecilia expounded on this by saying:

There's still a lot of debate in some ways around it [AB 705]. Some people who are still like, “Oh, no, we still need ...the pre-transfer level, we still need the remedial classes.

And even students are like, “Oh no, we totally need remedial classes still.”

Aurora also said instructors wanting to hold onto developmental classes by saying:

I'm worried that for some people who didn't see it coming, it was an abrupt change... there are a lot of us are plugged into it, and we're taking part in the training and things like that. And then there were some that were like, “Wait, what? What, just happened?” And we have a lot of people in our department who really for years have taught... those... foundation courses or gatekeeper classes and feel married to them...and will not budge. And so, I think that that does harm for our students to have these teachers that are just obstinate.

But, as Cecilia said, “Something had to change,” so even though there may be resistance at schools, AB 705 is mandating that schools change how remediation works no matter what faculty may think about the rules.

Adele feels it is really hard to tell if AB 705 is working since there has only been one full semester of data (fall 2019) since the spring 2020 semester had the pivot to distance education mid-semester, and the fall 2020 semester was all online. However, she also said the previously offered class one level below transfer “was important. I felt like... I really saw progress a lot of progress with my students” in that class.

Charlotte at Cuvier believed students starting in low levels of developmental in the past felt they were “nowhere near ready to be in college” when they saw the structure of multiple levels below 100. At the same time, she indicated it is important for schools to realize some students do still need developmental help. With the corequisite class, Charlotte sees the need for scaffolding to help students reach their goals “rather than looking at all of the ways that they may be deficient in reaching those goals.” This can encourage students because they see themselves as able to do the work for the class.

Joe from Anderson College explained that the classrooms where some of the English classes are held are in a building without Wi-Fi, “I think classrooms would be the biggest challenge in... these bungalows...and it just conveys a really bad message to students about the value of humanities.” He believes the messaging from the school to the students in these classes “is like, ‘hey, you, you’re not ready for college, so go to this crappy building.’” He worried about what this communicates “to our incoming students who are the most vulnerable.” When students consciously or unconsciously receive messages like this from the schools, that can affect the student’s confidence which could affect their success in gaining knowledge. However, he also said:

...statistically more students will then have access to the college experience and everything that goes along with that...and I think that will spread. I think it's a feedback

loop. Their family members will see that success, and it will continue on through the communities that traditionally have been just straight up blocked by the systemic racism. Therefore, though he was concerned about the messaging of the building his students are in, Joe also saw how the idea of higher education could spread among communities who did not see it as an opportunity in the past because of the access AB 705 allows.

AB 705 could go both ways, according to Veronica from Birmingham College. She thinks it could hurt or improve student success. She stated she believes students who might not pass the new version of this class and give up probably would have had the same issue in the multiple levels below transfer offered before where they might have given up instead of taking all of the classes. Now they might give up when they realize they might have to take 100 with support multiple times if they do not pass. She continued on wondering if it is better for student to take the multiple classes before the 100 class and pass them and if that was “more useful than taking 100 and failing... is that going to hurt your pride... I don’t know if you’re setting up people for failure.” She said students in her corequisite class now will see the work of other students and know theirs is nothing like that, and this could motivate them to work harder, or it could discourage them to think they do not belong in the class.

Christina from Nichols College said that in the corequisite classes, something she hasn’t seen before is:

There's a homogenous group, not in terms of ethnicity, but just in terms of past success in school... And when you have all of these students together without those other students to kind of raise the bar even and just in terms of motivation...I don’t know how to solve that.

Christina felt in the past students would help those with lower skillsets to become more motivated in trying to match the work of their peers. She said they would “lift the other students up or... they'd just become a bar that other students need to raise to.” Now she feels her classes basically have students at all the same level, so there are not students to help set a higher standard that other students want to achieve.

Lydia was the only person who said that right now, in her second semesters working with the corequisite at Clemens College, she thinks AB 705 is hurting student success. After a sigh and a long pause following the question, she clarified, “It's not enough to replace a full semester of the... developmental. It's not a substitute for the developmental.” She feels this new course arrangement is not a substitute for developmental classes that were offered before.

Step Four

In this step, there is need to reflect on how a policy could affect inequality and privilege, and this was reflected in the question where instructors were asked who they were fearful might get left behind because of AB 705. A few themes emerged from the interviews that show there is a fear inequality will continue even though the intent of AB 705 is to eliminate barriers in college. Those themes are concern for: students with disabilities, ESL students, students who are part of generation 1.5, students who lack time or who have other time constraints, those the Bill was meant to help, some general “other” categories of students, and a few people who said they were not concerned about any students getting left behind because of the Bill.

Students with Disabilities

One of the main findings of this study is that eight of the people interviewed think students with disabilities could be left behind because of AB 705. Jaqueline gave the caveat that, “We're going to have to analyze the data” to see if this is true. “It may be that if you have a

certain type of disability, but we can't...say that every person with this type of disability needs to have two semesters. It just depends on the person.” She continued on to say:

But really, I think that if you've got the six hours a week, you got maybe an embedded tutor, you've got the time with the instructor that regardless of where you're coming in, with whether it's a visual impairment or cognitive impairment, you could probably do those things in one semester if you get enough practice and repetition and revision, and you get a chance to really master the skills. Especially if you're willing to put in the work.

This also reflects the idea that she believes students who are able to put in the work will be able to pass the 100 with support classes with effective instruction, so even if a student has a disability, it is possible they could pass the class in its new version with support.

Others concerned about students with disabilities being able to succeed without developmental classes had various reasons for this concern. Carol at Clemens College said in the past she had students registered with the Disability Resource Center (DRC)³ who would take the developmental class a few times, and though they didn't pass on their first try, they were still learning. When asked who she thought could get left behind because of AB 705, Carol reflected:

I think that students connected to the DRC. Students with disabilities used to really have a place in our developmental program where they could spend... a year, maybe not pass, come back two years, three years where they're learning... they're... maybe not passing, but they're learning... though they're not going to have a conventional path to transfer. So, for students who are really intent on transfer, AB 705 will not leave them behind, partly because of... the way [funding is] modeled for completion, and... there's going to be a heavy emphasis on resources for those students...but I know from talking to

³ Schools use different names for centers for students with disabilities, but for the purpose of this study, I will use the term DRC.

people...in the DRC, that students...who just cannot attempt 100, there's no equivalent place for them to be outside of developmental writing, at least not in our program. So, I worry about those students.

This illustrated Carol's concern for students with disabilities and the impact AB 705 will have on their success in higher education.

Adele also at Clemens commented that the concern with DRC students for her is because writing skills are foundational, and "I've been worried about our DRC students because of the faster pace, because... students who may have issues with...processing, so that concerns me." Since these writing skills are needed in the rest of their academic career, if students do not get to the writing proficiency required of all of their college classes, that could be detrimental to these students being successful in other classes.

Joan from Nichols College reflected that in the spring of 2020, students she knew were registered with their DRC program did not make the transition to remote learning. "I had several of the students in my English [class number given here] class, and I lost them once we moved to the online platform." This led to the concern that the global health pandemic could be affecting these students in addition to the other challenges they already face as students.

ESL Students

Another group of students interviewees were concerned about is those whose first language is not English⁴. Five people said they are concerned about ESL students in their responses to who might get left behind because of AB 705. When asked this question, Charlotte replied, "...the only thing I can think of is, I hope not, a large swath of our second language learning students because I just think it's murkier what this means for them in terms of where

⁴ They will be referred to as ESL students in this dissertation.

they can get the language acquisition skills...” Though these issues may not mean ESL students are being left behind, the fact instructors did express concern for these students is important to highlight.

Though there was anxiety for ESL students getting left behind with the Bill, Corey, for example, believes:

ESL students may have a problem with their prepositions or their subject verb agreement, but they know how to organize an essay. They know the function of an introduction. They know the function of transitions. So, their weaknesses are balanced out with their strengths.

Joe mentioned the amount of effort and work ESL students put into their assignments, so they are not a concern to him because:

Those students do just fine with the assignments of writing...The only problem is, I feel like they're getting left behind in our class discussion, particularly the big class. So, the interpersonal communication. So, I wonder if I'm doing them a disservice. But then when I see their work. I think that they're totally ready to move on to, you know, their majors and stuff.

By highlighting the success Joe sees with his ESL students, he clarified that he is not at worried they will be left behind because of AB 705.

Generation 1.5

Two instructors expressed alarm for students in generation 1.5. This is used to describe students who have “feelings of being culturally between first- and second-generation immigrants; they are often fluent in spoken English but may still be working to command aspects of written English, especially academic writing” (Fleischer, 2017). Generally, these students are

born in another country but have lived in the United States for years. They may not consider themselves as ESL students or they want to distance themselves from the ESL designation (Fleischer, 2017). Charlotte at Cuvier College commented on how generation 1.5 used to be talked about a lot, but now it seems this group of students are not being discussed, but they didn't do away, so, "there are still plenty of students who have very little literacy in English in their homes, or even, even if they're attending high school in the United States... I just think it's trickier for them." So even though this group may not be talked about as much, instructors still need to consider how they are helping them.

