LOUISIANA SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES FOR PARCC COLLEGE-READY DETERMINATION POLICY IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS & POLICY AND GENERAL CONTENT CLAIMS FOR PARCC PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Prepared by Louisiana Board of Regents (October 2012)

PARCC Campus Leadership Teams at all public and private universities and two-year colleges were asked to submit one team response to a series of questions developed by Achieve regarding the PARCC College-Ready Determination Policy in English and Mathematics & Policy and General Content Claims for PARCC Performance Levels. In addition, PARCC Educators Leader Cadre members and personnel within the Louisiana Department of Education provided formal and informal feedback about the Achieve questions and PARCC policies. A total of 13 out of 14 public universities, 3 out of 5 private universities, 7 out of 12 community colleges, and 6 PARCC Educator Leader Cadre team members provided formal feedback. Other Louisiana Department of Education and Board of Regents staff provided informal feedback.

Personnel from the Board of Regents and Louisiana Department of Education reviewed all responses and determined the following:

- Overall, 69% to 87% of the postsecondary teams and K-12 individuals who responded to the PARCC survey "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" to the language and concepts discussed within the PARCC survey questions.

- The strongest agreement (87%) pertained to PARCC using five performance levels to report student results on the PARCC assessments.

- The smallest agreement (69%) pertained to language clearly describing the academic implications of earning a College-Ready Determination and language describing the PARCC performance level descriptors (i.e., policy claim and general content claim). For those who disagreed, written feedback indicated that the language within the policy document was vague and needed to be clearer.

  The same percentage (69%) agreed that College Algebra or Introductory Statistics were appropriate entry-level, credit-bearing courses. For those who disagreed, some recommended that additional mathematics courses be added (e.g., Contemporary Math) and others recommended that Introductory Statistics be deleted for College Algebra served as a prerequisite for Introductory Statistics at some institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PARCC:

- Provide clearer language within the policies. Recommendations include the following:

  - Use consistent language throughout the different levels.
  - Be more explicit when identifying expectations for each level.
  - Provide further clarification for each level.
  - Use titles that clearly convey meaning.
  - Use bold print on "must do" items to ensure that expectations are clear.

- Include other examples of mathematics courses (e.g., Contemporary Math) that serve as entry-level credit-bearing college mathematics courses and clearly communicate that high school students who perform at Level 4 or Level 5 will have the necessary knowledge to experience success in Introductory Statistics.

LOUISIANA SPECIFIC SURVEY RESPONSES FOR PARCC COLLEGE-READY DETERMINATION POLICY IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS & POLICY AND GENERAL CONTENT CLAIMS FOR PARCC PERFORMANCE LEVELS

INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO PARCC SURVEY

PARCC Campus Leadership Teams at universities and two year colleges were asked to meet, discuss the draft PARCC College-Ready Determination Policy and Policy-Level Performance Level Descriptors and submit one set of responses to the PARCC survey questions for their overall teams. In addition PK-12 Educator Leader Cadre members were asked to respond. Responses were received from the following:

Grambling State University
Louisiana State University at Alexandria
Louisiana State University and A&M College
Louisiana Tech University
McNeese State University
Nicholls State University
Northwestern State University
Our Lady of Holy Cross College
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern University and A&M College
Southern University at New Orleans
Tulane University
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
University of Louisiana at Monroe
University of New Orleans
Xavier University

Two-Year Colleges:

Baton Rouge Community College
Bossier Parish Community College
Delgado Community College
L. E. Fletcher Community College
Louisiana State University at Eunice
Southern University at Shreveport
Sowela Technical Community College

PK-12 Schools:

Educator Leader Cadre Member #1
Educator Leader Cadre Member #2
Educator Leader Cadre Member #3
Educator Leader Cadre Member #4
Educator Leader Cadre Member #5
Educator Leader Cadre Member #6

PARCC QUESTIONS & LOUISIANA RESPONSES

1a. PARCC is planning to use five performance levels to report student results on the PARCC assessments. These levels are currently named Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Level 5. Level 5 is the highest performance level.

Strongly Agree	8	28%
Agree	17	59%
Neutral	1	3%
Disagree	3	10%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

1b. If Disagree or Strong Disagree, please recommend an alternate number of levels and justify rationale.