Echoing Charlotte's thoughts, Christina from Nichols said when asked which students she thinks might get left behind,

I don't think it's the students in our ESL program. I think it's...those 1.5 generation students... those students who are not ESL, but yet maybe speak Spanish at home and really struggle with syntax and with grammar, kind of those sentence level issues that don't have the ESL support classes to help them.

Though these students were only a concern of two interviewees, the fear for them is reflected in other responses about students who are not at the college-level and wondering if this could be a reason why, so it is important for schools to consider as AB 705 continues.

Students who lack time

One of the other answers that came up more than once was the idea of time. For some professors the idea of time has to do with students not having it. As Cecilia at Patton College said, "...if you have children, and you're trying to pay rent, if you have all these things going on, it's just like school, nah nah, it's the least of my concerns." Continuing with that idea, Lydia at Clemens College declared students who don't access resources may not benefit from AB 705,

but she said that not accessing the resources, “It's not because they don't care... but they also are, you know, raising families, working full time jobs.” Christina from Nichols also noted students “getting work in in a timely manner and juggling classes with...this real-world juggle” can be a major challenge for her pupils. These instructors realize the many roles students play in their lives, so their lack of success in a 100 with support class may not be because they cannot do the work, but it could be because they have so many other things to deal with in their lives, they may not have the time to put into school that is needed to pass the class.

Jesse at Clemens College talked about time in a different way. He believes the students who may be left behind by AB 705 are “students that don’t put in the time,” and Jaqueline at Alga College said students who are “willing to put in the work” should not be left behind. Jaqueline also said that with the support class:

You've got the time with the instructor that, regardless of what you're coming in with, whether it's a visual impairment or cognitive impairment, you could probably do those things in one semester if you get enough practice and repetition and revision and you get a chance to really master the skills.

Both of these instructors link the time spent on the class with the ability to succeed or not.

Additionally, Cecilia explained students may have the time, but for others, resources and time can be an issue for their success. There are students:

...who have the time to be able to do the work that they need to do to pass the class and succeed. And then there are others who do not have those resources, who do not have that time. And those are the students were being left behind.

These responses highlight the struggle students have with the amount of time they need to spend doing their schoolwork and all the other things competing for their attention. Time is a privilege

not all students have. Not everyone can devote themselves just to academics. This leads to inequities in who can be successful in college.

Those with Time Constraints

Another way pupils may lack time comes from Nichols College and is part of their support class structure and is not an issue of student pressures competing for their time. At Nichols, students do not have class for as many hours a week as other schools have their students meet in the 100 with support combination. The six other colleges have the combination classes meet for a longer amount of time each week in their combination classes. This is a major concern for Christina who said there has been a lot of talk in the department because they know this current structure is not working, and there seems to be a consensus this is because students do not get enough class time with their instructors. The department wants to “maintain rigor but yet also meet students where they are at” to promote equity while realizing these are students who need developmental work in English. Christina stated the department has, “...kind of a blanket course to get everyone up to speed and...it's just not possible with the way that we right now have [English 100] setup. That's not possible.” She did feel with more hours with the students like other schools have for the 100 with support classes it would be more probable to help students then they are now because “students are capable with the appropriate amount of time and support.” This shows the issue with time in a different way highlighting the fact the school is limiting access to instructors for students, and this could led to students not being successful in this new version of helping students with developmental skills.

Similar to Christina’s thoughts, Jaqueline mentioned that Alga College started with meeting their students more hours per week in the 100 with support classes, but “because of budgetary constraints and other issues, they've decided to make it [number of hours given here] a

week. And just for my own personal experience, that model is not as successful as six hours a week.” This highlights the desire from instructors to see their students more hours per week in these classes to best help them succeed. Jaquelyn also observed:

If you're going to get rid of 18 units of reading, writing [the number of developmental English units students could possibly take before], you could give the students one hour back. Right? I think we owe that to them, and especially in the model that really works.

That's what we should be doing.

She was illustrating that six units is still a lot less than the number of units learners who took the full developmental course sequence had to take before, so it makes sense to have students meet six hours a week so they could really get the time and assistance needed to succeed. A six-unit class is still not the high number of units students in pre-transfer sequences of English had to take before, so students would not get stuck in a developmental sequence rut like they did in the past.

A time constraint students also cannot control was discussed by Aurora. When asked the biggest challenge with implementing AB 705, she said, “I think time, honestly; the time that's going into giving really good feedback.” She continued to say that though she wants her students to focus on their ideas and structure most of all, she spends a lot of time with feedback because she knows the students want to know how to fix their grammar, so she wants to give assistance on mechanics as well as content, “So really it's the time and so much more time than I anticipated giving feedback.” Aurora also commented: “In our department we do talk more about that conference...that one on one student time... and so I spend a lot of time reaching out individually more than I did before and setting up those personal conferences.” She noted this

also takes time. Known for already having a lot of grading to do, it is possible AB 705 is adding more to the load of English professors which could affect students negatively.

Those it was Meant to Help

Another notable result from this question was two of the four people interviewed from Clemens College felt those left behind by AB 705 would be the very students the Bill intended to help. Lydia said, “I think the very students that it...seeks to...help. You know, the ones who... are coming out of high school or...it's been a while since they've...been in school who are coming out, just with not college level writing skills.” Adel said, “The very students it's meant to help I still do worry about.” They both expressed concern some students are not coming in ready for English 100 classes, and they wonder if one semester is enough to help students with all the foundational writing skills required for them to know to be successful in writing.

Along those lines, instructors at other colleges specifically mentioned students in poverty, students from low socioeconomic statuses, and students of color might not benefit from AB 705 in the end. Concerning students who the Bill aims to help but might not, Carol from Clemens expressed:

I worry about the students... who do not have the technology, the access they need with or without COVID, you know? Just the way the technology has been a big aspect of learning. And the third group I worry about are the ones who are... living in poverty because they just don't get to us, you know, even you know as valuable as it is that that barrier has been removed, they still don't have the socioeconomic, what they need to become a student.

Continuing to echo the concerns Carol expressed, Veronica observed that underserved communities could get left behind with the new requirements of AB 705:

...it's those populations who had a bad education...underserved...communities that had...poor education in high school...And then they get to community college, and they're not ready. And they realize it's going to be really, really hard. But... I don't know if it makes much difference where they go in. It's going to be hard no matter what. Right? Given this, Veronica expressed how she is not sure if AB 705 makes a difference because classes will still be hard for students who are not ready no matter what level they are at to start their classes.

Others

Some other students the faculty interviewed were concerned about not benefiting from AB 705 are: those who get overwhelmed, those without self-confidence, those who are returning to college after an absence in education, those with children, and those who will give up if they do not pass. When talking about students who might get left behind, Joan at Nichols reflected on a student who was overwhelmed:

...maybe students also too that get kind of overwhelmed... by the freshman composition....for some students, they tell me like, I had somebody last year. She dropped... I thought she was doing fine, but she was just like, this is just too much for me. I'm not ready for this type of class... and she dropped.

These students face personal challenges that instructors simply might not be able to help them overcome, so though the students with these concerns may have the skills to pass a corequisite class and a teacher might do all they can to promote confidence and to help with time management, most of this comes down to the student and if they are able to overcome their challenges.

No One

The two people interviewed from Anderson College both responded they did not think any students would be left behind because of AB 705. Ava commented, “I think now we’ve opened doors for students to not get left behind, so if anything, I think it’ll do the opposite.” Joe said he knew saying he didn’t think anyone would get left behind because of AB 705 was a different perspective from many people, but “I honestly don’t think that students who would have made it without AB 705 will in any way be left behind. So, yeah, I would say none. Could be wrong.” These responses stood out because Jaqueline at Alga College was the only other person who indicated that with hard work, no student would be left behind because of AB 705. Though she did say there would be a need to look at data as the school collects more, she also said:

So far, our success rate of African American students is exponentially wonderful... so far, our data is really strong that students are doing much better in these accelerated classes that are designed well because it’s the kind of instruction that makes many, many, many, students successful.

Thus, there is hope these classes really will distribute the power of knowledge to students.

A look at the demographics of the areas Anderson and Alga Colleges serve was done in comparison to the other five schools to see if that could relate in some way to these responses versus the other schools in terms of being in higher income areas or other such factors. However, there was nothing that stood out about the income, ethnicity, or access to computers and internet at home when information was pulled from the government census web site about the areas these colleges serve, so it is unclear what might be a factor in these responses except perhaps personal and institutional optimism.

Conclusion

A variety of answers have led to some themes that will be discussed in Chapter Five as I consider what the results to this survey mean in light of some recent findings that have come from early data about AB 705. This chapter looked at steps one, three, and four of CPA specifically, and it found that though schools seem to be implementing the Bill as it was intended, there are still concerns about AB 705 not helping all students which could still leave to inequity which is what the Bill is trying to avoid.

It should be noted that when looking at responses, nothing stood out in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age, or years of teaching experience in connection with respondents and their replies. Answers varied across these categories with nothing of significance being observed.

Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications for Future Research and Practice

Introduction

There have been many attempts to help community college students who are not at the college-level succeed. Before AB 705, schools were actively working on the Basic Skills Initiative from 2006 until the last few years. While some schools began transitioning to accelerated learning, schools still had to help students who needed remediation (Illowsky, 2008). AB 705 was a way to address the criticisms of developmental coursework that was being questioned by many scholars for a variety of reasons.

In September 2020, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Guided Pathways Task Force released an executive summary on AB 705. This summary notes, “Now, more than ever, community college must recognize their student populations and their mission to successfully enable all students to reach their educational goals” (Academic Senate for CA, 2020). The summary also reminds people of the idea “that higher education should be available to everyone” reiterating the open access mission community colleges were founded on (Academic Senate for CA, 2020, p. 1). In the report, they also state they have a few areas of concern given the early data that has been collected about the enactment of AB 705:

The data analysis indicates three primary areas of concern:

- The overall decrease in students enrolled in any math and English, which are basic building blocks for higher education success;
- Growing equity gaps in successful completion of courses for every ethnic group **other than white non-Hispanic** and Asian; and

- Major equity gaps in success and throughput for some special populations, including Foster Youth, CalWORKS, DSPS, and others. (Academic Senate for CA, 2020, p. 2)

Some of their areas of concern expressed by the interviewees are highlighted in my interviews with faculty who are the ones in the classrooms working with students impacted by AB 705. Mainly, there is concern both from the Senate report and my interviewees that students with disabilities are struggling with the requirements of AB 705.

After interviewing 16 subjects and looking at their responses using the Critical Policy Analysis lens, there are a number of findings that are important for community colleges to consider as they look at how they are implementing AB 705 and what they might want to do as they analyze their data.

The summary and implications will continue to use the CPA framework to consider what my interviews suggest as AB 705 continues. Step one concerning what a policy says compared to what is done with the policy by those implementing it was discussed in the previous chapter, but there were no notable findings and nothing to recommend to schools with this part of CPA. Step two will not be discussed here since the roots and development of the policy were addressed in Chapter Two and were not part of the interview questions. Steps three and four have findings that will be discussed further in this chapter. Step five will also not be addressed here as it is too soon to tell if this policy will face any resistance to domination or oppression that may occur because of the policy.

The interviews mostly led to results that fall into step three and looking at the power, resources, and knowledge that are gained or lost because of a policy. Therefore, this section will highlight the important conclusions that came from the interviews that schools need to consider

when looking to make sure resources are being used in a way that gives students power and knowledge.

Key Findings

Critical Policy Analysis

The use of this framework gave a helpful foundation to think about AB 705. The ideas to investigate when looking at a policy can be applied to laws that involve any number of ideas. However, the framework is not specific to education. Though all five steps certainly apply to education, a version of this framework could be developed to be specific to policies that affect schooling.

For example, step one wants scholars to look at what is being said versus done with a policy. However, in education, there can be many schools enacting the same policy in different ways. There could be a step specific for education in this framework that requires teasing out the differences between the ways the rule is being discussed and implemented among all of the schools.

Looking at the roots of the policy in step two should include a specific area of focus to see who authored or sponsored a Bill involving education and who helped gather the information that supported the Bill. For example, AB 705 was introduced by Assemblymember Irwin, but her education is in systems engineering, and there is no indication she has any experience working in education (“Biography,” 2014). Analyzing the sponsors and authors of Bills could be useful for people to understand who is proposing these changes in education and if they have gotten enough information to truly be suggesting worthwhile and necessary changes. Though Irwin likely consulted with experts in community colleges in California, it is not clear who she talked

to, what research she was presented with, and how she decided to support this Bill, so this leads to questioning if there was an accurate understanding of remediation at the community college.

In step three the distribution of power, resources, and knowledge is to be evaluated. I looked at this in terms of faculty and students, but a way this could be expanded to be a framework specific to education would be to evaluate all the stakeholders affected by a policy. For example, there could also be administration, classified staff, tutors, etc. who can be affected by a new policy, so there should be an area of this framework that specifies looking at all the people at schools who could gain or lose because of a policy.

I felt step four did not need any revisions. Looking at inequality and privilege for an education bill could be done with CPA the way it is.

Step five and seeing who might resist a policy is harder to analyze with new policies. Though there is always pushback to new laws no matter how well-intentioned they might be, it can often take time before there is evidence that shows how people might rebel against the domination the policy brings to certain groups. It might be wise to make this a step that is only included in examining policies that are at least five years old. Granted, in some cases a policy could have instant resistance, but in the case of AB 705, many inequities have been eliminated for now, but it is possible as more data becomes available a clearer view of the “non-dominate groups” being oppressed could be discovered, and this data could lead to changes (Diem, et al., 2014, p. 1072).

Step Three: Distribution of Power

Key findings using the CPA framework’s third step is to see the distribution of power, resources, and knowledge that occur because of the policy. The interview results highlighted a few main ideas schools need to consider as AB 705 continues.

Placement and Registration

One of these come with student placement and registration which can give power to the school or to the students. Schools need to review their methods for explaining how the multiple measures placement works to students in order for them to understand what the regular 100 class is versus the one with support, and so students understand why the class with support was suggested to them. Similarly, schools need to find better ways for students to understand what the support class is, when it meets, and how they register for it, so the teachers are not left with students who are confused and trying to change schedules the first week because they did not understand how the corequisite worked. Adele felt students at Clemens College are “confused about which class is linked.” As highlighted earlier, Corey also specifically mentioned issues at Patton Colleges with students struggling with these issues and looking at the registration pages of the other schools, though it did not come up in other interviews, it seems this might be a common issue for schools to investigate. If students without a clear understanding of college are accessing the information from school web sites, the institutions need to be sure the information is presented to students in a way that is extremely clear and helpful. If a student does not understand what they need to do, the school could lose the student completely.

Moreover, something to consider was pointed out by Joan who said not all students plan to transfer, so they may not need these English classes. Joan lamented:

... we're community college... not everybody's taking classes to transfer... what happened to the idea of just ... taking classes for personal enrichment? And I had so many students in a reading class ...they had low skills and they just wanted to improve... not everyone is going to get a degree or anything like that. And so, I don't know, I just think that's... kind of...a tragedy.

Schools should consider what they can do to allow students to bypass classes like this if the learner's only intention for being in college is for personal improvement or enrichment in specific subjects. Students in these instances should be given more agency with course selection to pick the classes they want to take without having required classes if they do not intend on getting a degree or certificate.

Step Three: Distribution of Resources

Tutoring

Instructors at four of the seven schools in the study talked about the importance of tutoring, and specifically embedded tutoring with the support classes. For Clemens, Alga, Nichols, and Patton Colleges, two instructors at each school talked about the importance of having funding to support tutoring programs and student support services as was discussed in Chapter Four. While Patton College is using embedded tutors for the corequisite classes, the other three schools are not providing them with consistency. The use of embedded tutors by everyone who said they have them is significant for schools to consider. Since institutions have cut multiple levels below transfer, they need to support students with assistance that will guide them to be successful with the model of having no developmental classes or only one level below transfer that has limited class sections. Student support services like tutoring are vital to the success of students affected by AB 705. Budgets should not be cut at the expense of the most vulnerable students. Schools need to look at ways to cut their budgets that do not include tutoring, and they need to look into having embedded tutors in all English 100 with support classes.

Harvard began remediation with the use of tutors for the affluent, white males being admitted in 1630 (Boylan & White, 1988; Boylan & White, 1994). Arendale (2010) questioned if

given this was the reason remediation started, is it right to eliminate these courses when they are not just serving rich, white men anymore? As the schools in this study are all Hispanic Serving Institutions and given the idea that community colleges are open to all, institutions need to make sure budgets do not sacrifice the support all students, no matter their race/ethnicity, income, or gender identity need to pass these classes.

Reading

In addition to tutoring funding, 11 of 16 instructors representing six of the seven schools that took part in the interviews stated the need for students to get reading support in addition to the additional writing instruction they get in corequisite classes. Anderson College was the only school not to mention the need to help students with reading skills in the two interviews conducted with professors there. Everyone interviewed from Clemens, Alga, Cuvier, Birmingham, and Nichols Colleges mentioned reading skills as being vital to the ability of students to succeed in college and that students struggle with this skill.

In course offerings before AB 705, many schools had pre-transfer level reading classes in addition to writing classes. Some of the schools still have transfer level reading classes, and two schools still offer developmental reading classes, but schools need to look at these courses to make them truly assist their current students who AB 705 is impacting the most. Instructors who meet the minimum qualifications for teaching reading according to the California Community College Chancellor's office should be the only ones who continue to teach these skills to students.