Disagree:

Response #1 (LSU): The only explicit rationale for the assessment is to determine fitness for college courses. This requires a 2-point scale. Implicitly, one senses other uses may be made of the results that would justify additional levels of discrimination. Until those uses are made explicit, one cannot make a reasoned decision about the appropriate number of levels.

The current language is too broad and open to interpretation. We are unable to determine what the appropriate levels are because we do not know what these labels represent ". . . knowledge, skills and practices necessary to enter directly into and succeed in entry level, credit-bearing courses" differ across institutions. For example, level 4 does not seem rigorous enough compared to level 5. Unless or until the content is determined at each assessment level, appropriateness of learning outcomes for specific college-level courses is indiscernible. Faculty in each of the content areas (English and Mathematics), should agree upon the specific learning outcomes that demonstrate "superior," etc.

Response #2 (Sowela): As explained in the criteria section of page 2, students would need a threshold score for Level 4 to earn the College-Ready Determination and be permitted into entry-level classes without placement testing. This means that students in Levels 3, 2, and 1 would be required to take placement tests at the two- and four-year institutions. Our concern is that when presented with a classification system consisting of five levels, the general public has a tendency to equate these levels with the five standard grades of A, B, C, D, and F. Further, the public also has a tendency to view grades of A, B, and C as being successful. These perceptions could lead to confusion and misunderstanding on the part of the general public, including parents. Two examples of misunderstandings: 1) not understanding how a Level 3 student (i.e. a successful C student in mind of public) is not sufficiently prepared to enroll in entry-level college courses without further assessment. 2) The false perception that only Level 4 and 5 students (A and B students in the mind of public) are college-ready. I would recommend

that only four levels of College-Ready Determination be implemented. Essentially, Level 3 could be eliminated.

Response #3 (SLU): We have two suggestions. The first is a four level rubric. Psyhcometrically this is sounder. Also, as currently written, it is not clear why this is not just a dichotomous division of meets or exceeds standard or does not meet standard...although levels one, two and three may provide remedial information, it is not clear in current supporting documentation that multiple levels are required. If left as is, we recommend two levels, meets or exceeds standards and does not meet standard

Additional Responses:

Response #4 (LSU-A): *(Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.")* For ENGL, concerned that with 5 levels, if uncertainty, defaults to Level 3 will occur.

Response #5 (Mcneese): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.". The following is the response of one person on the team.*) One member of our team strongly disagreed and provided the following rationale, which I thought was a pertinent enough comment to add in here: "I would prefer if PARCC were set up to help improve achievement levels. Rather than giving the politicians grades and ways to punish teachers/students, we should simply list areas of strength and weakness and then have students able to move to different levels based on mastery. We need to list where there is mastery and students need to move on and where there is a need to improve. We need to move to mastery learning rather than an antiquated "grading" mentality. If tests drive instruction, then let them help the nation move to mastery learning. I would say have tests on a continuum so that anything that students haven't mastered will move forward to the new tests. That way students will have to have mastered to arrive at the next level (I would name the levels AA-J with AA being below grade 2 level and J is 12th grade level. We have the technology. If the tests are going to be on a computer then let's make sure that each time they take the test they start a bit below level and then as the students get them correct the level will rise. This will also help with accountability for value-added states since it will allow our advanced and gifted students the ability to advance to other levels rather than being limited."

1c. If PARCC were to name the levels, what names do you believe would best align with the descriptions contained in the policy-level descriptors?

Response #1 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #1):

CCSS Superior
CCSS Solid
CCSS Partial
CCSS Limited
CCSS Very Limited

Response #2 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #2): Currently in Louisiana, the terms Advanced, Mastery, Basic, Approaching Basic and Unsatisfactory are being used to identify the levels of achievement. These terms are easily understood by the general public and would match the 5 levels concept.

Response #3 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #3):

Level 5 – excellent/outstanding
Level 4 – good/ above average
Level 3 - average/adequate
Level 2 – poor/below basic/marginal
Level 1 – inadequate/ below minimum expectation

Response #4 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #6):

Advanced
Mastery
Basic
Approaching basic
Unsatisfactory

Response #14 (BRCC):

Superior
Exceeds Expectations
Meets Expectations
Needs Improvement
Unsatisfactory

OR

Couldn't they just correspond to the existing descriptors? For example, instead of Level 4, Solid Command of Knowledge and Skills.

Response #5 (Delgado):

Level 5: Masterful
Level 4: Skilled
Level 3: Developing
Level 2: Limited
Level 1: Very Limited

Response #6 (Fletcher):

5 - Superior knowledge
4 - Adequate knowledge
3 - Basic knowledge
2 - Limited knowledge
1 - Very limited knowledge

Response #7 (LSU): As noted above, we are concerned about dividing performance into 5 levels. It may be difficult to differentiate, particularly at the lower end of the range. In addition, the levels are characterized in the PARCC Draft CRD Policy document: Superior, Solid, Partial, Limited, and Very Limited. The term Superior suggests a comparative score (relative to other students) rather than a score based on qualitative criteria of excellence. There also appears to be a gap between the use of the words "superior" and "solid." We have had some fallout over the terminology when reporting achievement levels. We would advise sticking to a numbered or lettered system (level 1, level 2, or A, B) so the ratings appear to be more objective.

Response #8 (LSU-A): Superior
Solid
Partial
Limited
Very limited

Response #9 (La Tech): Level 5: Superior Academic Competence
Level 4: Academic Competence
Level 3: Emerging Academic Competence
Level 2: Limited Academic Competence
Level 1: Unsatisfactory Academic Competence

Response #10 (Northwestern): We believe that the levels should not be labeled. Our experience in Louisiana is that once the levels are given label names, there is a stigma attached.

Response #11 (SLU): The current names have limited context outside of this PARCC document and do not convey true learning terminology. What is "solid command" in any other field or industry, for example. We would recommend labels which imply more than content knowledge but also cognition. So the labels would imply cognitive learning as much as mastery of content

Response #12 (SUBR): Superior Command – Advanced
Solid Command – Mastery
Partial Command – Basic
Limited Command – Approaching Basic
Very Limited Command – Unsatisfactory

Should be aligned with achievement levels of LEAP, *iLEAP*, EOC.

Response #13 (SU-Shreveport):
5: Standard of Excellence (Mastery)
4: Approaching Standard of Excellence (Approaching Mastery)
3: Meets Acceptable Standard (Average)
2: Marginally meet Acceptable Standard (Limited)
1: Does not meet Acceptable Standard

Response #11 (UL-L): Level 5: Well-Prepared (for the academic rigor of entry level College Mathematics or English)
Level 4: Sufficiently Prepared (for the academic rigor of entry level College Mathematics or English)
Level 3: Marginally Prepared (for the academic rigor of entry level College Mathematics or English)
Level 2: Underprepared (for the academic rigor of entry level College Mathematics or English)

Level 1: Considerably Underprepared (for the academic rigor of entry level College Mathematics or English)

Response #14 (UL-M): In the following phrase regarding Level 4 on pg. 7, what does "solid" command mean? Suggest staying consistent with Level 5 verbiage "superior command" and use a phrase such as "good command" for Level 4. SUGGESTED CHANGE: "Level 4 Students performing at this level demonstrate a solid command good command of the knowledge, skills, and practices embodied by the Common Core State Standards assessed at their grade level."

Response #15 (Xavier): We believe that the ranking of the five levels is very important. The naming of the levels should not be limited to just numbers but should include language that is clear and understood by all, especially the students and their parents. We would suggest language with added explanation. For example: Superior Command of English Content Needed for Entry Level College English.

2a. Each PARCC performance level descriptor includes two components: (1) a policy claim, which describes the educational implications for students at a particular performance level; and (2) general content claims, which describe the academic knowledge and skills students performing at a given performance level are able to demonstrate, regardless of grade level.

Strongly Agree	8	28%
Agree	12	41%
Neutral	4	14%
Disagree	4	14%
Strongly Disagree	1	3%

2b. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, how would you clarify the language?

Strongly Disagree:

Response #1 (LSUE): Language in the policy claims appears to be vague. Students will be exempt from taking college placement exams based on vague language, incomplete policy, and assessments that have not even been created or field tested yet.