English departments should be consulting with their reading faculty so the two groups can work on offering students the help they need with college reading skills. Bahr (2010) indicated reading is a necessary lifelong skill, so he believed reading remediation was needed.

However, it could be possible for reading to be addressed without remediation. Schools should consider having the reading faculty work with students as part of the corequisite class attached to the English 100 classes. Additionally, schools should contemplate offering transfer-level reading classes that help students in specific majors like STEM or business and/or students in specific programs like DRC, Umoja, etc. This way the necessary skills will be taught, but they can be geared towards students in meaningful ways while allowing them to get transfer-credit.

Students will not be successful in college if they do not have the reading skills their content area instructors expect them to have because they are in college. When thinking about community colleges being open to all students, the schools need to make sure they have prepared their students with all the skills they need for academic success.

Step Four

This step brought to light extremely important information for schools to consider in terms of students who might get left behind from the changes brought about by AB 705. Additionally, some research came out in fall of 2020 that goes along with some of the findings from the interviews, and it will be discussed here.

Students with Disabilities

Faculty are concerned about students with disabilities being successful with the requirements of AB 705. Eight of the 16 people specifically talked about their concern for if DRC students can be successful with this model. The eight instructors represent five of the seven schools that were part of the study. As Carol indicated, students with disabilities who took the developmental classes in the past have nowhere else to turn for developmental writing support with this new structure because “there's no equivalent place for them to be outside of developmental writing, at least not in our program.” This left her concerned for these students.

Aurora at the same school as Carol explained she was worried about students who might give up if they do not pass the corequisite class. She said, "...if they don't pass, they'll give up. And that that breaks my heart a little bit, but I think overall it's [AB 705] good for students." Though she did not directly mention students with disabilities, they could be students who would give up if they did not pass the 100 with support classes on their first attempt.

Since the original intent of community colleges was to allow all people to take classes in higher education, one group of students they serve are those who may need extra support with learning and who may need extra classes to help them. Additionally, there are some community college students with disabilities who are there to help with socialization and other skills for functioning in society.

The California Academic Senate report suggests this question needs to be addressed, "What are the specific factors that influence transfer or basic skills success that can be identified within special population strategies such as Puente, EOPS, Umoja, and DSPS to better optimize success and reduce equity and achievement gaps?" (Academic Senate for CA, 2020). Along with this question, schools need to consider what classes and support services are being offered that help DRC students and what classes students in this program used to take and versus the classes they are taking now. Schools need to talk to their DRC departments to see what courses their students still want and need to take that could help prepare them for success in English 100 with or without support. If schools do not work to better help DRC students with the changes that have happened because of AB 705, they risk closing access to community college to these students.

ESL and Generation 1.5 Students

Attewell, et al. (2014) suggested that pre-transfer classes at the community college allow ESL students to get to the level they need to be successful at the university level. However, AB 705 could be another way to help ESL students with changes to the way the pre-college level classes work. The fall of 2020 was when the ESL adaption to AB 705 needed to be executed, so those departments have been working on ways to help their students with pre-transfer and transfer level work. However, ESL students do take English 100 classes, so another theme that emerged was concern for ESL students getting left behind because of AB 705. The five instructors who voiced concern for ESL students were from Cuvier, Nichols, and Patton Colleges, and the two instructors who discussed generation 1.5 students are from Nichols and Cuvier Colleges.

As the ESL departments work on their implementation of requirements for AB 705, it will be important for schools to look at the data that comes from the English 100 with support classes especially so the schools can determine if these students are getting the help they need. At least one school has already created an English 100 equivalent that is housed in the ESL Department. This allows students to get ESL-specific support with the class while getting the same transfer credit. The generation 1.5 students are not likely to take the ESL classes, so schools should see if students who might fall into this category are able to be successful in English 100. If not, then more needs to be done to find out how schools can help these students.

Time Issues

One of the arguments against remedial classes was the students are caught having to take too many courses (Adelman, 1999; Adelman, 2006; Arendale, 2010; Braxton et al., 2013). This is another way that reflects time as an issue for students. They need to take the classes to get the

certificates or degrees that will help them with jobs and income but getting through remedial sequences takes too long and is too expensive.

Since students will always have other factors in their lives that compete for their time and attention, there is little for schools to do about students who lack time except to try to offer classes at times that might help these students and to consider financial aid that might allow students to work less so they can concentrate on their studies.

Another step schools can take is to make sure students are getting the time they need with their instructors in class. Instructors at Nichols and Alga college talked about their 100 with support class structure does not give students the amount of time with faculty that would best for helping these learners. The reduction in time for the classes was attributed to budgets in both cases. This means by doing this, schools are setting up students to not get the support needed to succeed, so other ways of cutting the budget should be considered instead of a reduction in support class time.

Class Sizes

Additionally, the maximum number of students varies across the colleges. While four schools have a cap of 25 students per English class, one school has a 30-student cap, and two have 35 student enrollment maximums. Again, these numbers have to do with school budgets, but they also mean faculty cannot spend all the time they would like with each student given the number of students and the number of classes they teach. For students to be successful in the 100 with support classes, schools that allow over 25 students per class need to consider if that is in the best interest of learners. Especially if they are schools unable to offer embedded tutoring to students in these classes. Asking teachers to teach more students who need additional attention and support from them is not going to lead to student success and will lead to teachers who get

burnt out and frustrated. Faculty want to help their students, but with other commitments to the college to fulfill as well, the number of students per class is very significant.

Limitations

It is important to remember that implementation of AB 705 was only mandatory starting in fall of 2019, so though some schools started working on application of the Bill earlier, other schools only have one semester of data that is not marred by the disruption of COVID-19. In spring 2020, all the community colleges in San Diego County transitioned to remote learning at about the midway point of the semester, and in the fall of 2020, all classes at these schools were held online either including class meetings on Zoom or being fully online. This means schools will have to consider if any meaningful conclusions can be made from the data they collect from those semesters or if they should wait to make suggestions and/or adjustments to their offerings when they have more semesters of classes offered in their traditional face-to-face format.

Given most people interviewed only taught one full semester of the AB 705-compliant English 100 with support classes not during a global pandemic, the information collected in the interviews for this study could also be different than data collected upon the return to face-to-face instruction with the pandemic having subsided. It will be important for faculty to consider what they are seeing in their students in these classes when the return to campus happens. Though most faculty interviewed specifically indicated observations they made about their students that they thought could be exclusive to the pandemic and learning happening through Zoom and online, but it is possible faculty thoughts could change in the future when they get to teach more students in the support classes without the stressors of COVID-19.

It is also important to remember that there were only 16 interviews conducted in this study, so this is a very small sample of experiences of English faculty in San Diego County

community colleges. Though clear themes emerged from the interviews, a larger-scale interview project when schools have returned to their “normal” modes of instruction should be considered to collect more information from faculty directly working with students impacted by AB 705.

Suggestions for Future Research

As the implementation of AB 705 continues and schools move back to in person learning after the COVID-19 pandemic subsides, further research needs to be done on DRC students. The effects of AB 705 need to be considered for this population so schools can continue to help them, as they have in the past, while continuing the mission of being open access.

Additional research should also be done as there are more semesters completed post-pandemic to see the data on success and what groups of students have had the most and the least amount of success with passing the corequisite classes and moving on to the next course. Schools that may have gaps in research for specific students need to look at institutions that have success for those students to see what the schools do differently that could be the reason for that success to consider implementing parts of those schools’ models into their own practices.

Schools need to also specifically study the results of their students of color to see if they are passing classes with corequisites. If these students are passing the class, what grades they are getting in the English 100 with support classes? If the students are barely passing, there needs to be consideration as to why that is. Schools also need to look at their data to see if students of color in the support English 100 classes are enrolling in classes the next semester. Also to consider is if a student of color fails English 100 with support, do they try the class again or do they take other classes and avoid English or do they drop out of school? Once this data is available, further research needs to be done to see why these students are not passing English 100 at the rates of white, non-Hispanic and Asian students if the trend from the Academic Senate

report in fall 2020 continues. Interviews need to be conducted with students of color in this English 100 with support classes before, during, and after the semester to get their viewpoints on the classes and what helped or hindered their success in the classes.

There should also be more research that specifically talks to students about AB 705. Focus groups and/or interviews should be conducted with students who take the 100 with support classes to see their thoughts on those classes. Though some students might be frustrated with the number of hours they meet, it is important to get their viewpoints on what they are doing with that additional meeting time and if they found the corequisite beneficial. If they did find it beneficial, it is important to ask them what was particularly helpful so instructors know what students want out of these classes. If students did not find the corequisite to be helpful, it will be vital to find out the way(s) would they have preferred that supplementary class time to be spent.