Disagree:

Response #2 (LA Tech): Because PARCC plans to formally assess three of the strands of the CCSS (reading, writing, and language), we think the phrase "knowledge and skills" needs to be qualified to indicate the range of knowledge and skills assessed. The descriptor "engage successfully" seems too general for a determination of this magnitude. From the perspective of a high school teacher, it is best that students and their parents have a more solid understanding of what PARCC results indicate when making college decisions about college selection, early admissions, and scheduling, for example. Perhaps inclusion of language about the ability to "engage successfully" by developing deep conceptual understanding of the presented subject matter and completing tasks with

insight and control would allow students and parents alike to understand what successful engagement actually looks like in the context of college-level courses. Parents who did not attend college but who hope to send their children to college need the abstraction "college-ready" made concrete because they lack the experience to draw from to prepare their children for the challenges that college-level courses can present. The designation of the difference between Levels 4 and 5 is indicated by an adverb ("well") which begs the question of how the difference between well and not well will be determined. Further clarifying language about the quantifiable difference between superior and solid is needed. The designation of a partial command would benefit from slightly more concrete descriptions of partial.

In addition, we suggest making the language for Level 5 consistent: The policy claim talks about "superior command," whereas the content claim for mathematics describes someone who "Almost always can express grade level appropriate mathematical reasoning …" and who "solve[s] most …." In no way does a student who is almost always on grade level and solves most problems have superior command of what is being taught. The policy claim is also inconsistent within itself. It describes superior performance as not needing remediation, that is, as meeting the regular entry requirements. Meeting entry requirements indicates adequate preparation and has nothing to do with the term "superior."

Resolution: Replace "superior" in the policy claim in Level 5 with "solid," remove "solid" from policy claim for Level 4. Remove any and all occurrences of the word "superior" from any and all PARCC documents. Superior performance in any of the areas addressed does not place students into the mentioned courses – it places them beyond these courses.

Response #3 (Northwestern): We believe the language needs further clarification. For example, what is the difference between "limited command" and "very limited command". Along with the definition, examples could be included to further explain the policy claims.

Response #4 (SLU): The current titles do not convey meaning and are not defined. The term policy claim itself is not frequently used in any of the fields of our PARCC Leadership Team members' disciplines and will not convey meaning to parents, business people, or other constituents.

Response #5 (Xavier): For the policy claims, using bold print on the must do items to ensure that the understanding and expectations are clear. Also, instead of using superlatives use percentages to indicate the levels. Ex. 90% Superior 80% Soli

Additional Responses:

Response #6 (LSU): *(Note: The overall team rated the item as "Neutral.")* The policy claims clearly communicate the intended use of the assessment: to determine likelihood of success in college-level introductory courses. They are not contributing substantively to the document beyond that purpose.

2c. To what extent do you agree that the language of the policy claims at all grade levels clearly describes a student's academic preparedness and ability to pursue further study at each performance level?

Strongly Agree	7	24%
Agree	13	45%
Neutral	4	14%
Disagree	5	17%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

2d. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, how would you clarify the language?

Disagree:

Response #1 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #3):

Descriptions of various problem solving levels are not clear; they should be clarified.

Level 5 – "solve most problems…"
Level 4 – "solve problems"
Level 3 – "solve some problems"
Level 2 – "solve limited number of problems"
Level 1 – "solve very few problems"

"Solve problems" is not clearly a level between "solve most problems" and "solve some problems." "Solve problems" may indicate one solving all problems (even though "all" is not explicitly stated). For example, when we say "Rectangles are squares," we mean that all rectangles are squares and not just "some" or "most." On the other hand, "solve problems" may also just mean "solve some problems," such as when we say for example, "we discuss ways of implementing the new policies."

Lastly, I don't see the difference between "some problems" and "limited number of problems;" is "some" more than "a limited number? "Strong fluency…" of/in what? This needs clarification. Description of various levels of fluency is not clear. What 's the difference between "adequate fluency" and "often demonstrate fluency? "Often demonstrate fluency" and "Inconsistently demonstrate fluency" don't have the same meaning. "Inconsistently demonstrate fluency" is used to describe Level 3 and Level 2 as well.

Response #2 (LSUE): Again, the language in the College Ready Determination Policy in English and Mathematics is vague. Specifics should include exactly what the student should know for each level.

Response #3 (LA Tech): NOTE: The ELA lists are not parallel in construction which limits ease of readability. In level 5, a student "Almost always can express grade level appropriate mathematical reasoning …" whereas in level 4, a student can "Express grade level appropriate mathematical reasoning …" according to this reasoning, a student satisfying this part of the level 4 definition seems stronger than a student satisfying the corresponding part of the level 5 definition. Resolution: Interchange the "grade level appropriate mathematical reasoning …" statements from levels 4 and 5.