Finally, more faculty who are teaching the 100 with support classes should be interviewed. It is important to keep hearing from the faculty about what they are seeing and doing to understand how the Bill is or is not being implemented. The information released so far on AB 705 has mostly been about student success and completion rates; however, talking to faculty to find out what they are seeing with their students and what they are doing in their classes is essential to helping this Bill succeed. Effective strategies can be replicated while things that have not worked as well can be eliminated. In San Diego County, students have eight community colleges to choose from, so though getting to each school might not be easy for every student, they could go to a different school if they do not like classes at the school they are attending. Schools want to keep their students, so they need to investigate how to make sure English 100 with support at their school is not a barrier to student success.

Conclusion

Overall, these interviews highlight that faculty believe in the intent of AB 705, but there are some concerns in terms of the support the schools are giving students to be successful in the corequisite English 100 classes. These concerns lead to instructors being apprehensive that not all students will be successful with the lack of developmental classes being offered, so though AB 705 may erase some racial and income inequalities that led students to be in developmental classes for a long time, new issues could emerge for students like failing the corequisite version of English 100 more than once, frustration, and other anxieties.

In addition, these issues could continue to affect the students the Bill was meant to help thus defeating some of its purpose. More data gathered about successes and areas that need improvement with implementing AB 705 without a global pandemic factored in will be important to consider as information coming out now will need to be considered with the lens that a pandemic was happening that affected students in their personal lives in addition to their academic lives. When more data from face-to-face learning is available, schools need to make sure their AB 705 implementation is not making students feel they are being dominated or oppressed. Rather, schools need to make sure their data helps students feel as if they are powerful and knowledgeable, and if the data does not show that, schools need to make changes.

As colleges and universities begins to eliminate or lower the number of courses offered in remedial education, it is important for schools, educators, and the government to consider what has happened with past variations on remedial education and what the elimination of these courses could look like in the future. Though it may be fine for universities to eliminate remedial work in some areas, lawmakers also need to consider first if community colleges are readily

accessible to students in all parts of the country, and if they are, will they assume remedial work can happen in them instead of four-year schools.

Moreover, states considering the elimination of remediation could benefit from seeing what happens in California with AB 705. Community colleges must always remember their purpose – to help all members of the community they serve with whatever goal they have for attending college. This could mean students want to attend college to improve remedial skills, or it could also mean students want to take remedial classes before moving to transfer-level work because they know they need additional help and support to succeed in more advanced classes. All reasons for education need to be considered when thinking about if AB 705 should stay as it is or if it should be altered to best serve the students it is meant to help.

References

- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2017). *FAQ on AB 705 How do the goals of AB 705 interface with efforts already underway to achieve the outcomes delineated in the Chancellor's Vision for Success?* Retrieved from https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/AB705_FAQ_030218_FINAL_2.pdf
- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Guided Pathways Task Force. (2020). *Optimizing student success: A report on placement in English and mathematics pathways*. Retrieved from https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/ASCCC%20Optimizing%20Student%20Success%20white-prp%202020%20executive%20summary_v1.pdf
- Achieving the Dream, Inc. (2019). *Achieving the Dream*. Retrieved from <https://www.achievingthedream.org/>
- Adams, P., Gearhart, S., Miller, R., & Roberts, A. (2009). "The accelerated learning program: Throwing open the gates." *Journal of Basic Writing*, 28(2), 50–69.
- Adelman, C. (1998). The kiss of death? An alternative view of college remediation. *National Crosstalk* 6(3): 11. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Education.
- Adelman, C. (1999). *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and bachelor's degree attainment*. Washington, DC (Washington 20208-5531): U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Adelman, C., & United States. Office of Vocational and Adult Education. (2006). *The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Dept. of Education.
- Aguilar-Smith, S., & Gonzales, L. D. (2021). *A study of community college faculty work*

- expectations: generous educators and their managed generosity. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 45(3), 184–204.
- <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2019.1666062>
- Amey, M. (2017). Making sense of multiple missions. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2017(180), 95-97. doi:10.1002/cc.20285
- Arendale, D. R. (2002). “History of supplemental instruction (SI): Mainstreaming of developmental education.” In D.B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Histories of developmental education* (pp. 15-28). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.
- Arendale, D. (2010). Special issue: Access at the crossroads--learning assistance in higher education. *Ashe Higher Education Report*, 35(6), 1-145.
- Arendale, D. R. (2014). “History of Learning Assistance in U.S. postsecondary education” in *Developmental Education: Readings on its Past, Present, and Future*, eds. Hunter R. Boylan and Barbara S. Bonham, (Boston, 2014), 12, 30.
- Astin, A. W. (1998). Higher education and civic responsibility. *NSEE Quarterly*, 18.
- Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T. & Levey T. (2014) “New evidence on college remediation” in *Developmental education: Readings on its past, present, and future*, eds. Hunter R. Boylan and Barbara S. Bonham, (Boston, 2014).
- Ariovich, L., & Walker, S. (2014). Assessing course redesign: The case of developmental math. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 9, 45-57.
- Assembly Bill 705, 2017 (CA, 2017).
- Assembly Bill 1725, 1988 (CA, 1988).
- Ayers, D. (2017). Three functions of the community college mission statement. *New Directions*

for Community Colleges, 2017(180), 9-17. doi:10.1002/cc.20276

- Baber, L. D., Zamani-Gallaher, E. M., Stevenson, T. N., & Porter, J. (2019). From access to equity: Community colleges and the social justice imperative. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 203-240). Springer, Cham.
- Bahr, P. (2007). Double jeopardy: Testing the effects of multiple basic skill deficiencies on successful remediation. *Research in higher education*, 48(6), 695-725.
- Bahr, P. R. (2010). Revisiting the efficacy of postsecondary remediation: The moderating effects of depth/breadth of deficiency. *Review of Higher Education*, 33, 177–205.
- Bahr, P. (2012). Deconstructing remediation in community colleges: Exploring associations between course-taking patterns, course outcomes, and attrition from the remedial math and remedial writing sequences. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(6), 661-693.
- Bahr, P., Fagioli, L., Hetts, J., Hayward, C., Willett, T., Lamoree, D., . . . Baker, R. (2019). Improving placement accuracy in California's community colleges using multiple measures of high school achievement. *Community College Review*, 47(2), 178-211. doi:10.1177/0091552119840705
- Bailey, T., & Columbia University. Community College Research Center. (2008). *Challenge and opportunity: Rethinking the role and function of developmental education in community college. CCRC working paper no. 14*. Place of publication not identified: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse. (2008). Retrieved October 9, 2019, from ProQuest.
- Bailey, T. (2009). Challenge and opportunity: Rethinking the role and function of developmental education in community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2009(145), 11-30.
- Bailey, T., Jaggars, S. S., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2013). Characterizing the effectiveness of

- developmental education: A response to recent criticism. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Basic Skills Initiative. (2009). About Project. Retrieved from <http://www.cccbsi.org/about>
- Beach, J. M. (2010). *Gateway to opportunity?: a history of the community college in the united states* (1st ed.). Stylus Pub.
- Berger, D. (1997). Mandatory assessment and placement: the view from an English department. In J. Ignash, *Implementing effective policies for remedial and developmental education* (100th ed., pp. 33-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bers, T. H. (2018). Improving student progress and completion of developmental English. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2018 (182), 11-19. <https://doi-org.ccl.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/cc.20297>
- Bettinger, E., & Long, B. (2005). Remediation at the community college: Student participation and outcomes. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2005 (129).
- Bill Votes. (2017). Retrieved from http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billVotesClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705
- Biography | Assemblymember Jacqui Irwin Representing the 44th California Assembly District. (2014). Retrieved February 20, 2021, from Asmdc.org website: <https://a44.asmdc.org/biography>
- Blanc, R. A., DeBuhr, L. E., & Martin, D. C. (1983). Breaking the attrition cycle: the effects of supplemental instruction on undergraduate performance and attrition. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 54(1), 80–90.
- Boylan, H., & Bonham, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Developmental education: Readings on its past,*

- present, and future* (Bedford/St. Martin's professional resources). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Boylan, H. R., & Saxon, D. P. (1999). What works in remediation: Lessons from 30 years of research. *Unpublished report*. Retrieved December 29, 2019.
- Boylan, H. R., & White, W. G. (1988). Educating All the Nation's People: The Historical Roots of Developmental Education: Part I. *Research in developmental education*, 4(3).
- Boylan, H. R. and White, Jr. W. G., (1994) "Educating All the Nation's People: The Historical Roots of Developmental Education." *From Access to Success: A Book of Readings on College Development Education and Learning Assistance Programs*, ed. Martha Maxwell (Clearwater, FL: H&H Publishing Company), 3.
- Brathwaite, J., & Edgecombe, N. (2018). Developmental education reform outcomes by subpopulation. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2018(182), 21-29.
doi:10.1002/cc.20298
- Braxton, J. (2013). *Rethinking college student retention* (First ed., Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series) [First edition.]. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (2013). Retrieved October 24, 2019, from ProQuest EBook Central.
- Breneman, D. W., & Haarlow, W. N. (1998). Remediation in Higher Education. A Symposium Featuring" Remedial Education: Costs and Consequences." *Fordham Report*, 2(9), n9.
- Brier, E. (1984). "Bridging the Academic Preparation Gap: An Historical View." *Journal of Developmental Education* 8, no. 1: 2-5.
- Brothen, T., & Wambach, C. A. (2004). Refocusing developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 28(2), 16–33.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American*