Response #4 (Northwestern): Currently, the language is vague and does not provide clear information for the reader (administrators, teachers, parents, students)

Response #5 (Xavier): For the policy claims, use bold print on the must do items to ensure that the understanding and expectations are clear. Also, instead of using superlatives use percentages to indicate the levels. Example: 90% Superior; 80% Solid

Additional Responses:

Response #6 (LSU): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Neutral.")* It is impossible to determine the policy questions without first constructing the content to which these policies apply. Some faculties in our area are hard at work on determining the specific knowledge, skills and abilities required at each level (mathematics). Once these are determined and codified, content claims can be developed.

The substantive contributions of the content claims (for mathematics) are as follows: The curriculum involves "major content" and "supporting content"—a distinction that traces back to the PARCC Model Content Frameworks. Mathematical achievement involves Reasoning/Arguing/Critiquing with prevision, solving real world problems and modeling; and fluent performance of skills. In general, assessment (and instructional practice at the secondary level) has focused almost exclusively on skills. It is always nice to talk about real world problem solving and reasoning. However, the challenges both conceptual and practical – of evaluating these learning goals through standardized assessment are staggeringly difficult.

Response #7 (SLU): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Neutral.")* Because the content claims are not side-by-side the content, the language is still fuzzy to our team.

2e. To what extent do you agree that the language of the policy claims at the high school level clearly describes the academic implications of earning a College-Ready Determination?

Strongly Agree	6	21%
Agree	14	48%
Neutral	4	14%
Disagree	5	17%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

2f. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, how would you clarify the language?

Disagree:

Response #1 (LSU-E): Again, at the risk of sounding repetitive) the language in the College Ready Determination Policy in English and Mathematics is vague. Specifics should include exactly what the student should know what to do. College faculty want PARCC content claims to be specific.

Response #2 (LA Tech): We suggest the removal the hyperbolic descriptors in the policy statements for Levels 4 and 5. The content statements describe individuals who perform at a level that does not warrant the policy language for Levels 4 and 5, but Levels 4 and 5 do describe students who should eventually place into entry-level college courses.

Response #3 (Northwestern): (Currently, the language is vague and does not provide clear information for the reader (administrators, teachers, parents, students)

Response #4 (ULM): "PARCC will make College-Ready Determinations in ELA/ literacy and in mathematics.

Students who earn a College-Ready Determination in ELA/ literacy will have demonstrated the knowledge, skills and practices necessary to enter directly into and potentially succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing courses in College English Composition and Literature, and introductory courses requiring college-level reading in a range of disciplines, such as history and the social sciences."

Reason for suggested emendation: The following paragraphs on pg. 2 of the draft explain the limitations on statements regarding the ability of students to succeed in college classes based on their PARCC scores. It would follow that these limitations be reflected in the wording of the statement on pg. 1 and that can easily be achieved with insertion of the word "potentially."

It should be noted that the acquisition of academic knowledge, skills, and practices are necessary but not sufficient to succeed in college. Other factors contribute to success, such as study and social skills, motivation, physical and emotional health, and finances. Many states are engaged in describing these factors and determining ways to support students in acquiring them as part of a broad agenda to increase college graduation rates. Since these non-academic factors are so important, PARCC College-Ready Determinations can only provide an estimate of the likelihood that students who earn them will succeed in entry-level, credit-bearing courses. Accordingly, the information and process used to identify the scores on PARCC assessments used to make College-Ready Determinations will be designed to promote confidence in the estimate, realizing that no estimate can be 100 percent accurate. A brief description of the information and process that will be used to establish the scores is provided in the final section of this proposal. "

Response #5 (Xavier): For the policy claims, use bold print on the must do items to ensure that the understanding and expectations are clear. Also, instead of using superlatives use percentages to indicate the levels. Example: 90% Superior 80% Solid.

Additional Responses:

Response #6 (LSU-A): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.")* Suggestion - For writing, connect the performance levels to the models in Appendix C via hyperlink so that scorer can quickly access models on different levels.

Response #7 (SLU): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Neutral.")* One of the issues with the notion of a PARCC level assessment is the distinction is that the rating from a PARCC assessment is very different than a grade in a college course. There are multiple components of attaining a "C" in a college course not taken into consideration, particularly related to cognitive and affective abilities.

3a. In order to inform the standard-setting process that will be used to identify the threshold scores students will need to achieve on the PARCC high school assessments to earn a College-Ready Determination, and to conduct future studies to validate the efficacy of those Determinations, the draft policy states that at least 75% of students performing at Level 4 will earn college credit by attaining at least a grade of C or its equivalent in introductory courses in English and mathematics.

Strongly Agree	6	21%
Agree	15	52%
Neutral	3	10%
Disagree	4	14%
Strongly Disagree	1	3%

3b. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, please recommend and justify alternate criteria.

Strongly Disagree:

Response #1 (LSU): Performance in college classes should be based on some verifiable evidence. We do not know how these performance targets were developed. Are they just targets for further study and verification? Will they be adjusted based on student performance in college-level courses? If there is no evidential bases for these targets and they are not derived from standard benchmarks, It makes far more sense to set expectations comparable to the high school performance: e.g., "Students who achieve a level 4 or 5 assessment level will continue to achieve in college at that level of performance (A or B)."

The relevant threshold criterion has to do with the percentage of Level 4 and 5 students earning a C or better relative to the overall rate of all students earning a C or better. If normally 75% of all students earn a C or better, then applying a 75% percent criterion for students "passing" the assessment (i.e., achieving Level 4 or 5) would not add any

predictive advantage to the assessment. If normally 50% of all students earn a C or better, then the assessment would be providing a significant predictive advantage. If only 25% of all students earn a C or bettr, then the assessment would be providing a much more strongly significant predictive advantage. However, for the assessment to be predictive at the latter level, it might be necessary to limit the percentage of students who achieve at Level 4 or 5 to such an extent as to reduce the practical usefulness of the test. In any case, once the appropriate predictive advantage is determined, the threshold scores should be modulated according to relative criteria. For example, one might say "students achieving at Level 4 or 5 will fail to earn a C or better at half the rate of students overall." This would mean that if 50% of students overall earn a C or better, then 75% of students achieving Level 4 or 5 should earn a C or better. However, if 60% of students overall earn a C or better, then 80% of students achieving Level 4 or 5 should earn a C or better. Note that this index can be set based on statewide data about achieving a C or better, or else on a college-by-college basis. The latter choice would require more programming effort.

Disagree:

Response #1 (LA Tech): Consideration - "students will earn college credit" implies some type of prediction or guarantee that cannot be made without data. This can only be a long term goal, not an up-front guarantee. The document itself says students "should," so no change is required to the actual document. Some clarifying language that "should" does not equal "will" until several years worth of data with large cohorts provide a measurement might not hurt. Moreover, changing the claim from "75% of students performing at Level 4" to "75% of students performing at Level 4 or 5" will clarify the expectation for level 5, which is currently not stated explicitly.

In addition, we believe there is a necessity for additional statements regarding the qualification of the students earning a C based strictly on knowledge and skills preparation. We realize that there is a qualification of the college-ready determination in the opening statements; however, we believe the policy needs to qualify that PARCC is assessing knowledge and skills that determine college readiness, not behavior and attitudes, in as many places as possible.

Response #2 (Northwestern): We believe that a change in criteria may be necessary. By stating that "75% will earn at least a grade of C" is too broad. Too many additional factors contribute to the success of the college freshman.

Response #3 (SLU): We propose that 100% of students with four would have the content mastery to expect to be able to earn a C in the classes mentioned pending the other facets of college success mentioned in the beginning of the document and including cognitive and affective skills not part of mastering content. The PARCC rating may imply 50% of the opportunity to be successful and college-ready.

Response #4 (Tulane): This is a minimal expectation--- add something like " at least 40% will earn a B or above." If we are using levels 4 and 5 on the PARCC tests, a significant portion of these students should be able to earn more than a "C"….

Additional Responses:

Response #5 (LSU-A): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.")* For precision, consider modifying the statement to include "…at least 75% of students performing at Level 4 or 5 who attend college will earn college credit by attaining…."

Response #6 (LSU-E): I understand that PARCC wants to create their own assessments; however, this language appears as if it came from ACT.

4a. To what extent do you agree that College Algebra or Introductory Statistics are the appropriate entry-level, credit-bearing courses to which the mathematics College-Ready Determination should apply?