- colleges and universities*. Transaction Publishers.
- Burdman, P. (2009). Does California's master plan still work? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 41(4), 28-35.
- Butts, R. F., & Cremin, L. A. (1966). *A history of education in American culture*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Cafarella, B. V. (2014). Developmental education: Then and now. *Research in Developmental Education*, 25(4), 1-5.
- California Code: community colleges: student equity and achievement program funds. (2019). Retrieved October 14, 2019, from Ca.gov website:
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB943
- California Community Colleges. (2018). *AB 705 CREDIT ESL IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE*. Retrieved from
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b6b67ed88251b350b72312a/1533765614472/AB-705-ESL_Timeline.pdf
- California Community Colleges. (2015). Dual Enrollment. Retrieved March 8, 2019, from
<http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/DualEnrollment.aspx>
- California Community Colleges. (2016). Program overview. In *Student success and support program 2016 handbook* (pp. 4-9). Retrieved March 8, 2019 from
[http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/SSSP%20Handbook%202014/2016%20SSSP%20Handbook_FINAL%20\(3\).pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/SSSP%20Handbook%202014/2016%20SSSP%20Handbook_FINAL%20(3).pdf)
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2019). Key Facts. Retrieved January 6, 2021, from Cccco.edu website: <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Key-Facts>
- California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2019.). Mission and Vision. Retrieved

April 1, 2019 from

<http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/ChancellorsOffice/MissionandVision.aspx>

from California Education Code Section 66010.4 (a), as of 10/19/99

<https://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/cccmision.htm>).

California Community Colleges Chancellor s Office Student Equity Fact Sheet - PDF Free

Download. (2017). Retrieved October 5, 2019, from Educationdocbox.com website:

https://educationdocbox.com/College_Life/69588755-California-community-colleges-chancellor-s-office-student-equity-fact-sheet.html

California Department of Education. (2007). *The "Department of Public Instruction" Before 1921*.

The Campaign for College Opportunity & California Acceleration Project. (2019). *GETTING THERE II: A Statewide Progress Report on Implementation of AB 705 Are California Community Colleges maximizing student completion of transfer-level math and English?* Retrieved from <https://collegecampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Getting-There-II-FINAL.pdf>

Casazza, M. E., & Silverman, S. L. (1996). *Learning assistance and developmental education: a guide for effective practice* (1st ed., Ser. The Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series). Jossey-Bass.

Christ, F. (1984). Learning Assistance at California State University-Long Beach, 1972-1984. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 8(2), 2-5. Retrieved September 2, 2019, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42774637>

Clowes, Darrel A. (1980). "More Than a Definitional Problem: Remedial, Compensatory, and

- Developmental Education.” *Journal of Developmental & Remedial Education* 4 (1): 8–
10. *Developmental Education: Readings on its Past, Present, and Future* 2014., edited by Hunter Boylan, Barbara Bonham. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Cohen, A. M. (2001). Governmental policies affecting community colleges: A historical perspective. In B. K. Townsend & S. B. Twombly (Eds.), *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 3–22). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (2014), *The American community college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Complete College America. (2009). About. Retrieved March 5, 2019, from <https://completecollege.org/about/>
- Completion by Design. (2017). Retrieved 14 October 2019, from <https://www.completionbydesign.org/s/#hearthestory>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cross, K. P. (1976). *Accent on learning* (1st ed., Ser. The Jossey-Bass series in higher education). Jossey-Bass.
- Diem, S., Young, M., Welton, A., Mansfield, K., & Lee, P. (2014). The intellectual landscape of critical policy analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (qse)*, 27(9), 1068-1090.
- Donahoe Report: California Master Plan for Postsecondary Education (1960), Senate Bill 33,

Section 1, Division 16.5 of the Education Code, Higher Education, Chapter 1, General Provisions.

Douglass, J. (2007). *The conditions for admission: Access, equity, and the social contract of public universities*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Do you know TRIO? (2003). *Ed.gov*.

<https://doi.org/http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/trio/index.html>

EDC. (1976 & 1993). Retrieved October 5, 2019, from Ca.gov website:

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?division=7.&chapter=2.&part=48.&lawCode=EDC&title=3.&article=1.

Eells, W. C. (1931). *The junior college* (Ser. Riverside textbooks in education). Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ellison, J. W. (1973). The Concept of College and University Learning Resources Centers.

Finley, D.L., & Kinslow, S.L. (2016). In *Faculty talk about teaching at the community college*. essay, Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935291.013.47>

Fleischer, C. (2017, September 7). NCTE. Retrieved January 3, 2021, from NCTE website:

<https://ncte.org/blog/2017/09/esl-ell-generation-1-5-why-are-these-terms-important/>

Foundation for California Community Colleges. (2019). California Guided Pathways Project.

Retrieved March 3, 2019, from <https://www.caguidedpathways.org/contact>

Getting Past Go. (2010). Retrieved 8 October 2019, from

<https://www.issuelab.org/resources/9445/9445.pdf>

Ginder, S. A., Kelly-Reid, J. E., & Mann, F. B. (2018). *Postsecondary institutions and cost of attendance in 2017–18; degrees and other awards conferred, 2016–17; and 12-month enrollment, 2016–17: First look (preliminary data) (NCES 2018-060)*. U.S. Department

- of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved December 5, 2019, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>
- Gray, A. (1915). The Junior College in California. *The School Review*, 23(7), 465-473. Retrieved January 8, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1076876>
- Goudas, A., & Boylan, H. (2012). Addressing flawed research in developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 36(1), 2-4.
- Grenier, J. (1990). Milestones in California history: The Donahoe higher education act, 30 years after. *California History*, 69 (1).
- Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.
- Hetts, J., Hayward, C. Newell, M., Willett, T., Perez, A. (2019). *Navigating and networking through AB 705 implementation: We're all in this together [PowerPoint slides]*. Retrieved from https://www.dropbox.com/s/c1bmngph8avmxlv/Mesa_Regional_Workshop_PPT.ppt?dl=0
- Higher Education Act. (2020). Retrieved October 17, 2019, from Aacrao.org website: <https://www.aacrao.org/advocacy/issues/higher-education-act/3>
- Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs): 2018-19. (2018). Retrieved January 5, 2021, from Excelencia in Education website: <https://www.edexcelencia.org/research/publications/hispanic-serving-institutions-hsis-2018-19>
- Hodara, M. & Smith Jaggars, S. (2014). An examination of the impact of accelerating

- community college students' progression through developmental education, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85:2, 246-276, doi:10.1080/00221546.2014.11777326
- Hughes, K., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2011). Assessing developmental assessment in community colleges. *Community College Review*, 39 (4), 327-351.
- Hull, G., Rose, M., Fraser, K., & Castellano, M. (1991). Remediation as Social Construct: Perspectives from an Analysis of Classroom Discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 42(3), 299-329. doi:10.2307/358073
- Illowsky, B. (2008). The California basic skills initiative. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2008 (144), 83-91.
- Institute for Higher Education. (1998). *College remediation: What it is, what it costs, what's at stake*. Institute for Higher Education.
- Jaggars, S. S., & Bickerstaff, S. (2018). Developmental education: The evolution of research and reform BT - *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*: Published under the Sponsorship of the Association for Institutional Research and the Association for the Study of Higher Education. In M. B. Paulsen (Ed.) (pp. 469–503). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Jenkins, D., & Cho, S. (2013). Get with the program ... and finish it: Building guided pathways to accelerate student completion. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2013(164), 27-35. doi:10.1002/cc.20078
- Keppel, F. (1987). *Educational policy in the next decade*. University Press of America.
- Key Facts | California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2019). Retrieved 19 October 2019, from <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Key-Facts>
- Kozeracki, C. A. (2002). ERIC review: Issues in developmental education. *Community College*