Strongly Agree	7	24%
Agree	13	45%
Neutral	1	3%
Disagree	8	28%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

4b. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, which course(s) should be added/Which course(s) should be deleted?

Disagree:

Response #1 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #1): Delete - Introductory Statistics

Response #2 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #3): This may depend on the topics/content included in Introductory Statistics, but in general, College Algebra is a prerequisite for Statistics courses.

Response #3 (LSU): It is impossible to determine the appropriate level credit-bearing courses without first constructing the content to which these policies apply. The ". . . knowledge, skills and practices necessary to enter directly into and succeed in entry level, credit-bearing courses" varies across institutions. Length of course (number of credit hours, how the material is divided into one or more courses, prerequisites, major and other variables affect the content of "college algebra" and "introductory statistics." Understanding the specific learning outcomes of students assessed at "level 4" or level 5" is crucial to determining which introductory course is appropriate.

Response #4 (LaTech): Possibly, PARCC could add a level that says students can attempt to bypass College Algebra? To not infringe upon individual schools' standards, it would need to state something like "recommend inquiring about the option to place in classes beyond College Algebra."

Response #5 (McNeese): Introductory Statistics should be deleted. Some colleges

require college algebra as a prerequisite for statistics; therefore, the CRD determination may not be sufficient.

Response #6 (SLU): In mathematics we recommend that the course sequence be 1) College Algebra and 2) Quantitative Literacy/Finite Math. This more accurately reflects the sequencing toward the curriculum in the majors

Response #7 (Sowela): I believe that Introductory Statistics is not an entry-level college course and should be deleted. Statistics involves both the ability to manipulate data and interpret data. Traditionally, College Algebra develops an essential foundation of the algebraic processes and analytical skills that are pre-requisite for the critical thought processes required in Statistics.

I'd like to see other courses considered as entry-level college math courses. These would include certain applied math classes that may be components of technical degrees at two-year institutions. Such courses are designed to cover in one semester the mathematical skills and concepts required for a particular career. For example: Technical Math for Electricians which is a combination of selected concepts of algebra and trigonometry.

Response #8 (Xavier): Most colleges/universities require students to take a basic/survey Math course; not College Algebra or Statistics. The description does not include the basic courses and these courses would not be included in the data collection of students' proficiency levels.

Additional Responses:

Response #9 (LSU-A): *(Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.")* Keep College Algebra and Statistics

Response #10 (UL-L): (*Note: The overall team rated the item as "Agree.")* Care must be taken that the critical course is a college algebra that students in the non-technical fields take and not the college algebra/pre-calculus algebra that prepares students for calculus. Some states (including LA with a recent change) do allow a first course that is neither College Algebra nor Statistics, how will these courses be identified/used?

Response #11 (LSUE): Do two year degree seeking students all need the same course (college algebra)? There are many non STEM fields that have no need for the college algebra course, but need some form of mathematical reasoning. I do not have a name, but perhaps an applied mathematics for those seeking an associate degree in non STEM fields. These students may then be required to take college algebra if they transfer to a four year institution depending on their major.

5a. To what extent do you agree that College English Composition or Literature and introductory courses that require college-level reading, such as the social sciences and history, are the appropriate entry-level, credit-bearing courses to which the ELA/literacy College-Ready Determination should apply?

Strongly Agree	8	28%
Agree	16	55%
Neutral	2	7%
Disagree	3	10%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

5b. If Disagree or Strongly Disagree, which course(s) should be added/ Which course(s) should be deleted?

Disagree:

Response #1 (LSU): The question is too ambiguous in that it addresses a wide range of courses. ". . . knowledge, skills and practices necessary to enter directly into and succeed in entry level, credit-bearing courses" differ in composition and literature. The meaning of "College Literature" is vague: there is no such course. In addition, social science courses may or may not be offered as "entry-level, credit-bearing courses" and will differ in rigor and content across institutions. Unless or until the content is determined at each assessment level, appropriateness is indiscernible. Faculty in each of the content areas (English and Mathematics), should agree upon the specific learning outcomes that demonstrate "superior," etc. The current language is too broad and open to interpretation. At the very least the word writing should be included with reading. History and social sciences should be separated from this question and addressed independently.