- Review*, 29, 83–101.
- Lardner, E., & Malnarich, G. (2008). A new era in learning-community work: Why the pedagogy of intentional integration matters. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(4), 30-37.
- Levine-Brown, P., Anthony, S. W., & Boylan, H. R. (2017). The current state of developmental education: an interview with Hunter R. Boylan. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 41(1), 18–22.
- Marwick, J. (2004). Charting a path to success: The association between institutional placement policies and the academic success of Latino students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(3), 263-280.
- Maxwell, M. (1997). *Improving student learning skills* (1st ed., Ser. The Jossey-Bass series in higher education). Jossey-Bass.
- McElroy, E. J., & Armesto, M. (1998). TRIO and Upward Bound: History, programs, and issues—Past present, and future. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 67, 373-380.
- McGrath, E.J. *The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Publications, 1965.
- McLane, C. (1913). The junior college, or upward extension of the high school. *The School Review*, 21(3), 161-170. Retrieved January 8, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1076737>
- Mejia, M., Rodriguez, O., & Johnson, H. (2020). *A New Era of Student Access at California's Community Colleges*. Retrieved from website: <https://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/a-new-era-of-student-access-at-californias-community-colleges-november-2020.pdf>

- Merisotis, J., & Phipps, R. (2000). Remedial education in colleges and universities: What's really going on? *Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 67-85.
- Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(9), 1212–1222.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315588501>
- Nevarez, C., & Wood, J. L. *Community College Leadership and its Administration*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2010.
- New Legislation Saves Students Time and Money toward Earning Degrees | Assemblymember Jacqui Irwin Representing the 44th California Assembly District. (2017, September 18). Retrieved October 14, 2019, from Asmdc.org website: <https://a44.asmdc.org/press-releases/20170918-new-legislation-saves-students-time-and-money-toward-earning-degrees>
- 1917 Amendment to the California State Political Code: Chapter 304. (2021). Retrieved January 8, 2021, from Cdlb.org website:
https://oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb396nb1dc&brand=oac4&doc.view=entire_text
- Offenstein, J., & Shulock, N. (2011). Political and policy barriers to basic skills education in the California community colleges. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(2), 160-172.
- Parsley, K., Tino, V., Goodsell-Love, A., Russo, P., & National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment. (1994). *Building learning communities for new college students: A summary of research findings of the collaborative learning project*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University NCTLA.
- Patton, M. Q. (2003). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3. ed.). Sage Publications.
- Porterville College Office of Institutional Research (2019). Early Data Shows the Promise of Co-

Requisite Model in English. Retrieved from <https://do-prod-webteam-drupalfiles.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/pcedu/s3fs-public/Research%20Brief%2013%20Early%20Data%20Shows%20the%20Promise%20of%20Co-requisite%20Model%20in%20English.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2CICApC0cnsim92f-Fn7RrdUd9acCFR5YhHQQiug4UUmhwRRWcLW6tvw>

QuickFacts: San Diego County, California; California; United States. (2019). Retrieved January 5, 2021, from Census Bureau QuickFacts website:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sandiegocountycalifornia,CA,US/PST045219>

Quigley, M., & Bailey, T. (2003). *Community college movement in perspective: Teachers college responds to the Truman commission*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.

Quint, J., Jaggars, S., Byndloss, D., Magazinnik, A., & MDRC. (2013). *Bringing developmental education to scale: Lessons from the developmental education initiative*. Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse. (2013). Retrieved April 28, 2019, from ERIC Clearinghouse.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., Omaha Boy, N. H., & Mullins, P. L. (1987). *Access & excellence: the open-door college*. Community College Press.

Roueche, J. E., & Roueche, S. D. (1993). *Between a rock and a hard place: the at-risk student in the open-door college*. Community College Press.

Roueche, J. E., & Wheeler, C. L. (1973). Instructional procedures for the disadvantaged. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 21(3), 222–225.

Rutschow, E., & Schneider, E., and MDRC (2011). *Unlocking the Gate: What We Know About Improving Developmental Education*. Place of Publication Not Identified: MDRC.

- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage. (2009).
Retrieved November 1, 2019, from Semantic Scholar.
- Sawchuk, S. (2018). "'Transition' Class Boosted College Credits but Not Learning.”
Education Week 38 (13): 7.
- Saxon, D. P., & Boylan, H. R. (2001). The cost of remedial education in higher
education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(2), 2-9.
- Seashore, C. (1940). *The junior college movement*. New York: H. Holt and Company.
- SB 1143 Senate Bill - AMENDED. (2010). Retrieved September 19, 2019, from Ca.gov
website: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_1101-1150/sb_1143_bill_20100802_amended_asm_v95.html
- Smith, A. A. (2019). More California community college students entering,
passing transfer-level math and English as result of landmark law. In *EdSource*.
Retrieved from <https://edsource.org/2019/more-california-community-college-students-entering-passing-transfer-level-math-and-english-as-result-of-landmark-law/617999>
- Smith, C. V. (2010). *The impact of part-time faculty on student retention: A case study in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri--Kansas City).
- Stone, M. E., & Jacobs, G. (2006). *Supplemental instruction: new visions for empowering student learning* (Ser. New directions for teaching and learning, no. 106). Jossey-Bass.
- Student Centered Funding Formula | California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.
(2019). Retrieved January 7, 2021, from Cccco.edu website:
<https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/College-Finance-and-Facilities-Planning/Student-Centered-Funding-Formula>
- Taylor, S. (1997). Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts and

- consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(1), 23-35. doi: 10.1080/0159630970180102
- Thelin, J. (2014). *Essential documents in the history of American higher education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program - Definition of an HSI -- Printable. (2016). Retrieved January 27, 2021, from Ed.gov website: <https://www2.ed.gov/print/programs/idueshsi/definition.html>
- UC Institutional Research and Academic Planning. Major Features of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. (2017, February). Retrieved from https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/California-master-plan-topic-brief.pdf
- Valentine, J., Konstantopoulos, S., & Goldrick-Rab, S. (2017). What happens to students placed into developmental education? A meta-analysis of regression discontinuity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(4), 806-833.
- Vandal, B., & Wellman, J. (2011). 5 Myths of Remedial Education. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/07/21/5-myths-remedial-education>
- White, W. J., & Martirosyan, R.W. (2014). "Preparatory Programs in the Nineteenth Century Midwest Land Grant Colleges (Part I)" in *Developmental Education: Readings on its Past, Present, and Future*, eds. Hunter R. Boylan and Barbara S. Bonham, 18- 27. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Winter, C. G. (1964). History of the Junior College Movement in California. Bureau of Junior College Education Release No. 20. Revised.
- Witt, A. A. (1994). *America's community colleges: the first century*. Community College Press.

Wright, D. A., & Cahalan, M.W.; and National Center for Education Statistics.

(1985) *Remedial/developmental Studies in Institutions of Higher Education Policies and Practices, 1984*. Rockville, MD: Westat Research.

Wyatt, M. (1992). The past, present, and future need for college reading courses in the U.S. *Journal of Reading*. 36(1), 10-20.

Xu, Y., Hartman, S., Uribe, G., & Mencke, R. (2001). The effects of peer tutoring on undergraduate students' final examination scores in mathematics. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 32(1), 22–31.

Yarnall, L. (2014). Meeting 2020 workforce goals: the role of industry-college collaboration and goals for instructional design. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(2-3), 250–260.

Zachry, E.M. (2008). Promising instructional reforms in developmental education: A case study of three Achieving the Dream colleges. New York: MDRC.

Zook, G. F. (2015). *Higher education for American democracy: A report of the Presidents Commission on Higher Education, vol. I-VI*. New Delhi: Isha Books.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Recruitment Email

Dear (name inserted here),

As California Community College English faculty continue adapting to the requirements of AB 705, I am conducting interviews to understand how faculty have modified their pedagogy in the English classes they teach and what faculty predict for AB 705 for my PhD dissertation through Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, CA. As a faculty member teaching (class name inserted here) at (college name inserted here) you are in a position to share valuable information with me.

The interview takes about an hour and can be conducted by Zoom or phone. Additionally, there is a short demographic survey and an interview agreement to sign (online). Your responses to answers and participation in the study will be kept confidential. Your name, school name, course name(s), and course number(s) will all be changed so identifying information is not revealed in my dissertation. The interview will be recorded so I can have a transcript for my research, but the recording will be password protected and deleted once I have confirmed the transcript.

There is no compensation for participating in this study, but your participation will be valuable to my research and could help you and others who teach English at California Community Colleges understand what is happening in classrooms with the implementation of AB 705.

If you are willing to participate, please suggest a day and time that works for you (just a note that I teach until 11 am on Tuesdays and Thursdays) and if you prefer Zoom or phone, and we can plan the interview. At that time, I will send confirmation with the Zoom link, the link to the survey, and the electronic signature form.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Erin C. Feld
PhD Candidate, Claremont Graduate University

Appendix 2: Revised Recruitment Email

An update from my previous inquiry, I can now offer to put your name into a raffle for your participation, see the third paragraph of this email.

Dear _____,

As California Community College English faculty continue adapting to the requirements of AB 705, I am conducting interviews to understand how faculty have modified their pedagogy in the English classes they teach, and what faculty predict for AB 705 for my PhD dissertation through Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, CA. As a tenured faculty member/ adjunct faculty member/ tenure-track faculty member (the appropriate one will be used depending on the subject I am emailing), you are in a position to share with me valuable information.

The interview takes about an hour and can be conducted by Zoom or phone. Your responses to answers and participation in the study will be kept confidential. Your name, school name, course name(s), and course number(s) will all be changed so identifying information is not revealed in my dissertation.

For participating, you will be entered into a drawing among all interview participants for a \$100 Amazon card. In addition, your participation will be valuable to my research and could help you and others who teach English at California Community Colleges understand what is happening in classrooms with the implementation of AB 705.

If you are willing to participate, please suggest a day and time that works for you, and we can plan the interview.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Erin C. Feld
PhD Candidate, Claremont Graduate University

Appendix 3: Interview Confirmation Email

Dear (name inserted here),

I would like to confirm your interview for my dissertation study on AB 705. Below are the details:

When: (day and time inserted here) the estimated duration is one hour.

Where: (Zoom link given)

Meeting ID: (number given)

Passcode: (inserted here)

Contact Information: My email is erin.feld@cgu.edu and my phone number is 917-517-8297 if you would like to contact me.

Informed Consent Form: You will be receiving a separate email with a PDF Informed Consent form with further information about the research. If you could please review and sign it electronically before we start the interview on (date inserted here), I would appreciate it.

Pre-Interview Survey: To collect some demographic information for the study, please visit this link and answer the questions here (this will take three minutes or less): <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/83LJYP5> . Please note, your name will only be used by me and will be replaced by a pseudonym upon confirmation of receipt of this information.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to talking to you soon.

Respectfully,
Erin C. Feld

Appendix 4: Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN *INTERVIEWS ON AB 705* (IRB # 3782)

You are invited to participate in a research project. Volunteering will not benefit you directly, but you will be helping the investigator to understand how your pedagogy has been impacted since the implementation of AB 705. If you decide to volunteer, you will take part in a one on one interview. This will take place in the summer or fall of 2020 for about an hour of your time. Volunteering for this study involves no more risk than what a typical person experiences on a regular day. Your involvement is entirely up to you. You may withdraw at any time for any reason. Please continue reading for more information about the study.

STUDY LEADERSHIP: This research project is led by Erin C. Feld, doctoral student of the Claremont Graduate University, who is being supervised by Dr. Dina Maramba.

PURPOSE: To discover how San Diego County Community College English instructors have adapted their teaching because of the implementation of AB 705 and to see their thoughts about the future of AB 705.

ELIGIBILITY: To be included in the study, you must be an English instructor at a San Diego County Community College.

PARTICIPATION: During the study, you will be asked to answer interview questions. This will take about an hour.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION: There are minimal risks by taking part in this study. All interviews will be recorded, and transcripts produced. Names will be changed in the transcripts so identifying information is not saved. All recordings and transcripts will be saved in password protected programs. The code for pseudonyms for you, your classes, school, and other people mentioned will also be password protected and kept separate from the recording and transcript.

BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION: I do not expect volunteering for this research to benefit you directly.

COMPENSATION: You will not be directly compensated for participating in this study.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may stop or withdraw from the study or refuse to answer any particular question for any reason at any time without it being held against you. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effect on your current or future connection with anyone at CGU *or with any other relevant entity/agency*.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your individual privacy will be protected in all papers, books, talks, posts, or stories resulting from this study. I may use the data I collect for future research or share it with other researchers, but I will not reveal your identity with it. In order to protect the

confidentiality of your responses, I will not use your name, the name of your school, or the name or number of any classes you mention.

There are minimal risks by taking part in this study. All interviews will be recorded, and transcripts produced. Names will be changed in the transcripts so identifying information is not saved. All recordings and transcripts will be saved in password protected programs.

FURTHER INFORMATION: If you have any questions or would like additional information about this study, please contact Erin C. Feld at 917-517-8297 or erin.feld@cgu.edu. You may also contact Dr. Dina Maramba at dina.maramba@cgu.edu. The CGU Institutional Review Board has certified this project as exempt. If you have any ethical concerns about this project or about your rights as a human subject in research, you may contact the CGU IRB at (909) 607-9406 or at irb@cgu.edu. A copy of this form will be given to you if you wish to keep it.

CONSENT: Your signature below means you understand the information on this form, that someone has answered any and all questions you may have about this study, and you voluntarily agree to participate in it.

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____ Printed Name of Participant _____

The undersigned researcher has reviewed the information in this consent form with the participant and answered any of his or her questions about the study.

Signature of Researcher _____ Date _____ Printed Name of Researcher _____

Appendix 5: Revised Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN *INTERVIEWS ON AB 705* (IRB # 3782)

You are invited to participate in a research project. Volunteering will not benefit you directly, but you will be helping the investigator to understand how your pedagogy has been impacted since the implementation of AB 705. If you decide to volunteer, you will take part in a one on one interview. This will take place in the summer or fall of 2020 for about an hour of your time. Volunteering for this study involves no more risk than what a typical person experiences on a regular day. Your involvement is entirely up to you. You may withdraw at any time for any reason. Please continue reading for more information about the study.

STUDY LEADERSHIP: This research project is led by Erin C. Feld, doctoral student of the Claremont Graduate University, who is being supervised by Dr. Dina Maramba.

PURPOSE: To discover how San Diego County Community College English instructors have adapted their teaching because of the implementation of AB 705 and to see their thoughts about the future of AB 705.

ELIGIBILITY: To be included in the study, you must be an English instructor at a San Diego County Community College.

PARTICIPATION: During the study, you will be asked to answer interview questions. This will take about an hour.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION: There are minimal risks by taking part in this study. All interviews will be recorded, and transcripts produced. Names will be changed in the transcripts so identifying information is not saved. All recordings and transcripts will be saved in password protected programs. The code for pseudonyms for you, your classes, school, and other people mentioned will also be password protected and kept separate from the recording and transcript.

BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION: I do not expect volunteering for this research to benefit you directly.

COMPENSATION: All interview participants will be entered into a drawing for a \$100 Amazon card.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may stop or withdraw from the study or refuse to answer any particular question for any reason at any time without it being held against you. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effect on your current or future connection with anyone at CGU *or with any other relevant entity/agency*.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your individual privacy will be protected in all papers, books, talks, posts, or stories resulting from this study. I may use the data I collect for future research or share it with other researchers, but I will not reveal your identity with it. In order to protect the confidentiality of your responses, I will not use your name, the name of your school, or the name or number of any classes you mention.

FURTHER INFORMATION: If you have any questions or would like additional information about this study, please contact Erin C. Feld at 917-517-8297 or erin.feld@cgu.edu. You may also contact Dr. Dina Maramba at dina.maramba@cgu.edu. The CGU Institutional Review Board has certified this project as exempt. If you have any ethical concerns about this project or about your rights as a human subject in

research, you may contact the CGU IRB at (909) 607-9406 or at irb@cgu.edu. A copy of this form will be given to you if you wish to keep it.

CONSENT: Your signature below means you understand the information on this form, that someone has answered any and all questions you may have about this study, and you voluntarily agree to participate in it.

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____ Printed Name of Participant

The undersigned researcher has reviewed the information in this consent form with the participant and answered any of his or her questions about the study.

Signature of Researcher _____ Date _____ Printed Name of Researcher

Appendix 6: Pre-Interview Survey Questions

1. What is your age range?
 - a. 22-25
 - b. 26-30
 - c. 31-35
 - d. 36-40
 - e. 41-45
 - f. 46-50
 - g. 51-55
 - h. 56-50
 - i. 61-65
2. I identify my ethnicity as:
3. My preferred pronouns are:
4. What classes have you taught in the English department in the past and present?

Appendix 7: Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me how long you have been teaching English?
2. What courses do you teach?
3. Can you share with me a little bit about your educational background?
4. What are some challenges you face teaching English at the community college?
5. What are some of the benefits of teaching English at the community college? Things you enjoy?
6. What is the make-up of the students in your English classes?
7. On average, what is the age range of your students?
8. At what writing level would you say most of your students come into your 100 classes with?
9. What are some common issues your students encounter in the classroom?
10. How do you adjust your teaching to each individual class and the students in each class?
11. Have you received any training to understand the barriers to access students face? If so, what has the training entailed?
12. What types of assignments do your students have in your English 100 class?
13. What type of resources are available to support students in your classes?
14. What is your understanding of AB 705?
15. What is your department telling you to do concerning AB 705?
16. If you have questions concerning AB 705, who do you go to?
17. Do you have required professional development about AB 705? If not required, is it offered at your school? If so, who attends?

18. How do you show students you value their experiences and background in your English classes?
19. What do you think are the biggest challenges you have faced in implementing the requirements of AB 705?
20. Do you feel you are facing pressure to get students through your classes because of AB 705?
21. Do you feel AB 705 is going to improve or hurt student success? Why?
22. What students do you think might get left behind because of AB 705?
23. Is there anything I didn't ask that you think is important to discuss about AB 705?