Response #2 (SLU): We do not support the College English Composition OR Literature. In our view English Composition includes and embeds literacy and writing content through the study of composition and literature intertwined (not or).

Response #3 (Sowela): I believe that Literature is not an entry-level college course and should be deleted from such classification. The manner in which Literature has been taught at the college level requires critical thinking skills and a solid ability to express oneself in written form. English Composition has traditionally been the course that builds the analytical processes and writing processes which are pre-requisite for the interpretation and reflection of literature.

6. Please use this space to provide any other comments not addressed by previous questions.

Response #1 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #1): Criteria Used to Make College-Ready Determinations- I prefer the option of using all three PARCC high school assessments in each content area. If a student has shown over the course of three years

that he or she has been consistently prepared for college level work, then that student has shown that he or she is indeed ready for college and has earned the College-Ready designation from PARCC. Using data from three years stresses to all involved in the educational process that college and career aren't things that can be prepared for on a whim. A student who does well for three years has shown the consistency of mind and spirit required to be successful in both the entry level courses discussed and in the work force.

Response #2 (Educator Leader Cadre Member #5): As an educator, I strongly agree with the 5 levels and what they say about readiness for either the next grade or college/career. Dividing the "non-ready" students into 3 levels (partial, limited, very limited) will help educators make better decisions as to what type of intervention is needed.

I believe that parents will struggle with the meaning of the 5 levels. Typically, the middle level (level 3) of a 5-level system indicates that a student is performing on grade level and as such he or she should be prepared for the next grade level or college/career. The third level of the proposed system indicates that a student has only a partial command of the content and will likely need support to be successful at the next grade or college/career.

Response #3 (BRCC): If a student is on a college prep track in high school, he/she should be ready to take college algebra or a higher mathematics course in college. If we create an exam that requires a score to be college algebra ready in order to graduate high school, every high school student will need take Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, and Advanced Math in order to make sure they are ready for College Algebra.

Response #4 (LSU): We believe that the development of levels that determine the mastery of knowledge and the establishment of levels of mastery is premature at this time. Program providers first need agreement on the learning outcomes and specific, measurable performance indicators for each subject (mathematics and English). Once these are determined, levels of mastery and policy can be set.

Other questions posed include limiting the number of assessments and addressing the opportunity to retest.

Response #5 (LA Tech):

1. How will the levels be determined if a student consistently demonstrates readiness in writing but not in reading or the converse? What if a student's subscores indicate a level 2 writing ability but a level 4 reading ability? Will the reports to teachers and schools indicate specific subscores so that teachers will be able to remediate to raise the student to level 4 in all areas?

2. The lack of parallel structure in the general content claims about ELA/literacy makes some of the descriptors difficult to comprehend fully.

3. There's a superscript 1 after the phrase "narrative elements" on pages 6 and 12 but I could not find the accompanying explanatory note. Also, I'm curious about

why only levels 5 and 2 have the superscript 1 when the same phrase is found in levels 4 and 3.

4. Level 5 reads that students demonstrate “use of context”, and levels 4-1 all read “use the context.” Is there a difference between the two or is it an oversight in editing?

Response #6 (Northwestern): When the technical/career components are addressed, a different test(s) will need to be incorporated into the PARCC assessment framework.

Response #7 (SLU): We support the effort of the PARCC team to develop rigorous standards and assessments for college ready success. The suggestions above are meant to provide opportunities to align more closely with the content and cognitive processes assumed in attaining a College "B" or "C." We recommend the language be modified to include cognition as well as content, and that the assessments assess both. In addition, we must recognize that the trend in colleges now is for larger sections of entry classes both live or online that may promote pedagogical approaches the opposite of the intent of this effort. Colllege success also implies a more intimate learning experience where tremendous feedback can assist entry level students with differentiated instruction to guide them through the college level content. Simultaneous efforts should be underway to bolster the entry-level experience for traditional age and non-traditional age college students. The implications of these changes are as much a middle school issues as high school/college, since the middle grades are currently where students either become intrinsically motivated learners or do not. Much of college success can be predicted before high school even begins. Thank you for your efforts and for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Response #8 (Sowela): At the end of end grade level, is the section regarding General Content Claims. For each subject area addressed, there is an introductory statement followed by a bulleted list. Several of the bulleted lists lack a reading fluency because the bulleted items are not grammatically parallel. These lists should be edited for parallelism.